Chapter 7

Preparing Teachers for Diverse Student Populations: A Critical Race Theory Perspective

GLORIA J. LADSON-BILLINGS
University of Wisconsin–Madison

The charge I received for this chapter was to create a synthetic review of the literatures of diversity and teacher education—no small task. A number of scholars have done work on this topic (see, for example, Dilworth, 1992; Gollnick, 1991; Gollnick, Osayande, & Levy, 1980; Grant & Secada, 1990; King, Hollins, & Hayman, 1997; Zeichner, 1992), including me (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Each of these reviews represents an effort to present a comprehensive, coherent synthesis of the extant literature on what may be termed multicultural teacher education or teacher preparation for diverse students. At least 35 journal articles specifically on "multicultural teacher education" have appeared since 1990. These articles focus primarily on preparing teachers to work with students from ethnic and racial groups other than those composed of Whites. Computer searches that include additional terms such as *diversity* and *diverse learners* produce articles that discuss preparing teachers for teaching students identified as having "special needs" and other disabilities, as well as students with gay and lesbian parents.

Grant and Secada (1990) asserted that most of the scholarship on preparing teachers for teaching diverse learners is not based on empirical studies. Furthermore, they asserted that almost none of the empirical studies point to a view of multicultural education that supports a transformative vision of society. But the task I have carved out for this chapter is not one of once again delineating studies and attesting to their worthiness. Rather, the real intellectual task of this chapter is to reframe the notions of preparing teachers for teaching diverse learners so that we might understand the "improbability" of such a task in public school systems that work actively at achieving school failure (McDermott, 1974). I propose to do such a reframing by employing a critical race theoretical perspective.

The chapter begins with a brief discussion of critical race theory (CRT), its history and major theorists. Next, I look at how diversity is constructed in education. Then the chapter examines the literature of diversity in teacher education that has been produced over the past 8 years. The chapter concludes with

---

I would like to thank the consulting editors, Michele Foster and Dan Liston, as well as my colleagues Carl Grant and William F. Tate for their insightful comments on various drafts of this chapter.

a look at the work of some notable scholars and exemplary programs from a critical race theory perspective.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY: A BRIEF DESCRIPTION[1]

According to Delgado (1995, p. xiii), "[CRT] sprang up in the mid-1970s with the early work of Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman, both of whom were deeply concerned over the slow pace of racial reform in the U.S." They argued that the traditional approaches of filing *amicus* briefs, conducting protests and marches, and appealing to the moral sensibilities of decent citizens produced smaller and fewer gains than in previous times. Before long, Bell and Freeman were joined by other legal scholars who shared their frustration with traditional civil rights strategies.

Critical race theory is both an outgrowth of and a separate entity from an earlier legal movement called critical legal studies (CLS). Critical legal studies is a leftist legal movement that challenged the traditional legal scholarship that focused on doctrinal and policy analysis (Gordon, 1990) in favor of a form of law that spoke to the specificity of individuals and groups in social and cultural contexts. Critical legal studies scholars also challenged the notion that "the civil rights struggle represents a long, steady march toward social transformation" (Crenshaw, 1988, p. 1334).

According to Crenshaw, "Critical [legal] scholars have attempted to analyze legal ideology and discourse as a social artifact which operates to recreate and legitimate American society" (1988, p. 1350). Scholars in the CLS movement decipher legal doctrine to expose both its internal and external inconsistencies and reveal the ways that "legal ideology has helped create, support, and legitimate America's present class structure" (p. 1350). The contribution of CLS to legal discourse is in its analysis of legitimating structures in the society. Much of the CLS ideology emanates from the work of Gramsci (1971) and depends on the Gramscian notion of "hegemony" to describe the continued legitimacy of oppressive structures in American society (Unger, 1983). However, CLS fails to provide pragmatic strategies for material and social transformation. Cornel West (1993) asserts that:

> Critical legal theorists fundamentally question the dominant liberal paradigms prevalent and pervasive in American culture and society. This thorough questioning is not primarily a constructive attempt to put forward a conception of a new legal and social order. Rather, it is a pronounced disclosure of inconsistencies, incoherences, silences, and blindness of legal formalists, legal positivists, and legal realists in the liberal tradition. Critical legal studies is more a concerted attack and assault on the legitimacy and authority of pedagogical strategies in law school than a comprehensive announcement of what a credible and realizable new society and legal system would look like. (p. 196)

CLS scholars critiqued mainstream legal ideology for its portrayal of U.S. society as a meritocracy, but they failed to include racism in their critique. Thus, CRT became a logical outgrowth of the discontent of legal scholars of color.

CRT begins with the notion that racism is "normal, not aberrant, in American society" (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv), and, because it is so enmeshed in the fabric

of our social order, it appears both normal and natural to people in this culture. Indeed, Bell's major premise in *Faces at the Bottom of the Well* (1992) is that racism is a permanent fixture of American life. Therefore, the strategy of those who fight for social justice is one of unmasking and exposing racism in its various permutations.

Second, CRT departs from mainstream legal scholarship by sometimes employing storytelling to "analyze the myths, presuppositions, and received wisdoms that make up the common culture about race and that invariably render blacks and other minorities one-down" (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv). According to Barnes (1990), "Critical race theorists . . . integrate their *experiential knowledge* [italics added], drawn from a shared history as 'other' with their ongoing struggles to transform a world deteriorating under the albatross of racial hegemony" (pp. 1864–1865). Thus, the experience of oppressions such as racism and sexism has important aspects for developing a CRT analytical standpoint. To the extent that Whites (or, in the case of sexism, men) experience forms of racial oppression, they, too, may develop such a standpoint. For example, the historical figure John Brown suffered aspects of racism by aligning himself closely with the cause of African-American liberation. Contemporary examples of such identification may occur when White parents adopt transracially. No longer a White family by virtue of their child(ren), they become racialized others. A third example is that of the criminal trial of O. J. Simpson. The criminal trial jury was repeatedly referred to as the "Black" jury despite the presence of a White and a Latino juror. However, in Simpson's civil trial, the majority White jury was given no such racial designation. When Whites are exempted from racial designations and become "families," "jurors," "students," "teachers," and so forth, their ability to understand and apply a CRT analytical rubric is limited. These examples often develop into stories or narratives that are deemed important among CRT scholars in that they add necessary contextual contours to the seeming "objectivity" of positivist perspectives.

A third feature of CRT is its insistence on a critique of liberalism. Crenshaw (1988) argues that the liberal perspective of the "civil rights crusade as a long, slow, but always upward pull" (p. 1334) is flawed in that it fails to understand the limits of the current legal paradigm to serve as a catalyst for social change because of its emphasis on incrementalism. CRT argues that racism requires sweeping changes, but liberalism has no mechanism for such change. Rather, liberal legal practices support the painstakingly slow process of arguing legal precedence to gain citizen rights for people of color.

Fourth, CRT argues that Whites have been the primary beneficiaries of civil rights legislation. For example, although the policy of affirmative action is under attack throughout the nation, it is a policy that has benefited Whites. A close look at the numbers reveals that the major recipients of affirmative action hiring policies have been White women (Guy-Sheftall, 1993). The logic of this argument is that many of these White women earn incomes that support households in which other Whites live—men, women, and children. Thus, White women's ability to find work ultimately benefits Whites in general.

Andrew Hacker (1992) demonstrates that even after 20 years of affirmative action, African Americans constitute only 4%–5% of the professorate. In 1991, there were 24,721 doctoral degrees awarded to U.S. citizens and noncitizens who intended to remain in the United States, and only 933, or 3.8%, of these doctorates went to African-American men and women. If every one of these individuals with newly minted doctorates went into the academy, their numbers would have a negligible effect on the proportion of African Americans in the professorate. In addition, the majority of African Americans who earn PhDs earn them in the field of education, and of that group, most of the degrees are in educational administration, where the recipients continue as school practitioners (Hacker, 1992).

CRT theorists cite this kind of empirical evidence to support their contention that civil rights legislation continues to serve the interests of Whites. A more fruitful tack, some CRT scholars argue, is to find the place where the interests of Whites and people of color intersect. This notion of "interest convergence" (Bell, 1980) was developed to explain the ways the interests of people of color can be met. Consider the way many school desegregation programs are enacted. In order to get White parents to keep their children in a school that is desegregating, school officials often offer special programs and other perks. Magnet programs, advanced classes, and after-school programs are examples of the desegregation compromise. Bell's (1980) argument is that people of color have to begin to set the terms of interest convergence rather than accept those that Whites offer.

In a recent compilation of key CRT writings (Crenshaw et al., 1995), it is pointed out that there is no "canonical set of doctrines or methodologies to which [CRT scholars] all subscribe" (p. xiii). But these scholars are unified by two common interests: understanding how a "regime of white supremacy and its subordination of people of color have been created and maintained in America" (p. xiii) and changing the bond that exists between law and racial power.

In the pursuit of these interests legal scholars, such as Patricia Williams (1987, 1991) and Derrick Bell (1980, 1992), were among the early critical race theorists whose ideas reached the general public. Some might argue that their wide appeal was the result of their abilities to tell compelling stories into which they embedded legal issues. This use of story is of particular interest to educators because of the growing popularity of narrative inquiry in the study of teaching (Carter, 1993; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). But, merely because the research community is more receptive to story as a part of scholarly inquiry does not mean that all stories are judged as legitimate in knowledge construction and the advancement of a discipline.

Lawrence (1995) asserts that there is a tradition of storytelling in law and that litigation is highly formalized storytelling, although the stories of ordinary people, in general, have not been told or recorded in the literature of law (or any other discipline). But this failure to make it into the canons of literature or research does not make stories of ordinary people less important. The ahistorical and acontextual nature of much law and other "science" renders the voices of

dispossessed and marginalized group members mute. In response, much of the scholarship of CRT focuses on the role of "voice" in bringing additional power to the legal discourses of racial justice. CRT theorists attempt to interject minority cultural viewpoints, derived from a common history of oppression, into their efforts to reconstruct a society crumbling under the burden of racial hegemony (Barnes, 1990).

Until recently, little of CRT found its way into the educational literature. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) broached the subject as a challenge to traditional multicultural paradigms. They argued that race continues to be salient in American society, that the nation was premised on property rights rather than human rights, and that the intersection of race and property could serve as a powerful analytical tool for explaining social and educational inequities.

Later, Tate (1997) provided a comprehensive description of CRT and its antecedents as a way to better inform the educational research community of its meaning and possible use in education. His discussion cites Calmore (1992), who identified CRT as

> a form of oppositional scholarship . . . that challenges the universality of white experience/judgement as the authoritative standard that binds people of color and normatively measures, directs, controls, and regulates the terms of proper thought, expression, presentation, and behavior. As represented by legal scholars, critical race theory challenges the dominant discourses on race and racism as they relate to law. The task is to identify values and norms that have been disguised and subordinated in the law. . . . Critical race scholars . . . seek to demonstrate that [their] experiences as people of color are legitimate, appropriate, and effective bases for analyzing the legal system and racial subordination. This process is vital to . . . transformative vision. This theory-practice approach, a praxis, if you will, finds a variety of emphases among those who follow it. . . .
>
> From this vantage, consider for a moment how law, society, and culture are texts—not so much like a literary work, but rather like the traditional black minister's citation of text as a verse or scripture that would lend authoritative support to the sermon he is about to deliver. Here, texts are not merely random stories; like scripture, they are expressions of authority, preemption, and sanction. People of color increasingly claim that these large texts of law, society, and culture must be subjected to fundamental criticisms and reinterpretation. (pp. 2161–2162)

Although CRT has been used as an analytical tool for understanding the law (particularly civil rights law), as previously noted, it has not been successfully deployed in the practical world of courts and legal cases or schools. In fact, the first public exposure CRT received proved disastrous for presidential civil rights nominee Lani Guinier. Its radical theoretical arguments were seen as a challenge to "the American way." Guinier could not be confirmed, and the president did nothing to support her nomination.

With no support for CRT in a practical legal sense, why attempt to employ such a perspective when considering multicultural teacher education? The power of such a perspective is its ability to move us out of a cycle of detailing and ranking research and programs without a systematic examination of their paradigmatic underpinnings and practical strengths. A CRT perspective on the literature is akin to applying a new prism that may provide a different vision to our notions of school failure for diverse students.

THE "PERVERSITY OF DIVERSITY": DEPRAVITY, DISADVANTAGE, AND DIVERSITY

A few years ago, one of my master's degree students completed a thesis on the "feminization of teaching" (O'Reilly, 1995). Her research included detailed life histories of two retired female teachers, one 87 years old, the other 93. The stories of the women were fascinating and richly detailed and told of life and teaching in a small midwestern town. Included in the thesis were copies of photographs the women supplied to elaborate their narratives. Both women included photos of their classes taken in the late 1940s. As I examined each photo, I noticed that each class contained a few African-American children. How was it possible for both teachers to have African-American students without making any mention of the presence of these students in their narratives?

Perhaps the teachers' failure to acknowledge the presence of the African-American children was an oversight. However, another explanation may reside in the way difference was constructed in this 1940s small town. This construction of difference is a central discursive practice for justifying our need to "prepare teachers for student diversity." Consider the rhetorical stance taken by a noted scholar in the late 1940s.

In 1948, Allison Davis delivered the Inglis Lecture to the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The lecture was titled "Social-Class Influences Upon Learning." In it Davis declared (1965):

> In order to help the child learn, the teacher himself must discover the reference points from which the child starts. . . . In every so-called "lesson," the pupil always has something important to tell the teacher; he may tell her what he has already learned that either aids or obstructs the new learning the teacher seeks to instigate. The slum pupil, to cite a case, cannot learn the teacher's culture well until his teacher learns enough about the slum culture to understand what the pupil's words and learning-acts mean. (pp. 1–2)

Davis, himself an African-American social psychologist, defined difference primarily as social class difference; he was careful to distinguish between the deportment, child-rearing practices, and "mental behaviors" among middle-class "Negro" children and lower-class "Negro" children. Later, Davis became associated with researchers who created a discourse of cultural depravity and disadvantage.

In the 1960s, many social scientists and educators began examining what was termed "culturally deprived" or "culturally disadvantaged" children and youth. The major tenet underlying this perspective or paradigm was that children who were not White and middle class were somehow defective and lacking. Thus, the school's role was to *compensate* for the children's presumed lack of socialization and cultural resources. Scholars such as Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965); Bettleheim (1965); and Ornstein and Vairo (1968) helped to shape not only a programmatic direction but also a way of thinking about social differences that remains with us to this day. Riessman's (1962) *The Culturally Deprived Child* was perhaps one of the most influential books published for teachers and other

educators. Although Riessman acknowledged the problematic nature of the term *culturally deprived*, his text proceeded to position White middle-class cultural expression as the normative or correct way of being in school and society.

The federal and state school programs that emerged from the cultural deprivation/disadvantaged paradigm are too numerous to list here. However, looking at some of the major programs such as Head Start, Follow Through, and Title I, it is clear that they rest on a foundation of cultural and social inferiority. It is important that the preceding statement not be interpreted as support for the abolition of such programs. Rather, it might be used to understand why such programs produce limited success in the school setting. If we begin with the notion that some children lack "essential" qualities deemed necessary for school success, how is it that schools can correct or compensate for those missing qualities? Some of these programs have imbedded in their premises a conception of children coming from families that are inadequate, and thus the role of the school (or the state) is to remove children from such families as soon as possible to "compensate" for those perceived inadequacies.

Hollins (1990) has looked carefully at success models for African-American urban schoolchildren. Her analysis suggests that successful approaches to raising academic achievement for Black inner-city students follow one of three theoretical perspectives. The first perspective is that of remediation or acceleration without regard to students' social or cultural backgrounds. Approaches such as the Chicago Mastery Learning Program follow this perspective. The second perspective is that of resocializing urban Black children into mainstream behaviors, values, and attitudes while simultaneously teaching them basic skills. Many Head Start programs operated from this resocialization perspective. The third perspective is one that attempts to facilitate learning by building on students' own social and cultural backgrounds. The work of Au and Jordan (1981) illustrates how teachers can use students' language and culture as a bridge to school achievement. Similarly, work done in many of the Black independent schools sees students' cultural background as critical to academic success (Lee, 1994).

Hollins's work also is important for what it says about teacher preparation; that is, these perspectives also operate in the ways in which teacher education is organized and implemented. Zeichner (1991, 1993) argues that teacher education programs are premised on a variety of traditions: academic, social efficiency, developmentalist, or social reconstructionist approaches. These premises help shape the experiences that prospective teachers have in their preparation programs. The academic tradition sees the teacher as a scholar and subject matter specialist. The focus of teacher education programs based on this tradition is on adding academic discipline to the program. Such programs minimize professional education courses in favor of more "rigorous" disciplined-based study. The social efficiency tradition in teacher education focuses on the perceived power in the scientific study of teaching as a discipline. Programs such as Competency Based Teacher Education were based on measuring a fixed set of teaching skills to determine the proficiency of prospective teachers. The developmentalist tradition

is rooted in the child study movement and the notion that there is a "natural order" of the development of the learner that provides the basis for determining what should be taught to both students and their teachers. Finally, the social reconstructionist tradition defines schooling and teacher education as cultural components of a movement toward a more just and equitable society. This tradition is rooted in the progressive era philosophy of social reformers like George S. Counts.

The academic tradition, much like Hollins's first perspective, focuses on increasing the academic abilities of teachers. The developmentalist approach focuses on helping teachers to resocialize students, and the social reconstructionist approach attempts to have teachers ask fundamental questions about the persistence of social inequity and what education might offer in the way of social change. Only the social efficiency approach is missing from Hollins's analysis.

Goodwin (1997) argues that teacher education's response to changing demographics, social and political action on the part of people of color, and the proliferation of scholarship regarding the teaching of the "culturally deprived/disadvantaged" was a reactive one. Thus, instead of rethinking teacher education, most programs created appendages in the form of workshops, institutes, and courses to deal with the "problem" of culturally different students. According to Goodwin, "The core of American education with its attendant white, middle class values and perspectives remained intact. Multiethnic or multicultural education was synonymous with 'minority' education. Thus, teachers, despite cultural 'training,' continued to function within a Eurocentric framework" (p. 9).

This framing of difference as a problem has a very long history in U.S. education. Cuban (1989) argues that since the beginnings of the common school in cities in the United States, there have been labels to identify those students seen as outside of the mainstream. Cuban further asserts that "the two most popular explanations for low achievement [of children who are seen as different] . . . locate the problem in the children themselves or in their families" (p. 781). The most recent label, "at risk," is another example of how particular discursive practices operate to create categories that soon function as taken-for-granted assumptions.

In 1983, the Commission on Excellence in Education published the widely circulated and cited report *A Nation at Risk*. The very clear message of this report was that the entire nation was at risk of a variety of things, including losing its competitive economic edge and paralysis of the democracy because our children were not being educated to be the kinds of citizens the nation would need to meet the demands of the coming century. The report was seen as a wake-up call to the nation and schools, in particular. It underscored how we all were in jeopardy because of the poor performance of our schools. However, within a short time, the at-risk label went from describing the nation to describing certain children. Being at risk became synonymous with being a person of color. How did this happen? How did the category become associated primarily with difference? This subtle, but significant, shift is emblematic of the way the language of

difference (disadvantage, diversity) works to construct a position of inferiority even when that may not have been the initial intent. Thus, educators (K–12 as well as collegiate level) talk about teaching "at-risk" students in a vacuum (i.e., they know little of the children other than their race or ethnicity). Teachers refer to teaching in a diverse or multicultural setting when, in truth, they are teaching in predominantly African-American or Latino schools. Diversity, like cultural deprivation and the state of being at risk, is that "thing" that is other than White and middle class.

TELLING THE "PREPARING TEACHERS FOR DIVERSE LEARNERS" STORY

One of the major principles of CRT is that people's narratives and stories are important in truly understanding their experiences and how those experiences may represent confirmation or counterknowledge of the way the society works. The use of narrative as a methodological tool is gaining some currency in the social sciences (see, for example, Bateson, 1989; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1998). However, many social scientists criticize it as "unscientific" and not scholarly. This debate is not merely one of methodology, but also one of epistemology. The question of what (and who) counts as knowledge is at the center of the debate. But this chapter makes the assumption that narrative is a way of knowing that can provide valuable insights into our social world. Thus, I proceed to tell the story of preparing teachers for diverse learners.

Once upon a time there was a mythical time and place somewhere in the U.S. where all the children were just alike. They came from similarly constituted families. They spoke the same language. They held the same beliefs, values, and attitudes. When these children went to school their teachers were just like them and they imparted to them knowledge and skills that everyone had agreed upon. Everybody talked about how wonderful things were back then. "Our teachers really knew how to teach." "The children were so smart and well behaved." "We didn't have to worry about discipline and children who weren't capable." Everyone agreed that it had been a glorious era. What happened to disturb this Eden known as "Public School Way Back When (PSWBW)"?

Some say that a disastrous decision made by the nation's Nine Wise Men caused the PSWBW to crumble. In 1954 the wise men decided that "different" children should attend PSWBW with the wonderful, smart, just like us children. Some think that the wise men's ruling, *Brown v. Board of Education*, was an attempt at social engineering—for a nefarious Big Brother called "the federal government" to wrest the local control of schools from the hands of the people. However, a broader reading of this decision suggests that the Nine Wise Men understood the international context into which their decision would be read (Bell, 1980). The nation had just fought a world war for democracy and was embarking on a "cold war" with communist nations. How could the nation reconcile its commitment to democracy worldwide while maintaining several unequal tiers of citizenship at home? The Nine Wise Men proposed a mathematical solution (Tate, Ladson-Billings, & Grant, 1993) to unequal schooling. By forcing PSWBW to desegregate, the nation could prove to the world that democracy was for everyone. Needless to say, this change was not an easy one. And, today people tell stories about how that decision may have helped or hurt all kinds of people (Shujaa, 1996).

What did this change mean for teachers and how they are educated? At first, nothing changed very much in teacher preparation programs. Prior to the *Brown* decision, people involved in the intergroup movement had begun meeting to

discuss how to promote interracial harmony and understanding. Efforts were focused on preparing activities, units, and intergroup gatherings for elementary and secondary schools (Banks, 1981). Later, educators began to focus on a more pluralistic approach to education (Baptiste & Baptiste, 1980) that recognized that students would be educated in more inclusive and culturally diverse classrooms. Unfortunately, this approach typically consisted of isolated cultural awareness and sensitivity workshops that reminded people of just how different the children who were not a part of PSWBW were.

By the 1960s, the entire nation was in upheaval. Not only were schools changing, but these different people were demanding "rights" in every arena of public life: housing, employment, politics. How could schools ever meet all of their demands? Increasingly, the teachers began chanting "... but I wasn't prepared to teach these kinds of children." The teachers' dilemma was not helped by the teacher education programs. These programs had helped to construct PSWBW, and any real attention to the educational needs of all students would expose the mythology of PSWBW; everyone would see that it was not an objective reality but a social rubric used to justify particular schooling practices. Really paying attention to the problem would mean that teachers would learn that most teacher education programs had not helped them to teach any children (Conant, 1963; Goodlad, 1990; Herbst, 1989; Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1986). Teacher education suffered from low prestige and low status. It had an unclear mission and identity. It was filled with faculty disquietude, an ill-defined body of study, and program incoherence (Goodlad, 1990). Furthermore, "the constraints of misguided regulatory intrusions and lack of educational control of or influence over bureaucratically established traditional school practices" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 189) represented additional limitations to a field that was demoralized by its low prestige, lack of rewards, heavy teaching loads, and weak professional socialization (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Seemingly, the only logical response to difference for the PSWBW adherents was to create a new and different set of rules and regulations to add on to current practices. Totally revamping the current practice would mean that something was wrong with PSWBW. Adding a course, workshop, or field experience on diversity could help instantiate the old while presenting a veneer of change.

By the early 1970s, several widespread reviews or assessments had examined multicultural teacher education (Baptiste & Baptiste, 1980; Commission on Multicultural Education, 1978). The Commission on Multicultural Education, working under the auspices of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), surveyed 786 member institutions in 1977. Four hundred forty institutions responded to the survey, which attempted to see whether the institutions had courses, a major, a minor, or departments in multicultural or bilingual education or whether some aspect of multicultural or bilingual education was included in the foundations or methods courses. According to the directory (Commission on Multicultural Education, 1978), 48 of the 50 states and the District of Columbia had at least one institution with either a multicultural education course, major, or minor or a multicultural aspect in the foundations or methods courses.

The AACTE directory was useful in demonstrating the broad sweep of multicultural teacher education, but it failed to provide readers with any sense of the quality of these programs. This directory was followed by four volumes: *Multicultural Teacher Education: Preparing Educators to Provide Educational Equity* (Baptiste, Baptiste, & Gollnick, 1980), *Multicultural Teacher Education: Case Studies of Thirteen Programs* (Gollnick, Osayande, & Levy, 1980), *Multicultural Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Resources* (Lee, 1980), and *Multicultural Teacher Education: Guidelines for Implementation* (AACTE, 1980). The attempt to document the presence of multicultural teacher education programs and practices preceded the development of standards for national accreditation of multicultural teacher education.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), influenced by the Commission on Multicultural Education's work, began to draft standards to examine how teacher preparation programs addressed the multicultural education of its prospective teachers (Gollnick, 1991). In 1979, NCATE began requiring institutions applying for accreditation to "show evidence of planning for multicultural education in their curricula" (p. 226). By 1981, NCATE expected these institutions to implement this planned-for multicultural education.

In its 1990 revision of the accreditation standards, NCATE moved from a separate multicultural standard to integrated multicultural components involving four different standards: the standard on professional studies, the standard on field-based and clinical experiences, the standard on student admission, and the standard on faculty qualifications and assignments.

In its review of the first 59 college and university teacher education programs seeking accreditation under the new standards, NCATE found only 8 of the programs in full compliance with the multicultural education requirements. Most of the programs were deficient in the areas of student admission (54.2%) and faculty qualifications and assignments (57.6%). Forty-four percent of this group was deficient in professional studies, and 32.2% was deficient in clinical and field-based experiences. These numbers may be indicative of the resiliency of PSWBW and the desire or willingness of teacher education programs to maintain it by continuing to prepare teachers for that vision of schooling.

Later reviews of multicultural teacher education (Grant & Secada, 1990) revealed that few empirical studies exist to determine the programs' effectiveness. Zeichner (1992) provided a comprehensive review of multicultural teacher education that included both mainstream and fugitive literature. However, few of the programs he described provided systematic research or program evaluation to determine how well teachers were prepared to teach all children. Ladson-Billings's (1995) review indicated that few multicultural teacher education programs were grounded in the theoretical and conceptual principles of multicultural education. Most programs were satisfied with adding "multicultural content" rather than changing the philosophy and structure of the teacher education programs.

Since 1995, the literature on multicultural teacher education and diversity in teacher education has continued to grow. Most of the literature, similar to that

cited by Grant and Secada (1990), restates the need for multicultural teacher education without providing evidence of how such an approach will improve the academic performance of all students.

While teacher educators struggled to develop preparation programs to meet the needs of a diverse student population, theorists worked toward clarifying what multicultural education for school students should include. Sleeter and Grant (1987) determined that the literature reflects five approaches to multicultural education: educating the culturally different, human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, and education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. The final approach, education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist, was found rarely in theory or practice. However, this was the one approach endorsed by Sleeter and Grant as having the potential to change the society.

Banks (1995) detailed the history of multicultural education and offered what he termed "dimensions of multicultural education" (p. 4). The dimensions include content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture. Ladson-Billings (1995) employed these dimensions as a rubric for reviewing multicultural teacher education. Of some 42 articles published between 1988 and 1992 on multicultural teacher education, none embodied all five dimensions. Twelve reflected an emphasis on content integration. Nine had an emphasis on knowledge construction. Four had an emphasis on prejudice reduction. Two focused on equity pedagogy, and two emphasized empowering school culture. Most discouraging, from a theoretical perspective, was the fact that 14 of the studies could not readily be categorized in relation to any of the dimensions.

An electronic search employing the descriptors "multicultural teacher education" and "diversity and teacher education" indicates that a variety of studies and concept papers continue to be published on preparing teachers for diverse student populations. More than 30 journal articles have been published on the topic since 1992. Publications such as *Equity & Excellence in Education,* the *Journal of Black Studies, Multicultural Education,* and the *Journal of Negro Education* have a mission devoted to issues of equitable education. However, over the past few years, a number of the "mainstream" journals have published more articles on this topic.

The *Journal of Teacher Education* published two consecutive issues with a theme of preparing teachers for diversity. Articles such as those by Boyle-Baise and Washburn (1995), McCall (1995), Shade (1995), Deering and Stanutz (1995), and Greenman and Kimmel (1995) detail programmatic efforts to focus preservice teacher preparation on multicultural education. Unfortunately, few studies exist that document widespread use of multicultural teacher education programs. Zeichner (1992) suggests that two approaches exist for preparing teachers for diverse student populations, one integrating issues of diversity throughout course work and field experiences and the other representing a subtopic or add-on to regular teacher education programs. Zeichner further asserts that "despite a clear

preference for the integrated approach . . . the segregated approach is clearly dominant in U.S. teacher education programs. . . . There are very few teacher education programs of a permanent nature which have integrated attention to diversity throughout the curriculum'' (p. 13). Indeed, many of the programs that do integrate diversity throughout the curriculum exist as experimental programs on soft or external funds. Rarely are such programs institutionalized or incorporated into the institution's major teacher certification program.

Zeichner's findings are consistent with my assertion that there is no desire to disrupt the discourse of PSWBW in teacher preparation programs. Rather than a radical re-formation of teaching, most teacher education programs attempt to embrace the idea of diversity as long as it does not require any fundamental attack on the PSWBW structure. Zeichner did discover a set of ''key elements'' that exist in varying degrees in most teacher education programs aimed at preparing teachers for diverse students. These elements include the following:[2]

1. Admission procedures screen students on the basis of cultural sensitivity and commitment to social justice.
2. Students' sense of their own ethnic and cultural identities is developed.
3. Students examine their attitudes toward others.
4. Students are taught the dynamics of prejudice and racism and how to deal with them in the classroom.
5. Students are taught about privilege and economic oppression and the school's role in social reproduction.
6. Histories and contributions of various groups are integrated into the curriculum.
7. Characteristics of learning styles of various groups and individuals are incorporated, and the limitations of such information are assessed.
8. Sociocultural and language issues are infused into the curriculum.
9. Methods for gaining information about communities are taught.
10. A variety of ''culturally sensitive'' instructional strategies and assessment procedures are taught.
11. Success models of traditionally underserved groups are highlighted.
12. Community field experiences and/or student teaching experiences with individuals from various cultural backgrounds are a part of the practical component of the teacher education program.
13. Students experience opportunities to ''live'' or become immersed in communities of color.
14. Instruction is embedded in a group or cohort setting that provides intellectual challenge and social support.

More recently, Bennett (1995) argued for a model of preparing teachers for diversity that pays close attention to five key components: selection, understanding multiple historical perspectives, developing intercultural competence, combating racism, and teacher decision making. Each of these components is apparent in Zeichner's (1992) list of key elements just outlined. Theoretically, Bennett's

model seems reasonable, and we have seen examples of teacher preparation programs that have attempted to implement aspects of the model. However, it is important to examine the way existing teacher preparation norms and folkways have occluded our abilities to institute real change.

The very first aspect of the model—prospective teacher selection—is fraught with problems. Teacher education programs are filled with prospective candidates who have no desire to teach in schools where students are from racial, ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds different from their own (Grant, 1989; Haberman, 1989). Some novice teachers find themselves in diverse classrooms where they insist they were "not prepared to teach *these* children!" Just who *these* children are and what they represent fits nicely into the discourse of PSWBW. Indeed, if we were to push such novice teachers and raise the question "Just what kind of children were you prepared to teach?" there might be a deafening silence—an unwillingness to name the imagined, idealized children. Instead, many might begin to fault their teacher education programs for inadequate preparation. The double bind that teacher preparation programs find themselves in is as follows: In their attempt to attain legitimacy, they often become more academically selective. Unfortunately, academic selectivity for a profession of low prestige and even lower reward does not allow for much flexibility in the case of admissions.

The second aspect of Bennett's model, understanding multiple historical perspectives, is a noble notion that is dependent on an assumption that students understand any historical perspective. There is little evidence that they do. What we know about students' historical thinking and the development of the history curriculum via textbooks makes it unlikely that prospective teachers come into teacher preparation with any sense of history and its impact on our current social, political, and economic situation (Booth, 1993). According to an adage I came upon, "It's not what you don't know that's the problem; rather, it's what you know that ain't so!" So it is with history (Loewen, 1995). Most students in the United States experience an American history that tells a seamless tale of triumph, conquest, and the inevitability of America as a great nation. Teacher candidates come to preparation programs with a limited understanding of the synchronic and contiguous nature of human events. During the same year that Columbus happened upon the Americas, thousands of African Muslims and Jews were expelled from Spain. Thus, Spain was poised for conquest in one part of the world while simultaneously purging itself of what it deemed "undesirables" at home. What was the role of religion in these two instances? These are ideas with which most teacher candidates are unfamiliar. Few can talk about their own histories and backgrounds with a connection to larger historical issues. The likelihood that they can develop multiple historical perspectives is widely overshadowed by their lack of opportunity to gain more historical knowledge in most teacher education programs.

The third aspect of the model calls for developing intercultural competence among prospective teachers. Bennett uses the term *intercultural competence* to describe teachers' abilities to communicate effectively with a variety of different

people. Once again, this is an admirable quality, one we hope would be embraced by all citizens in a democratic and multicultural society. However, good communication—intercultural or intracultural—requires a healthy respect for the forms and varieties of communication styles that people use to express themselves. There is scant evidence that teachers appreciate the many ways that students different from them use language and other forms of communication. Baugh (1994), Moll (1988), and Smitherman (1987) all demonstrate that language issues are intimately intertwined with issues of race and class. As Baugh argues, "One of the primary reasons that average citizens assume that nonstandard English is inferior to standard English lies in the correspondence between speech and social class. We inherit language and wealth (or poverty) from the same source, and most observant individuals find cause-and-effect relationships that often distort linguistic reality" (1994, p. 196).

The kind of intercultural competence found among the teachers described by scholars such as Delpit (1995), Foster (1997), and Ladson-Billings (1994) is devoid of the kinds of value judgments described by Baugh. But these teachers typically have had intimate experiences with communities of color and use the language themselves, not just to communicate with students but to express their own thoughts and ideas. Typical teacher education students have led monocultural, ethnically encapsulated lives that have not afforded them the opportunities to broaden their linguistic and communicative repertoires. It is unlikely that a university-based course will adequately prepare teachers to achieve this communicative facility.

Combating racism is one of the more noble goals of Bennett's model. It also is one of the more difficult to achieve. Questions of race and racism plague our society. Most Americans are offended at the notion that they could harbor racist attitudes and perceptions. However, if we are ever to confront racism in education, we must unpack and deconstruct it in teacher education (McIntosh, 1988; Rothenberg, 1988). Most prospective teachers are not racist in the sense that they overtly discriminate and oppress people of color. Rather, the kind of racism that students face from teachers is more tied to Wellman's (1977) definition of racism as "culturally sanctioned beliefs which, regardless of the intentions involved, defend the advantages whites have because of the subordinated positions of racial minorities" (p. xviii).

These benefits are manifested in a myriad of ways in teacher education. Prospective teachers are likely to be in teacher education programs filled with White, middle-class students (AACTE, 1994). These prospective teachers rarely question their experience of being prepared to teach in a segregated setting. Their preparation is likely to be directed by White, middle-class professors and instructors (AACTE, 1994). The statistics indicate that there are 489,000 full-time regular instructional faculty in the nation's colleges and universities. Seven percent, or 35,000, are in the field of education. Eighty-eight percent of the full-time education faculty is White. Eighty-one percent of this faculty is between the ages of 45 and 60 (or older). Also, of all of the fields offered in our colleges and universities, education has the highest percentage (11%) of faculty members

who are classified as having no rank. This suggests that at least 4,000 instructors in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) are itinerants and adjuncts who do not have the security of a tenure line or the responsibility of research and scholarship. While this demographic portrait does not prove that our current teacher educators are incapable of preparing teachers to teach students different from themselves, it does suggest that the teacher educators were, themselves, people who experienced PSWBW. Their own experience with diversity is likely to have been vicarious and remote.

In addition to a predominantly White (and aging) teacher education faculty, the prospective teacher population is also predominantly White (AACTE, 1994). The enrollment of SCDEs is 493,606.[3] Of these students, 86.5% (426,748) are White, 33,436 (6.8%) are African American, and 13,533 (2.7%) are Latino. The number of Asian/Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaskan Native students enrolled in SCDEs is negligible. Thus, we have a situation where predominantly White faculty members are preparing predominantly White students to teach a growing population of public school students who are very different from them racially, ethnically, linguistically, and economically. Where are the voices to challenge the dysconscious racism (King, 1991) so prevalent among prospective teachers? Even if teacher preparation programs do include "multicultural" curricula, King (1991) argues that

> merely presenting factual information about societal inequity [and human diversity] does not necessarily enable pre-service teachers to examine the beliefs and assumptions that may influence the way they interpret these facts. Moreover, with few exceptions, available multicultural resource materials for teachers presume a value commitment and readiness for multicultural teaching and antiracist education, which many students may lack initially. (p. 142)

Zimpher and Ashburn (1992) contend that "there is little evidence to date that schools, colleges, and departments of education and the programs they maintain are, or can be, a force for freeing students of their parochialism" (p. 44). Instead, they argue that teacher education programs must be reconceptualized toward diversity, and that reconceptualization must include a global curriculum, an appreciation of diversity, a belief in the value of cooperation, and a belief in the importance of a caring community.

Similarly, work by feminist teacher educators underscores the problem that our traditional teacher education paradigms have in addressing diversity, equity, and social justice. McWilliam (1994) asserts that, "in general, the culture of teacher education has shown itself to be highly resistant to new ways of conceiving knowledge," and "issues of race, class, culture, gender, and ecology will continue to be marginalized while the teacher education curriculum is located in Eurocentric and androcentric knowledges and practices" (p. 61). McWilliam urges a break with the "folkloric discourses of teacher education" (p. 48).

PROMISING PRACTICES AND THE NOBILITY OF STRUGGLE

Legal scholar Derrick Bell is considered the father of the CRT legal scholarship movement. He contends that even though racism is a permanent fixture in U.S.

society, the struggle against it remains a noble undertaking (Bell, 1992). So it may be with preparing teachers for diverse student populations. Although I have attempted to argue that the pervasive myth of PSWBW contours most of the nation's teacher education programs, we are compelled to look for break-the-mold teacher educators and teacher education programs.

This section details a necessarily limited number of teacher educators and teacher education programs for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, space is limited. Second, regardless of the method used for selecting the teacher educators or the teacher education programs, I am not able to accurately represent the universe of possibilities. Indeed, many teacher educators and teacher education programs that are noteworthy are not represented in the literature because the people who work in them are too busy working to have the time to write about them. My intent here is to present a few representations of possibilities on which I might employ a CRT perspective.

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine: Theory Driven

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine is the Charles Howard Candler Professor of Urban Education and project director of the CULTURES program at Emory University. CULTURES is an acronym for Center for Urban Learning/Teaching and Urban Research in Education and Schools. I have chosen to discuss her and her work because she is a teacher educator who has taken a theoretically rigorous approach to preparing teachers for diversity. Irvine's work (1990, 1992) explores the notion of "cultural synchronization" as a necessary mediation for bridging the interpersonal contexts of students and their teachers. Irvine places this cultural synchronization into a larger process model of achievement for African-American children that includes the societal context, the institutional context, the previously mentioned interpersonal contexts of students and teachers, and teacher and student expectations. Irvine's work combines her earlier training in quantitative methodology and her more recent skills in ethnographic methods to document the classroom practices of successful teachers whose ideas may run counter to "standard" notions of teacher excellence (Irvine & Fraser, 1998).

The Internet Web site description of her program states that its mission is "to enhance the success of elementary and middle schools in educating culturally diverse students by providing professional development to sixty teachers annually" (www.emory.edu/CULTURES). The program provides 40 clock hours of professional development to teachers in the Atlanta, Georgia, metropolitan area. The teachers are divided into cohort groups of 15. Teachers selected for the program must have at least 3 years of teaching experience, satisfactory performance ratings on state evaluations, and an application accompanied by sample lesson plans. In addition, prospective participants must have recommendations from their principal, a peer teacher, and a parent. Finally, each applicant must have an interview with the CULTURES staff.

The program is designed to expose teachers to effective teaching strategies undergirded by sound research. It also provides cultural immersion experiences,

opportunities for reflective practice, visits to the classrooms of exemplary teachers, and a chance to develop action research projects. The entire program is geared toward helping teachers recognize the need for cultural synchronization to bridge the distance between home and school cultures. Irvine's theoretical work has laid a foundation for practical work in teacher professional development.

From a CRT perspective, Irvine's work illustrates the principle of interest convergence. The teachers' interests are to be more efficacious in urban classrooms. Few, if any, teachers want to feel unsuccessful. Student academic failure often is attributed to some personal or familial flaw—poverty, family structure, imagined values. For their part, students want more out of the schooling experience than repeated failure. The CRT analysis does not presume altruism, goodwill, or sincerity from teachers. Rather, teachers in urban schools are looking for ways to survive safely while avoiding the constant scorn of the public. Thus, a CRT perspective of Irvine's program would suggest that it has found a way to relieve teachers of the guilt and sense of futility of teaching in urban schools while offering urban students and their families opportunities for more effective instruction.

The CULTURES program is not aimed specifically at changing teacher attitudes toward students, even if that occurs as an ancillary benefit. Instead, this program speaks to teachers' senses of competence and professionalism. Nothing in Irvine's work suggests that she has developed a program that is designed to benefit Whites. However, the interest-convergence premise may operate as White teachers ask themselves "Of what benefit is this program to me?" If the program promises teacher effectiveness, then perhaps being able to demonstrate success with the least successful children will bring added recognition and a vehicle for professional advancement.

Marilyn Cochran-Smith: Theory Generating

Marilyn Cochran-Smith is the director of teacher education at Boston College. Previously, she taught at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, where she collaborated with Susan Lytle. Cochran-Smith's work is notable for her attention to issues of race and racism (Cochran-Smith, 1995a). Cochran-Smith's work with both preservice and in-service teachers focuses on the slow and often scary work of challenging teachers to examine the way race and racism colors their thinking about human possibilities. She details the painstakingly slow and careful work that must be done with teachers to deconstruct and construct a vision of teaching that better serves all students. Her work explores the ways that teacher knowledge can serve as a catalyst for different forms of research and changed practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Cochran-Smith attempts to help her prospective teachers develop five perspectives that are important in confronting race and language diversity: reconsidering personal knowledge and experience, locating teaching within the culture of the school and the community, analyzing children's learning opportunities, understanding

children's understanding, and constructing reconstructionist pedagogy (Cochran-Smith, 1995b).

Rather than beginning with a commitment to a particular theoretical frame, Cochran-Smith's work involves building theory from the ground up (i.e., from the work of teachers). In an impressive series of publications, Cochran-Smith has demonstrated an unwavering belief in the power of teacher knowledge to transform teaching. Cochran-Smith's work also is a good example of the use of reflection for teacher educators. Beyond lamenting the problem of preparing prospective teachers to teach all students well, Cochran-Smith (1995a) raises questions about the ability (and will) of teacher educators, themselves, to deal with difficult issues:

> I worry about how we can have more open discussions about race and teaching among our own staff, many of whom have worked pleasantly together for many years, let alone among our student teachers and their cooperating teachers who know each other much less well. How can we open up to unsettling discourse of race without making people afraid to speak for fear of being naïve, offensive, or using the wrong language? Without making people of color do all the work, feeling called upon to expose themselves for the edification of others? Without eliminating conflict to the point of flatness, thus reducing the conversation to platitudes or superficial rhetoric?. . . I have become certain only of uncertainty about how and what to say, whom and what to have student teachers read and write, about who can teach whom, who can speak for or to whom, and who has the right to speak at all about the possibilities and pitfalls of promoting a discourse about race and teaching in preservice education. (p. 546)

Instead of a prescriptive, static program of multicultural "dos and don'ts," Cochran-Smith's work is an attempt to use student teachers' own constructions of the issues of race and teaching. These constructions require students to rewrite their autobiographies or reinterpret aspects of their life stories or previous experiences. She also pushes students to "construct uncertainty" (Cochran-Smith, 1995a, p. 553). This work, according to Cochran-Smith, requires students to explore the ways in which issues of race and teaching make sense to them. She argues that "the process of constructing knowledge about race and teaching was more akin to building a new boat while sitting in the old one, surrounding by rising waters. In this kind of construction process, it is not clear how or if the old pieces can be used in the new 'boat,' and there is no blueprint for what the new one is supposed to look like" (p. 553).

Cochran-Smith's approach of helping prospective teachers make sense of their own experiences as a basis for teaching requires a radically different and daring approach to teacher preparation that relies less on received knowledge than on knowledge in the making. It is a risky but sincere effort at generating theory—a generation that must occur with each new cohort of teachers.

From a CRT perspective, Cochran-Smith's work is an excellent example of storytelling. In CRT, scholars use stories to analyze

> the myths, presuppositions, and received wisdoms that make up the common culture about race and that invariably render blacks and other minorities one-down. Starting from the premise that a culture constructs social reality in ways that promote its own self-interest (or that of elite groups), [CRT

scholars] set out to construct a different reality. Our social world, with its rules, practices, and assignments of prestige and power, is not fixed; rather we construct it with words, stories, and silence. (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv)

Cochran-Smith skillfully uses teachers' stories as text. As they tell their stories, there are opportunities for exploration of experiences with race and racism. The stories provide an avenue for talking about social taboos that many teacher education programs avoid. In the discourse of PSWBW, race and racism are those things "out there," disembodied and unattached to the everyday lives of the prospective teachers. Even in those teacher education programs where prospective teachers are exposed to a multicultural curriculum, students can distance themselves from historical and social reality (Ladson-Billings, 1991). Ahlquist (1991) experienced preservice classrooms where the prospective teachers claimed that racism and sexism no longer existed and that these topics were issues only because the professor raised them. Of course, these same students never questioned the fact that despite their living in one of the nation's most diverse cities, their teacher education classroom was composed of 28 White students and 2 Mexican-American students.

Cochran-Smith attempts to create a classroom atmosphere where the stories are not merely entertainment but the basis for learning. In professions such as law, medicine, business, and theology, stories are the central texts. The training of lawyers, doctors, and businesspeople revolves around cases, and what is a case if not a good story. These good stories are illustrative of important concepts, ideas, and examples that are useful for teaching and learning. CRT is designed to add different voices to the received wisdom or canon. It offers counterstories. Cochran-Smith's work helps prospective students see their stories as a legitimate starting place for the disruption of the stories that have maintained PSWBW as a dominant discourse.

Joyce King: Theory Enhancing

Joyce King is the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and diversity programs at the University of New Orleans.[4] Although most of her work is concerned with university administration, King has continued to regularly teach a course that builds on the work she started as director of teacher education at Santa Clara University. Trained as a sociologist, King has challenged the positivist-functionalist paradigm of traditional sociology, infusing it with perspectives from Black cultural knowledge (King, 1995). Like Joyce Ladner (1973) before her, King's work examines the "links among culture, ideology, hegemony, and methodological bias in social science knowledge production" (1995, p. 268).

In a course titled "Mapping University Assets for Public Scholarship and Community Partnering," King (1998) attempts to create a synergistic, bidirectional relationship between university students and community members. While many teacher education programs introduce prospective teachers to the more voyeurlike community observations or "immersion" experiences, King's course

is an attempt at a more authentic collaboration between students and their community partners. King's students need their community partners to help them understand the way the university can better serve the community. The community partners come to the university to share their expertise and learn of ways the university can better fulfill its "urban mission" by meeting community development needs.

King employs a Black studies theoretical perspective in her work with prospective teachers (King, 1997). She helps students understand that Black studies was not merely a political movement but also a paradigm that recognizes a "dialectical link between intellectual and socio-political emancipation and is ethically committed to knowledge for human freedom from the social domination of ideas as well as institutional structures" (p. 159). The generative concepts and themes used in King's social foundations course include "individualism versus collectivism"; "ideology, hegemony, and school knowledge"; and the notion that "White is a state of mind; it's even a moral choice."

As is true with Cochran-Smith, King is not concerned with providing students with fragmented pieces of information about "different" groups that keeps White identity in the center or place of normality. Her work helps prospective teachers understand their own miseducation as well as their "responsibilities as change agents" (King, 1997, p. 162). What makes King's work with prospective teachers so exciting is her ability to translate the work of critical theorists to practice-based applications for men and women learning to teach. Her work is best understood through her own words: "I introduce them to the praxis of teaching for change or transmutation experientially in a way that includes conceptualizing not only the realities of racism, poverty, and so on, but a role for themselves in the struggle against this reality" (King, 1997, p. 169).

A CRT perspective of King's work reveals threads of several CRT premises (e.g., call for context, storytelling, racism as a normal aspect of U.S. society). However, for this discussion, I focus on King's work as an example of CRT's critique of liberalism. Delgado (1995, p. 1) insists that "virtually all of Critical Race thought is marked by deep discontent with liberalism." The liberal discourse is deeply invested in the current system. It relies on the law and the structure of the system to provide equal opportunity for all.

King's work asks students to challenge the existing structure by focusing on the "need to make social-reconstructionist liberatory teaching an option for teacher education students . . . who often begin their professional preparation without having ever considered the need for fundamental social change" (King, 1991, p. 134). King observed that most of her students entered her social foundations course "with limited knowledge and understanding of societal inequity. Not only [were] they . . . unaware of their own ideological perspectives (or the range of alternatives they have not consciously considered), most [were] unaware of how their own subjective identities reflect an uncritical identification with the existing social order" (1991, p. 135).

Disentangling students from the liberal discourse is not an easy task. The idea of slow, steady progress, or incrementalism, is deeply ingrained in the U.S. social

and political rhetoric. The traditional chronicle of U.S. history records a story of forward moving progress, no matter how slow. Issues such as voting rights for African Americans and women, school desegregation, and social desegregation of public accommodations unfolded at a very slow pace. Thus, slow but steady progress seems the "right" way. It is clearly the way of progress that most prospective teachers have come to expect. This embrace of incremental change makes marginalized groups appear to be impatient malcontents rather than citizens demanding legitimate citizen rights.

King's work with prospective teachers is designed to help them look critically at the ways they omit "any ethical judgment against the privileges white people have gained as a result of subordinating black people (and others)" (1991, p. 139). She introduces students to the critical perspective that education is not neutral—that it can and does serve a variety of political and cultural interests. Prospective teachers in King's courses often feel "disoriented" because they are forced to "struggle with the ideas, values, and social interests at the heart of the different educational and social visions which they, as teachers of the future, must either affirm, reject, or resist" (1991, p. 141).

Martin Haberman: Theory Challenging

Martin Haberman is the Distinguished Professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. The focus of his research has been to study characteristics and practices that help make some teachers successful with students and those that make others fail. Haberman (1995a) believes that the "traditional approach to training is counterproductive for future teachers in poverty schools since it leads them to perceive a substantial number—even a majority—of 'abnormal' children in every classroom" (p. 4).

Haberman's work represents an almost wholesale rejection of traditional teacher education, and he specifically targets the admission processes attendant to such programs. In an article written for *In These Times*, Haberman (1995b) asserts that our conceptions of who is best suited to be successful in urban classrooms may be very different from who might actually be able to do the job. Haberman believes that many of the students who choose elementary education as a college major "do so because (1) they 'love children' and (2) they believe they can meet the general education requirements of the school of education" (1995a, p. 31). Haberman bemoans the fact that few prospective elementary teachers have any depth of knowledge in the subjects they are expected to teach. According to Haberman, teacher education programs perpetuate a cruel hoax on teachers that leads them to believe that because they can read a teachers' guide, they can teach children how to read (or do math, or science, or social studies). The intellectual life of the teacher is rarely considered in the certification process.

Haberman sees prospective teachers' age and maturity as one part of the problem of admission into teacher education. So, in a somewhat controversial move, he has inverted the teacher education paradigm by recruiting "adults" into teaching. Many of the students who enter Haberman's urban education

program are paraprofessionals who have extensive firsthand knowledge of urban communities and their residents. Haberman requires a rigorous interview process designed to test prospective teachers' persistence, willingness to protect learners and learning, ability to put ideas into action, attitudes toward "at-risk" students, professional-personal approach to students, understanding of their own fallibility, emotional and physical stamina, organizational ability, and disposition toward cultivating student effort versus innate ability.

In summary, Haberman (1995a) asserts that "completing a traditional program of teacher education as preparation for working [in today's urban classrooms] is like preparing to swim the English Channel by doing laps in the university pool. Swimming is not swimming. . . . 'Teaching is not teaching' and 'kids are not kids.' Completing your first year as a fully responsible teacher in an urban school has nothing to do with having been 'successful' in a college preparation program" (p. 2).

A CRT perspective on Haberman's work points toward the "call for context." As Delgado (1995) explains:

> Most mainstream scholars embrace universalism over particularity, abstract principles and the "rule of law" over perspectivism. . . . For CRT scholars, general laws may be appropriate in some areas (such as, perhaps, trusts and estates, or highway speed limits). But political and moral discourse is not one of them. Normative discourse (as civil rights is) is highly fact sensitive—adding even one new fact can change intuition radically. (p. xv)

For Haberman, teaching in urban schools requires a very specific type of teaching. Teaching in urban schools demands a different set of skills and abilities and requires people who themselves are committed to protecting learners and learning. Haberman believes that where teaching occurs matters. His perspective is not necessarily shared by those who construct teaching standards and assessments that are supposed to fairly judge teaching performance. A CRT perspective rejects the idea that the conditions under which urban teachers and suburban teachers work can be compared in a way that is fair and equitable. The context of the urban setting creates a challenging environment—issues of limited school funding, more inexperienced and underqualified teachers, greater teacher turnover, and more students assigned to special classes and categorical programs are endemic in urban schools.

Theory driven, theory generating, theory enhancing, and theory challenging are four ways to think about the practice of teacher educators who recognize that current teacher education programs are inadequate to prepare teachers for the rigors of teaching in classrooms that do not reflect the mythology of PSWBW. These individuals represent powerful ideas and powerful practices. What they have to share contributes to a necessary literature of teacher education. However, teacher education is dependent on more than individuals. It also requires models of practice representing systemic change that departs from PSWBW. The next section details two such programs. I have selected as examples Santa Clara University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison not because they are the

best or even among the best examples of preparing teachers for success with diverse students but, rather, because of my intimate knowledge of both programs. Their role in this chapter is that of institutional prototype. Certainly there are other programs throughout the country that are equal to or better than these two.[5] In some ways, Santa Clara University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison represent the range of programs, since they are so different on a variety of dimensions.

Santa Clara University: Challenging the Children of Privilege

Perennially named as one of the best liberal arts universities in the west (by *U.S. News & World Report*), Santa Clara University (SCU) is a Jesuit school located in the midst of California's Silicon Valley. Although the valley has large Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, the university's approximately 8,000 students are overwhelmingly White and upper middle class. Tuition exceeds $12,000 per year, and a large percentage of the students pursue degrees in the university's highly regarded engineering and business schools.[6]

Teacher education in California occurs at the postbaccalaureate level. The fifth-year program at SCU is in the Division of Counseling Psychology and Education. It is a small program, rarely serving more than 30 to 35 students a year. In the mid-1980s, two African-American women scholars who directed and coordinated the teacher education program took advantage of the institution's expressed social justice mission in order to restructure the teacher education program. Typically regarded as a curricular "extra," social justice generally was seen as a set of activities loosely coupled with course work or ministries directed by some of the Jesuits. The director and coordinator of teacher education decided to make changes in the existing program to ensure that issues of cultural diversity and social justice were at the center of the program (King & Ladson-Billings, 1990). The current director of teacher education, Sara Garcia (1997), has extended and revised the previous work to include a focus on self-narrative inquiry.

The SCU teacher education program is designed to cultivate "informed empathy" rather than a sense of "sympathy" where well-meaning students "feel sorry for" or pity others. The program's goal is to help prospective teachers "feel with" people they regard as different from a position of knowledge and information about how both they and others come to occupy particular social positions. The catalyst for developing informed empathy is a mandatory 1-week "immersion" experience prior to the start of classes. The purpose of this experience is to place students in social settings very different from any they have experienced. Through the use of soup kitchens, homeless shelters, and other facilities designed to serve poor and dispossessed people, students are challenged to see a fuller range of the human condition and begin a yearlong questioning of social inequity. Under the current director, the immersion experience has been expanded into a "comprehensive, structured, field-based course that provides a basis for continual self-reflection and community-based experiential learning" (Garcia, 1997, pp. 150–151).

SCU uses an integrated, cohort approach to teacher education. Students begin the program together in the fall quarter, take courses together, and complete the program at the end of the spring quarter. Because of changes in the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, SCU now offers the cross-cultural, language, and academic development teaching credential.[7] This credential requires that prospective teachers have course work that covers (a) language structure and first and second language development; (b) methodology of bilingual, English language development; and (c) culture and cultural diversity. Santa Clara was one of the few state programs that had less difficulty moving to the new certification because five of the courses in the previous credential program were directly related to issues of diversity and social justice. Those courses were social foundations of education, cross-cultural and interpersonal communication, curriculum foundations, reading in the content areas (which requires students to work one on one with a youth who is a nonreader and is awaiting adjudication of his or her case in the juvenile justice system), and a course in second language acquisition.

Another prominent theme in the SCU program is "miseducation." Although much has been written about the way children of color have been poorly served by schooling, little attention has been paid to the way our education system miseducates the children of privilege. A journal entry from a former SCU student is illustrative:

> From watching this video (*Eyes on the Prize*) I realized that the [19]50s were not such a great time. There was a lot of active discrimination and prejudice. It was hard for me to believe that White people could show such hatred for Black children just because they wanted to go to school.

This student was not atypical. Many of the students had no knowledge of the history of racism, sexism, and discrimination in the United States. Some expressed anger at the way this information was "kept from them." The challenge of a program like that of SCU is to help students construct a more accurate understanding of the past without plunging them into a state of complete cynicism and distrust.

Throughout the program, students are engaged in a field-based experience. During the fall and winter quarters, students are assigned to a half-day practicum in a local public school.[8] During the spring quarter, students participate in full-day student teaching. California State Department of Education guidelines specify that at least one of these placements must occur in a community whose population is different from that of the prospective teacher's. These placements, along with the program emphases, are often a source of contention for students who see SCU as a safe haven away from and against issues of diversity, equity, and social justice.

The SCU teacher education program fully recognizes that many of its students have never attended a public school and may have narrow conceptions of what it means to be a teacher in the latter part of the 20th century. King (1997) interviewed a 10-year graduate of the program to gain some perspective on what the SCU program meant for a practicing teacher:

I was going to recreate myself—create small versions of myself—a really arrogant point of view. The program helped me to understand that the students come to schools already with their characters intact—that my job as a teacher is to take who they are and help them define themselves culturally and personally and to develop their gifts and give that to the world. . . . [In your classes] you would, without any fear, challenge people's ideas—politely, but strongly—and get us to support our ideas, get us to reconsider what we believed. I ended the year being more open-minded than I started, and I took my job as a teacher more seriously. I also realized that I had more to learn, as much as the students. (p. 167)

Beyond helping the students to become good teachers, the SCU teacher education program attempted to provoke students' thinking about what it means to be a "good" human being. Once again, a student's journal entry illustrates the program's impact:

I don't want to talk about class or lecture because something happened to me today that made me so mad, I have to write about it. The first thing I have to say though is the reason I am most angry is because I did not say anything—and I am very angry at myself. I was in the women's bathroom this morning and saw two women students come in . . . as they came in a young Hispanic student walked out of a stall, washed her hands and left. Once she left, one of the women said, "Well, I'm not going to go where the Mexican was."... I wanted to ask her who the hell she thought she was. . . . That was my first reaction, then about an hour later I had another reaction—I was so mad and disappointed at myself for not saying it. How are people with those attitudes going to change if people let them do it?... I made a promise to myself to say something the next time something like that happens. (Ladson-Billings, 1991, p. 154)

By emphasizing equity, diversity, and social justice issues, SCU has moved away from the myth of PSWBW and toward preparing students for teaching in the new millennium. Like all teacher education programs, its impact may be minimal, but at least it has constructed itself as one whose foundation is built on principled and ethical stances toward schooling all children.

From a CRT perspective, Santa Clara University relies on a critical understanding of the social science underpinnings of race and racism (as well as other forms of oppression). According to Delgado (1995, p. 157), "A number of Critical Race Theory writers have been applying the insights of social science to understand how race and racism work in our society." The challenge of preparing teachers in an environment like Santa Clara is that most of the students have benefited from the current social order and have come to see social inequity as a "natural" outgrowth of a meritocracy. The students believe that their hard work landed them in the best private K–12 schools, and attending an elite, private school like Santa Clara is to be expected. What antagonism students do express is tied to their belief that some students (of color) ought not be at the university or that affirmative action stood in the way of their getting into an even more prestigious college or university. One student remarked, "I could have gotten into Stanford if my last name was Hernandez." Remarks such as these reflect a deep-seated resentment toward social programs designed to remedy structural inequities. The SCU teacher education program tackles such issues head on, even though "white students sometimes find . . . critical, liberatory approaches threatening to their own self-concepts and identities" (King, 1991, p. 142).

The SCU program "does not neglect the dimension of power and privilege in society, nor does it ignore the role of ideology in shaping the context within which people think about daily life and the possibilities for social transformation" (King, 1991, p. 143). Thus, the emphasis on understanding race and racism is not a goal in itself but, rather, a means for helping students develop pedagogical options that disrupt racist classroom practices and structural inequities. The SCU approach attempts to move beyond offering students a "diversity" curriculum where they act as voyeurs, exploring the culture of the other. Instead, the program is aimed at destabilizing students' sense of themselves as the norm. Although race is not the only axis on which issues of inequity turn, it serves as a powerful signifier of "otherness" and difference. Race is the one social marker that almost every student has encountered, either face to face or symbolically through media, cultural, and curriculum forms. Santa Clara, unlike many teacher education programs, has made a commitment to seriously engage race and racism.

University of Wisconsin–Madison: Pushing Past the Liberal Discourse

The University of Wisconsin–Madison is a large, land-grant university serving 40,000 students. It is regarded as one of the nation's top research institutions. Its School of Education is rated among the top five for scholarly productivity and the quality of its graduates. Teacher education (specifically elementary education) is one of the university's more popular majors. Because of the high demand of the major, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, which administers the teacher education program, has been forced to be highly selective in its admission process. Although the entire elementary education program is grounded in a philosophy of social reconstruction (Zeichner, 1991) and reflective practice (Zeichner & Liston, 1987), both size and complexity of the elementary program caused a group of faculty to reconsider how to ensure that students are well prepared to teach diverse students.[9]

Beginning in the summer of 1994, the university initiated its "Teach for Diversity" (TFD) master's with elementary teacher certification program. A key feature of TFD was its focus on attracting prospective teacher candidates who already had an expressed commitment to principles of equity, diversity, and social justice. Admission to TFD was open to students with a bachelor's degree in a major other than education. Applicants were required to have at least a 3.0 grade point average on the last 60 credits of their undergraduate degree (or post a strong score on the Graduate Record Examination) and to submit a statement of purpose and three letters of recommendation. The applicants' files were reviewed by an admissions committee composed of approximately 20 UW-Madison faculty and teachers from the local public schools.

TFD was designed as a 15-month elementary certification program where prospective teachers begin to understand what it means to teach diverse learners by starting in the community. The entire program consists of an initial summer session, fall and spring semesters, and a final summer session. The first summer

experience requires a 6-week assignment in a community-based agency (e.g., neighborhood center, Salvation Army Day Camp, city-sponsored day camp, or enrichment program). In addition to spending 10–12 hours per week in the community placement, students take two courses, "Teaching and Diversity" and "Culture, Curriculum, and Learning." Students also take an 8-week seminar to process and debrief their community placement experiences.

During the fall semester, students are placed in one of three elementary schools in the district that has both a representative number of students of color and a desire to work with the university in a new way. The students are placed in their school settings for the entire academic year and are required to maintain a community service commitment. The academic year course work includes three integrated methods courses and a state-required course in inclusive schooling. During the final summer of the program, the students enroll in courses titled "School and Society" and "Child Development." These courses are taught by the university's Educational Policy Studies Department and Educational Psychology Department, respectively. In most teacher education programs, these courses are the first courses prospective teachers take. When they are completed at the end of the program, TFD students can use their experiential knowledge as a way to understand and challenge perspectives and assumptions of educational literature. During the final summer, TFD students complete and defend their master's papers.

The truncated nature of the TFD program means that a few themes are emphasized and repeated throughout the preparation year. One such theme is that schools are community entities and teachers must better understand the communities in which they teach. Another theme is that learning specific teaching "methods" is less important than learning to develop a "humanizing pedagogy" (Bartolome, 1994). A third theme is that teaching is an "unfinished" profession. The best teachers of diverse students constantly work on their practice, looking for new and better ways to enhance student learning. A fourth theme is that self-reflection is an important skill in teacher development. A theme of the entire TFD program is that everyone is a learner. The program faculty, administrators, cooperating teachers, faculty associates, and students all are part of an exciting learning experiment.

At this writing, TFD is under moratorium while the elementary education faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction determine whether or not the department can afford to maintain such a program. In comparison with the ongoing elementary certification, TFD is expensive. It requires faculty members as well as graduate students to teach and supervise students. There are few evaluation data available as to its effectiveness. What is available is anecdotal and impressionistic. The attrition rate is high. In the first cohort of 21 students, 4 failed to complete the teacher certification program. Five of the students did not complete the master's paper by the end of the second summer. In the second cohort, one student withdrew after the first 4-week summer course. A second withdrew at the end of the second 4-week summer course. Three students were not permitted to student teach because of their failure to demonstrate that they

were ready by the end of the fall practicum experience. The engagement of tenured (and tenure track) faculty gave the program legitimacy and authority to make tough calls about who should and should not proceed toward teacher certification.

An important feature of TFD is its engagement with practicing teachers and the school community. Some of the seminars were held on site at the school. Cooperating teachers had some say in with whom and how the prospective teachers' placements would occur. Cooperating teachers also were members of planning teams that informed the content and organization of the students' courses.

Many of the TFD students came away from the preparation year profoundly changed. The combination of exposure to "high theory" in graduate courses and the complexity of schools and communities produced some powerful learning. The TFD program attempted to destabilize students' thinking around issues of diversity. Rather than endorse the simple notions of diversity as difference without asking "Different from whom?" TFD students were presented the daunting challenge of questioning everything they believed to be true about students, teaching, and learning. One student's master's paper, titled *Exposing Biases: Diversity Framed in a Western Lens* (Van Huesen, 1996), is illustrative:

> This "Western" philosophy toward education I was employing was evident in my use of psychological explanations and tests to define [my student's] "deficits," my quickness in categorizing him and deciding what "level" he should be, my ideas of what a child should be, my interpretation of his "behavior," and what I thought was a "lack" of emotion or assertiveness. (p. 1)

Certainly, not all of the students plunged into the depths of postmodern and critical theories, but enough of them engaged in the rigors of theoretical work to elicit words of praise from faculty in other departments.

A CRT perspective on the TFD program focuses on its use of context in constructing reality and the social construction of knowledge. Although many of the students wanted the program to "tell them" what to do, the faculty insisted on plunging students right back into the specific context of the community and school to which they were assigned. TFD did not pretend to have "answers" but instead a more complex way to examine problems. Simple prescriptions such as "Teachers should make home visits" were challenged in TFD seminars. What if parents don't want you in their homes? What if parents believe you are there to judge them and their parenting? Who are you to insert yourself into people's private lives? Throughout the preparation year, TFD students are asked to make meaning from their different contexts. By "telling teaching stories" (Gomez & Tabachnick, 1991), TFD students were challenged to examine teaching and students' experiences from multiple perspectives.

TFD was careful to challenge students about fixed notions of difference and diversity they may have held. In the introductory course, "Teaching and Diversity," there was an attempt to interrogate the meanings of diversity. Like Judith Butler (1991, p. 14) we wanted the students to be "permanently troubled by identity categories, [to] consider them to be invariable stumbling-blocks, and

understand them, even promote them, as sites of necessary trouble.'' As a consequence of this kind of teaching and learning, TFD students often were ''disruptive'' to both their university classes and their field experience sites. The term *disruptive* is used here not to describe uncivil or rude behavior but, rather, to describe a ''disturbing'' presence. TFD students constantly asked questions about why things were as they were. ''Why are the Chapter 1 children always being pulled out of the classroom during some of the most important instructional time?'' ''Why is it that only children of color are slated for categorical services?'' ''How is it that our discipline program is so arbitrarily applied, resulting in suspension of male children of color at twice the rate of White children?'' ''Why aren't the Black children learning to read?'' These questions and others like them posed a threat to notions of PSWBW that existed even in some of our most ''multicultural,'' ''progressive'' schools. The TFD students began to appreciate our argument that constructing the category also creates the desire to fill it.

Destabilizing prospective teachers' thinking while simultaneously preparing them to confront the rigors of urban teaching is ''dangerous'' work. TFD was not attempting to raise the level of uncertainty and anxiety in its students to the point where they would be ineffective in the classroom. It was trying to help them reconceptualize some of their fundamental beliefs and attitudes toward difference and diversity, even if they came into the program believing they were ''liberal'' or ''progressive.'' Ultimately, TFD could not hold up under its own weight. The intellectual work of deconstructing and reconstructing teaching and teacher education took its toll on faculty. Ironically, TFD is being rethought.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

What does a CRT perspective tell us about the preparation of teachers for diverse student populations? In general, it suggests that such work is difficult, if not impossible. First, it suggests that teacher educators committed to preparing teachers for effective practice in diverse schools and communities are working with either small, specialized groups of like-minded prospective teachers or resistant, often hostile prospective teachers (Ahlquist, 1991). It also tells us that many programs treat issues of diversity as a necessary evil imposed by the state and/or accrediting agency. These programs relegate issues of diversity to a course, workshop, or module that students must complete for certification. Even at schools, colleges, and departments of education with well-regarded teacher preparation programs, students talk of ''getting through the diversity requirement.''

Examination of the literature suggests that external accrediting agencies (e.g., state departments of education, collegiate accreditation) exert little power on SCDEs to ensure that prospective teachers are prepared to teach in diverse schools and communities. This conclusion comes from a minimal level of deductive reasoning. Few SCDEs require that students seeking admission to teacher certification programs exhibit any knowledge, skills, or experiences related to diversity.[10] Many states require that prospective teachers pass basic competency tests, even though most students do not enter the professional course sequence until

their junior year and should be able to read, write, and compute. However, the state does not employ a similarly watchful eye to determine prospective teachers' multicultural competence. Even though most teacher preparation programs require course work or field experiences in diverse settings, the standard for such requirements is variable. At one of the nation's more highly regarded education schools, there are no faculty of color involved in teacher preparation and no course work that directly attends to preparing teachers for diverse schools and communities.

Third, the snapshot of four teacher educators and two teacher education programs suggests that CRT can be a way to explain and understand preparing teachers for diversity that moves beyond both superficial, essentialized treatments of various cultural groups and liberal guilt and angst. The CRT perspective exposes the way that theory works in such programs. Unfortunately, too many teacher education programs have no basis in theory. Instead, teacher educators are forced to spend much of their energy trying to determine how to force some number of credit requirements into rigid time frames.

Fourth, the CRT perspective helps to ferret out the way specifically designed programs for preparing teachers for diverse student populations challenge generic models of teaching and teacher education. Rather than submit to the discourse of PSWBW, such programs and teacher educators establish themselves in opposition to the hegemony of an idealized past. Ahlquist (1991) points out that "most teacher educators never received an education that was empowering, anti-racist, problem posing, or liberatory" (p. 168). Thus, the people and programs that served as exemplars in this chapter represent a relatively small proportion of teaching and teacher education.

This chapter was an attempt at using a lens that is new to education, critical race theory, for understanding the phenomenon of preparing teachers for diverse student populations. I tried to provide enough of a foundation in CRT to ensure coherence in the subsequent arguments. From the beginning, the chapter adopted an almost schizophrenic character in which the author both challenged constructions of difference and deployed those constructions to understand school inequity. However, it was a necessary personality split, for we are, as Cochran-Smith says, "constructing a new boat while sitting in the old one."

Simply knowing what the literature says about preparing teachers for diverse student populations is unlikely to be of much use to teacher educators. What we need to know is the meaning that these teacher preparation programs make of difference, diversity, and social justice. Thus, it was important to take the reader back through a brief historical overview of the construction of the categories of difference. Next, the chapter infused the more traditional approach of reviewing extant literature with telling the "preparing teachers for diversity" story. This story (and it was important to name it as such) is a self-perpetuating one that has had a powerful influence on the ways that diversity has been constructed for teachers. Finally, the chapter concluded with a critical race theory perspective on a select group of practitioners and programs to illustrate the possibilities for challenging dominant discourses of education and educational research.

The practitioner and practice examples are not about "right" ways of preparing teachers; rather, they are about possibilities. They are about honest attempts to break with the discourse and mythology of PSWBW. Unfortunately, these profiles are not about optimism. Indeed, the power of myths (such as PSWBW) is that they can endure and have meaning far beyond their usefulness. Practitioners and practices that defy the conventional paradigm remain as showcases and oddities. The vast majority of new teachers will continue to be prepared in programs that add on multicultural education courses, workshops, or modules. Most teacher education programs will continue to accept student resistance to issues of difference, diversity, and social justice as a given.

Our tacit acceptance of student resistance may reflect our ongoing desire to believe in some mythical time when school was perfect. We may want to be able to point to the elements (or, more pointedly, the people) that destroyed that perfection. We may want to believe that this different group of students requires some extraordinary type of teaching because if we do not believe it, it calls into question all of the teaching we have endorsed heretofore.

Perhaps the real task of this chapter was not to investigate our preparation of teachers for diverse learners, but rather simply our preparation of teachers. Perhaps the service this chapter renders is to pose a new set of questions: What kinds of knowledge, skills, and abilities must today's teacher have? How are we to determine teaching excellence? Is a teacher deemed excellent in a suburban, middle-income White community able to demonstrate similar excellence in an urban, poor community? How do we educate teacher educators to meet the challenges and opportunity diversity presents? How do we deconstruct the language of difference to allow students to move out of categories and into their full humanity? As long as we continue to create a category of difference—teacher preparation versus teacher preparation for diverse learners—we are likely to satisfy only one group of people, those who make their living researching and writing about preparing teachers for diverse learners.

NOTES

[1] Portions of this section are adapted from an earlier publication (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

[2] These elements are adapted from Zeichner's (1992) special report.

[3] This is a total figure for all students enrolled in SCDEs. It includes graduates as well as undergraduates and students not seeking teacher certification.

[4] At this writing, Joyce King has just accepted a new administrative post at the City University of New York's Medgar Evers College.

[5] Many other excellent programs could have been selected here, including those at Alverno College, the University of Alaska–Fairbanks, Wichita State University, and the University of Utah, as well as Etta Hollins's work at California State University–Hayward and Washington State University.

[6] Aspects of these profiles are taken from Ladson-Billings (in press).

[7] There is also a bilingual, cross-cultural, language, and academic development teacher credential.

[8] Prior to the change in director in the mid-1980s, SCU students regularly did their practicums and student teaching in private (often church-related) schools.

[9] Several UW-Madison faculty members, including Carl Grant, Ken Zeichner, Bob Tabachnick, Mary Gomez, and Marianne Bloch, have conducted small cohort programs whose focus has been on preparing teachers for diverse classrooms. Each of these programs was developed within the existing teacher education program structure.

[10] At the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater, teacher education applicants must meet a minimal diversity requirement.

REFERENCES

Ahlquist, R. (1991). Position and imposition: Power relations in a multicultural foundations class. *Journal of Negro Education, 60,* 158–169.

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (1980). *Multicultural teacher education: Guidelines for implementation.* Washington, DC.

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (1994). *Briefing books.* Washington, DC.

Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139–152). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Banks, J. A. (1981). *Education in the 80's: Multiethnic education.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, practice. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–24). New York: Macmillan.

Baptiste, H. P., & Baptiste, M. L. (1980). Competencies toward multiculturalism. In H. P. Baptiste, M. L. Baptiste, & D. Gollnick (Eds.), *Multicultural teacher education: Preparing educators to provide equity* (pp. 44–72). Washington, DC: AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education.

Baptiste, H. P., Baptiste, M. L., & Gollnick, D. (Eds.). (1980). *Multicultural teacher education: Preparing educators to provide equity.* Washington, DC: AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education.

Barnes, R. (1990). Race consciousness: The thematic content of racial distinctiveness in critical race scholarship. *Harvard Law Review, 103,* 1864–1871.

Bartolome, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64,* 173–193.

Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life.* New York: Penguin Books.

Baugh, J. (1994). New and prevailing misconceptions of African American English for logic and mathematics. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 191–205). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93,* 518–533.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism.* New York: Basic Books.

Bennett, C. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 259–265.

Bettleheim, B. (1965). Teaching the disadvantaged. *National Education Association Journal, 54,* 8–12.

Bloom, B., Davis, A., & Hess, R. (1965). *Comprehensive education for cultural deprivation.* Troy, MO: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Booth, M. (1993). Students' historical thinking and the national history curriculum in England. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 21,* 105–127.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Washburn, J. (1995). Coalescing for change: The coalition for education that is multicultural. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 351–359.

Brown v. Board of Education. (1954). 347 U.S. 483.

Butler, J. (1991). Imitation and gender subordination. In D. Fuss (Ed.), *Essentially speaking: Feminism, nature, and difference* (pp. 13–31). New York: Routledge.

Calmore, J. O. (1992). Critical race theory, Archie Shepp and fire music: Securing an authentic intellectual life in a multicultural world. *Southern California Law Review, 65,* 2129–2230.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(1), 5–12.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995a). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 63,* 541–570.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995b). 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,* 493–522.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington, DC.

Commission on Multicultural Education. (1978). *Directory: Multicultural education programs in teacher education institutions in the United States.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Conant, J. (1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2–14.

Crenshaw, K. (1988). Race, reform and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in anti-discrimination law. *Harvard Law Review, 101,* 1331–1387.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement.* New York: Free Press.

Cuban, L. (1989). The at-risk label and the problem of urban school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70,* 780–784, 799–801.

Davis, A. (1965). *Social class influences upon learning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Deering, T., & Stanutz, A. (1995). Pre-service field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 390–394.

Delgado, R. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: New Press.

Dilworth, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching.* New York: Free Press.

Garcia, S. (1997). Self narrative inquiry in teacher development. In J. King, E. Hollins, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 146–155). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gollnick, D. (1991). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 218–239). London: Falmer Press.

Gollnick, D., Osayande, K. I. M., & Levy, J. (1980). *Multicultural teacher education: Case studies of thirteen programs* (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Gomez, M. L., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1991, April). *Preparing preservice teachers to teach diverse learners.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72,* 185–194.

Goodwin, A. L. (1997). Historical and contemporary perspectives on multicultural teacher education. In J. King, E. Hollins, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 5–22). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gordon, R. (1990). New developments in legal theory. In D. Kairys (Ed.), *The politics of law: A progressive critique* (pp. 413–425). New York: Panetheon Books.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. and Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Grant, C. A. (1989). Urban teachers: Their new colleagues and the curriculum. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70,* 764–770.

Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403–422). New York: Macmillan.

Greenman, N., & Kimmel, E. (1995). The road to multicultural education: Potholes of resistance. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 360–368.

Guy-Sheftall, B. (1993, April). *Black feminist perspectives on the academy.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Haberman, M. (1989). More minority teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70,* 771–779.

Haberman, M. (1995a). *Star teachers of children in poverty.* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Haberman, M. (1995b, January/February). The meaning of the best and brightest in urban schools. *In These Times,* pp. 26–28.

Hacker, A. (1992). *Two nations: Black and White, separate, hostile, and unequal.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hollins, E. (1990, April). *A re-examination of what works for inner-city Black children.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Irvine, J. J. (1992). Making teacher education culturally responsive. In M. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 79–92). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Irvine, J. J., & Fraser, J. W. (1998, May 13). Commentary—'Warm demanders': Do national certification standards leave room for the culturally responsive pedagogy of African American teachers? *Education Week,* pp. 42, 56.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60,* 133–146.

King, J. (1995). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 265–290). New York: Macmillan.

King, J. (1997). ''Thank you for opening our minds'': On praxis, transmutation, and Black studies in teacher development. In J. King, E. Hollins, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 156–169). New York: Teachers College Press.

King, J. (1998, April). *Teaching researchers, learning through cultural memory.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

King, J., Hollins, E., & Hayman, W. (Eds.). (1997). *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity.* New York: Teachers College Press.

King, J., & Ladson-Billings, G. (1990). The teacher education challenge in elite universities: Developing critical perspectives for teaching in a democratic and multicultural society. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, 1*(2), 15–30.

Ladner, J. (Ed.). (1973). *The death of White sociology*. New York: Vintage Books.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Beyond multicultural illiteracy. *Journal of Negro Education, 60,* 147–157.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research in multicultural education* (pp. 747–759). New York: Macmillan.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a "nice" field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11,* 7–24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (in press). Preparing teachers for diversity: Historical perspectives, current trends, and future directions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97,* 47–68.

Lawrence, C. (1995). The word and the river: Pedagogy as scholarship and struggle. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The writings that formed the movement* (pp. 336–351). New York: Free Press.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (1998). *Portraiture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, C. (1994). African centered pedagogy: Complexities and possibilities. In M. Shujaa (Ed.), *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of Black life in White societies* (pp. 295–318). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Lee, M. (1980). *Multicultural teacher education: An annotated bibliography of selected resources* (Vol. 3). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.

McCall, A. (1995). Constructing conceptions of multicultural teaching: Preservice teachers' life experiences and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 340–350.

McDermott, R. P. (1974). Achieving school failure. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Education and cultural process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondence through work in women's studies*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

McWilliam, E. (1994). *In broken images: Feminist tales for a different teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Moll, L. (1988). Some key issues in teaching Latino students. *Language Arts, 65,* 465–472.

O'Reilly, K. (1995). *For love of children: Life histories of two women teachers entering the profession from 1920–1940: Case studies of the feminization of the teaching profession*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin.

Ornstein, A., & Vairo, P. (1968). *How to teach disadvantaged youth*. New York: McKay.

Riessman, F. (1962). *The culturally deprived child*. New York: Harper & Row.

Rothenberg, P. (1988). Integrating the study of race, gender and class: Some preliminary observations. *Feminist Teacher, 3,* 37–42.

Sarason, S., Davidson, K., & Blatt, B. (1986). *The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education* (rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Shade, B. (1995). Developing a multicultural focus in teacher education: One department's story. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 375–380.

Shujaa, M. (Ed.). (1996). *Beyond desegregation: The politics of quality in African American education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review, 7,* 421–444.

Smitherman, G. (1987). Opinion: Toward a national public policy on language. *College English, 49,* 29–36.

Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 22, pp. 191–243). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Tate, W. F., Ladson-Billings, G., & Grant, C. A. (1993). The *Brown* decision revisited: Mathematizing social problems. *Educational Policy, 7,* 255–275.

Unger, R. M. (1983). The critical legal studies movement. *Harvard Law Review, 96,* 561–675.

Van Huesen, C. (1996). *Exposing biases: Diversity framed in a Western lens.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin.

Wellman, D. (1977). *Portraits of White racism.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

West, C. (1993). *Keeping faith.* New York: Routledge.

Williams, P. J. (1987). Alchemical notes: Reconstructing ideals from deconstructed rights. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 22,* 401–433.

Williams, P. J. (1991). *The alchemy of race and rights: Diary of a law professor.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (1991, April). *Teacher education for social responsibility.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Zeichner, K. M. (1992). *Educating teachers for cultural diversity.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Zeichner, K. (1993). Traditions of practice in U.S. pre-service teacher education programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9,* 1–13.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 23–47.

Zimpher, N., & Ashburn, E. (1992). Countering parochialism in teacher candidates. In M. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 40–62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Manuscript received August 5, 1998
Accepted November 5, 1998