1

Diversity and Teacher Education

A Historical Perspective on Research and Policy

*Carl Grant and Melissa Gibson**

Questions about diversity and education—including teacher education—are not new questions. In fact, in the United States, the intersection of diversity and education has been a source of inquiry for decades. As successive waves of migrants have entered schools, as groups previously excluded have gained educational access, as classrooms increasingly reflect the heterogeneity of American society, and as the world grows interdependent and globalized, questions of whether and how American education—including teacher education—should address student diversity have been at the forefront.

What it means to address diversity varies greatly, but several key questions endure. For example, Woodson (1933/2008) wondered whether white teachers could successfully teach black students. Although he concluded that "there is no particular body of facts that Negro teachers can impart to children of their own race that may not be just as easily presented by persons of another race if only they have the same attitude as a Negro teacher" (p. 28), this remains hotly debated. Who should teach particular groups of students, and are disposition and ideology—or "the same attitude"—enough? The flipside of this is the teaching of white students by black teachers. Jackson Coppin (Sigerman, 2000) is cited as perhaps the first African American to teach both black and white students: "I felt I had the honor of the whole African race upon my shoulders. I felt that should I fail, it would be ascribed to the fact that I was colored" (p. 264). Who should teach different groups of children, and what are the implications of these demographic (mis)matches?

Phillips (1940) raises another enduring question, arguing that black teachers need additional qualifications to teach black students: "keen insight into the current social, economic, and political issues in relation to the problems peculiar to minority groups, vocational opportunities for one's group, and a willingness to assume educational leadership" (p. 485), raising the question, is content knowledge alone enough qualification?

In *A Talk to Teachers*, James Baldwin (1963) raises a third enduring question in the teacher education discourse. Baldwin tells teachers that, as educated people,

they have the ability to create social change in their classrooms. He argues that teachers should teach the truth, not sugarcoated history, and should acknowledge that America has often perpetuated segregation and discrimination in order to keep marginalized peoples, such as African Americans, in their place. Here, Baldwin raises essential questions about what and how students should be taught as well as the role of the school in social reconstruction.

These questions, while historically situated, are debated today. Of course, they assume that schools and teachers *should* address student diversity. But this very assumption is also interrogated. What, precisely, do we mean by diversity? And what is the role of diversity in American society? These questions are closely associated, for example, with the turn of the nineteenth century, when unprecedented waves of immigrants were seen as a threat to the American way of life (see Banks, 2005; Jacobson, 1998; Montalto, 1982; Olneck, 2004). Debates around who should be considered "diverse" and whether to accommodate that diversity in schools continue today, whether in disagreements about the nature of a multicultural curriculum (see Buras, 2008; Sleeter, 1995) or in describing diversity as evidence of "cultural deprivation" (e.g., Clark & Plotkin, 1972; Lewis, 1966).

Obviously, these questions about diversity, education, and teaching are not new. Despite the youth of the field, its questions are enduring: What do we mean by diversity? What is and what should be the role of diversity in American society and schools? Why does diversity matter? Who should teach diverse groups of children? What should diverse groups of children learn and how should they be taught? What does a teacher need to know, believe, and do in order to teach diverse groups of children? These questions remain at the heart of research, public policy, and debate. Their endurance is both reassuring and worrying—Why are we still asking the same questions? Has anything at all changed?

While there have been many literature reviews of research on diversity and teacher education (e.g., Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Grant & Secada, 1990; Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Sleeter, 2001), this chapter takes a somewhat different approach. This prior work has been essential for setting a course for the field—in drawing attention to gaps in the research, in describing the central areas of inquiry, and in directing future research agendas. We will not attempt to rehash these findings—although we will, undoubtedly, repeat some of them. Instead, we don the hats of historians: "History has the special obligation to recall, reassess, and re-interpret the past, bringing it to bear on the present and translating it into a form each new generation can use" (Nye, 1960, p. 2). Historians study the past to understand how institutions, programs, and societies have evolved to their present state and to understand how contemporary conditions have come to be defined and perceived as they are. Our aim is not to tell a comprehensive history of diversity and teacher education but to gauge where we are today, how we have come to be here, and where we need to go in the future. To do that, we begin by surveying research on teacher education and diversity conducted by committed scholars: How do those who have made the field define, describe, and problematize it? Given concern for diversity in public discourse, we also look to public policy as a way of understanding the role of diversity in teacher preparation: How is attention to and consideration of diversity in teacher education framed by policy makers, and how does this discourse compare to scholarship? Where public policy and teacher

education research meet is, we believe, where we can gain future direction and also gain understanding about why we have not gone there yet.

In taking this tack, we also don the hats of detectives. We approach the field like a crime scene, where clues might lead to the solution of the crime. Good observation and analysis can lead detectives to an understanding of the crime, the perpetrator, and the victim. And although no pun is intended, it's clear that at this crime scene, "diversity" has been the victim. In our historical detective work, we hope, as Nye (1960) describes, to bring the past to bear in such a way that it is of use to future generations. Like solving any complicated crime, however, this historical detective work follows a long and murky path.

WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? SCHOLARLY RESEARCH ON DIVERSITY AND TEACHER EDUCATION

To understand where the field has been and to *define* the field, we have looked to scholars whose primary chain of inquiry has focused on diversity and teacher education. Each of the researchers included in our review is a committed scholar in the field. This is not to discredit the work of other scholars, nor is it to ignore research on diversity issues in other areas of education. Rather, because we are interested in understanding broadly where we have been as a field and because we have been charged with telling the history of the field, we have focused our review on those who have historically *made* the field.

We are, in essence, conducting a conceptual literature review. In defining our research this way, we borrow from Mary Kennedy's (2007) typology. Unlike a systematic literature review, which focuses on an empirical question and gathers all available literature, a conceptual review is concerned with "gaining new insights into an issue" (p. 139). This kind of review may be theoretical, historical, methodological, or integrative in nature. Conceptual reviews, rather than asking what we know empirically, set out to ask why we don't know more. Our conceptual review is historical in nature: Over time, how has diversity and teacher education, as an area of inquiry, constituted itself through *research*? In looking across this research, what new directions are scholars pointed in?

To answer these questions, we have looked at the research of sixteen scholars of diversity and teacher education[1]—a total of 152 articles, chapters, reports, and books. We focused our review on *research* rather than on theoretical, editorial, or conceptual pieces—although these pieces are drawn on when appropriate. When surveying *research* on diversity *and* teacher education by senior scholars, what composite is painted of the field?

The State of the Field: Thirty Years of Research

Grant and Secada (1990) noted twenty years ago the dearth of empirical research on diversity and teacher education. While attention to diversity has ballooned since then (an ERIC search today using the descriptors "diversity" and "teacher education" returns 960 records!), when looking at the research reviewed here, one realizes that Grant and Secada's critique still holds weight. A full sixty-nine of the research pieces

included here—almost half—are literature reviews, or synthetic research. What these syntheses repeatedly note—and as borne out by our own review of the research on diversity and teacher education—is that the field lacks a strong empirical base for its claims, findings, and recommendations about multicultural teacher education (see Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Grant & Tate, 1995; Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1994b, 1995b, 1999a, 1999b; Sleeter, 1985, 2001).

Of the eighty-three pieces that are not literature reviews, only three include longitudinal or large-scale data (Ball, 2006; Pagano, Weiner, Obi, & Swearingen, 1997; Villegas & Clewell, 1998a) and only two employ primarily quantitative analysis (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Gollnick, 1978). Few studies at all deal with assessing program effectiveness or looking at the outcomes of teacher education in K–12 classrooms. There is limited empirical research on teacher education and diversity. The majority of research, after literature reviews, is practitioner inquiry or self-study (n = 23), program description (n = 20), case study (n = 14), and survey/self-reporting (n = 15), with these genres frequently overlapping: for example, eight of the program and case studies are also practitioner inquiry (Cochran-Smith, 2003a, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Irvine, 2002, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Sleeter et al., 2005; Villegas, 2007). While this research enriches the field and offers a strong anecdotal base for recommendations, practices, and further research, it does not necessarily constitute an empirical base.

What is striking about this body of research is not its prioritizing of self-reflective and narrative inquiry over empirical research. After all, qualitative research is primarily "concerned with moral discourse [that] asks . . . the social sciences and the humanities [to] become sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom, and community" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2007, pp. 3–4). Indeed, the preferred research methods of teacher educators—from case study and practitioner inquiry to narrative inquiry and literature reviews—afford a critical and reflexive means of interrogating the field. These methods are a good fit for the type of questions asked.

What *is* surprising, however, is the exclusion of empirical approaches. Certainly, empiricism has been used as a hegemonic tool to "deflect attention away from deeper issues of value and purpose" and to "make radical critiques much more difficult to mount" (Smith & Hodkinson, 2007, p. 431). That said, empirical research plays an important role in speaking back to power because empiricism is quote often the tool of the powerful: "One makes one's way through universes in which more and more technical, rational justifications will be necessary in order to dominate and in which the dominated can and must also use reason to defend themselves against domination" (Smith & Hodkinson, 2007, p. 431).

And therein lies the tension of research on diversity and teacher education. On the one hand, it sets out to challenge dominant ideologies, and it must employ methods—such as practitioner inquiry and critical synthesis—that allow it to do so by bringing out the nuanced and perspectival meanings of students and educators. On the other hand, such research is not often generalizable—and policy makers look to generalizable research to inform decisions. While self-study can be a transformative experience for educators, it does not often impact policy—and without a clear line of inquiry within and the continual building off other self-studies, it will continue to fail to do so (Zeichner, 2007).

Certainly, teacher education is a young field. The earliest articles reviewed here date from the 1970s and early 1980s (e.g., Gollnick, 1978; Grant, 1981; Grant & Sleeter, 1985; Hollins, 1982; Sleeter, 1985; Zeichner & Grant, 1981), with many other scholars not writing about teacher education and diversity until the late 1980s and early 1990s (e.g., Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Haberman, 1988a, 1988b; Haberman & Post, 1990; Irvine, 1988, 1989, 1990; King, 1991; King & Ladson-Billings, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1991; Villegas, 1988; Villegas et al., 1993). What's more, research on diversity and teacher education is an area that has rarely been funded for large-scale research (Grant & Millar, 1992).

While the youth of the field and the lack of funding certainly *explain* the state of research, they do not excuse it. Repeatedly, scholars call for more research examining the effectiveness of teacher education programs and connecting university-based teacher education to K–12 classrooms (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2003b; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Gollnick, 1978; Gollnick, Osayende, & Levy, 1980; Grant & Agosto, 2006; Grant & Tate, 1995; Hollins, 1993; Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Sleeter, 2001; Zeichner et al., 1998). Yet these forays are limited. Of the 152 research pieces, 16 heed this call (Ball, 2006; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009; Cochran-Smith et al., in press, 2009; Pagano, Obi, Weiner, & Swearingen, 1995, 1997; Sleeter, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 2004; Valli, 1995, 1996a, 1996b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Weiner, 1993a). Even program research is often an analysis of one's *own* program—with the work of Gollnick, Villegas, and Zeichner as notable exceptions (Gollnick, 1978; Gollnick et al., 1979; Gollnick, Osayenda, & Levy, 1980; Melnick & Zeichner, 1997, 1998; Tabachnik & Zeichner, 1993; Villegas & Clewell, 1998a; Villegas et al., 1993; Zeichner, 1995; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996a, 1996b). Self-study and program description are valuable—but they alone do not constitute an empirical base. Sleeter (2001) even argues that they lead to a repetitive knowledge base that fails to offer new findings.

Defining Our Terms: What Do We Mean When We Say Diversity?

What is meant by diversity and teacher education? In this body of research, diversity is largely synonymous with race, ethnicity, and/or culture, with these terms frequently overlapping or conflated (n = 103). Given that attention to diversity and multiculturalism in education stems, in part, from racial and ethnic struggles for justice (see J. Banks, 2004)—and given the public attention to the achievement gap between different races and ethnicities—this conception of diversity is logical. It also makes sense given the oft-cited "demographic imperative" facing teacher education: K–12 classrooms are increasingly heterogeneous, with growing numbers of students of color in U.S. schools, while those entering teaching are overwhelmingly white women (see Banks et al., 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Nieto, 2005; Sleeter, 2001; Valli, 1996a; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Weiner, 2002). How can teacher education prepare these candidates for the children who will be in their classrooms? And how can it do so in meaningful ways that embody a specific commitment to diversity *beyond* the platitudes of educating "all children"?

It is worth noting the frequent conflation of race-ethnicity-culture in the research as well as the infrequent discussion of what distinguishes them or how they impact learning. In this, the field's conception of diversity is open to critique: Hol-

lins (2008) challenges such an approach with her theorization of "deep" cultural knowledge, in which she argues that we need to move beyond a static or simplified understanding of culture as entirely social or political to an understanding that sees culture abstractly and flexibly as the nexus of affect, behavior, and intellect. Scholars are not always explicit about "deep culture" and how it impacts learning. Similarly, King (1997, 2004) argues that, too often, the white or Euro-American experience is not recognized as a cultural experience; teacher education must help preservice teachers relearn their understanding of race, ethnicity, and culture through a "pedagogy of transmutation," or a culture-centered pedagogy that pushes back against hegemonic miseducation. To engage in this counterhegemonic education, however, requires that teacher educators themselves deeply understand what constitutes culture, how it is distinguished from race, and how it impacts and is integral to learning (Hollins, 1990, 1999; King, 1994, 2004). More important, teacher educators must understand the dehumanizing effects of a singular focus on race and ethnicity—particularly the black/white binary—on *all* students and to understand the ways in which attention to 'diversity' can obscure the workings of oppression and hegemony (King, 2004, 2005).

While most of the research reviewed defines diversity in terms of race, culture, and ethnicity, there is frequent mention of the need to prepare teachers to be successful with "all students" (a problematic phrase that we will return to later in this chapter). Many scholars attend to "all children" by naming socioeconomic stratification (n = 51) and linguistic diversity (n = 37) along with race-culture-ethnicity (n = 98) as diversity, but there is little research examining what it takes to prepare excellent teachers for *all* students, truly—for diversity that encompasses gender (n = 22), religion (n = 6), (dis)ability (n = 8), sexuality (n = 1), and ideology (n = 1). While literature undoubtedly exists, it is not necessarily at the heart of research on diversity and teacher education.

Orientations to Diversity: Why Does Diversity in Schools Matter?

There are several orientations from which teacher educators answer, "Why does diversity matter?" One approach looks at diversity in relation to urban schooling (e.g., Clewell & Villegas, 1999; Haberman, 1996; Nieto, 2003b; Valli, 2000; Weiner, 1993b, 2002). The nexus of racial discrimination, the effects of living in ghettoized poverty, the lack of adequate material support for schools, the centralized and bureaucratic nature of large urban districts, the prevalence of "street culture" (Haberman & Post, 1998), and the high turnover rate of urban teachers—coupled with overwhelmingly white, upper- and middle-class, suburban and rural female teachers, who live in different "existential worlds" than their potential students (Gay, 1993)—warrants changes in teacher education. Teaching marginalized student populations requires different dispositions, beliefs, training, and practices than traditionally conveyed in teacher education—including the need to address institutional factors such as bureaucracy, time demands, class sizes, and emotional strain that too often send teachers fleeing (Haberman, 1995b; Irvine, 1990; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2004; Weiner, 2000). Traditional teacher education is failing urban students, as evinced by the high turnover rate of urban teachers, the poor achievement of urban students, and the lack of qualified teachers (Haber-

man, 1994, 1995a): "Something other than conventional preparation is necessary" (Ladson-Billings, 1994b, p. 138).

A second approach looks at training teachers to be successful educators of specific student populations, such as African American students (e.g., Ball & Lardner, 1997; Hollins et al., 2004; Hollins & Spencer, 1991; Irvine, 1990; King, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994b) or English Language Learners (e.g., Grant, 1982; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). Teachers must understand how culture impacts learning, and they must also understand the way that this culture is traditionally assimilated or ignored in schooling. To be a successful teacher of African American students, for example, requires that teachers not only value African American culture but they must also understand its role in learning, particularly as an asset to students' achievement, identity, and sense of self (see King, 1994). Teacher education, then, must help preservice teachers gain cultural knowledge; it must help them connect that culture to their classroom practice and it must challenge teachers to reject deficit views. It must also help teachers differentiate among race, ethnicity, and culture and to see how social hierarchies and constructions of race dehumanize (King, 2004, 2005).

A third approach attends to diversity from a multicultural, social justice orientation. Schools are envisioned as pluralistic and democratic places that honor and accommodate diversity; they are also seen as vital for promoting social justice, for furthering social reconstruction, and for cultivating pluralistic dispositions and commitments among future citizens (e.g., Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Grant & Agosto, 2008; Nieto, 1999; Sleeter & Grant, 1999; Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997). Teacher education, in turn, helps to instill multicultural perspectives, values, and practices; it encourages preservice teachers to develop a multicultural knowledge base; it cultivates a commitment to social justice; and it encourages teachers to question the purposes of education and who education serves and to enact an alternative vision in their classrooms and schools. A multicultural approach asks teachers and teacher educators to move beyond simply naming the "demographic imperative" and demographic differences in achievement, retention, and engagement. Instead, a multicultural approach begins by asking what the purposes of schooling are in a pluralistic society and to work backward to articulate what and how students should be taught and what corresponding skills, dispositions, and knowledge teachers need. In many ways, a multicultural, social justice orientation subsumes other approaches to diversity.

Diversity and the Teaching Force: Who Will Teach Diverse Groups of Children?

When teacher educators talk about diversity, they are generally referring to the diversity of K–12 students—and not necessarily the diversity of educators. Given the aforementioned "demographic imperative," or the cultural and demographic mismatch between white, middle-class teachers and students of color from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, this emphasis on student diversity is logical. Teacher education *must* be concerned with better preparing these teachers for the students they will teach and for helping them to bridge their different "existential worlds" (Gay, 1993).

However, several scholars question this emphasis (e.g., Haberman, 1991a, 1991b; Ladson-Billings, 1999a; Zeichner, 1995). Can teacher education really shape beliefs and dispositions, and can coursework really instill the attitudes and perspectives

that enable teachers from dominant backgrounds to successfully teach all students? There is evidence to suggest it cannot. For example, Haberman (1991a; Haberman & Post, 1992) found that coursework intending to educate about culture, inequality, and diversity often ended up reinforcing rather than challenging stereotypes. Likewise, Weiner (1993a, 1993b) found that teachers' class, race, and gender indelibly shaped their perspectives, beliefs, and practices. As Gay (1993) points out and as others have echoed (e.g., Haberman & Post, 1998; Villegas & Clewell, 1998b), demographic differences often result in different lived experiences, ideologies, and cultural norms—demographic differences often indicate that individuals live in different "existential worlds." Can these differences be bridged?

This question is at the heart of research on diversity and teacher education: *How* do we bridge these differences? There is, however, a strong subset of teacher education research arguing that the recruitment and retention of teachers who share experiences, perspectives, backgrounds, and ideologies with diverse groups of students are just as important as trying to bridge cultural differences (e.g., Haberman, 1988a; Hollins, 1990; Irvine, 1988, 2002; Irvine & Fraser, 1998; Villegas & Clewell, 1998a, 1998b; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Villegas et al., 1993; Villegas & Lucas, 2004; Weiner, 1993b, 2002).

For example, Haberman (1993, 1995b, 1996; Haberman & Post, 1998) argues that the best predictor of success in urban schools is not teacher preparation; rather, it is teachers' life experiences, their attitudes and dispositions toward inequality and difference, and their reasons for teaching. In a thumbnail sketch of successful urban teachers, Haberman and Post (1998) found these teachers were generally over thirty years of age and not white, had lived in poverty at some point in their lives, had experienced living "normally" in the midst of violence, had extensive experience with children, were themselves urban residents, and had firsthand knowledge of social injustice. These characteristics—including a predisposition to a multicultural curriculum—were not taught. They were, however, characteristics that could be selected for, leading Haberman and Post (1998) to argue that "selection is more important than training" (p. 102). Similarly, Villegas (Villegas & Clewell, 1998a, 1998b; Villegas & Lucas, 2004) has argued that—while a teacher's race and ethnicity do not guarantee success and while *all* teachers can be better prepared for diverse classrooms—the cultural and experiential match between teacher and student can lead to increased success. Villegas (2007) also notes that the commitments and dispositions such programs try to instill are, in part, determined by the teacher candidate's preexisting beliefs and life experiences.

Research on the pedagogy of African American teachers supports this view. From the well-known practice of Marva Collins (Hollins, 1982) to the African American teachers researched by Irvine (2003), it is clear that African American teachers and other teachers of color often enact a culturally specific pedagogy, a pedagogy of cultural translation (Irvine, 1989) and a pedagogy of caring, other mothering, believing, demanding, and disciplining (Irvine & Hill, 1990). These teachers of color and their pedagogies have often been silenced in teacher education research (Irvine & Hill, 1990)—and yet their culturally specific practices embody the ways that identity indelibly shapes teaching and learning. Indeed, Irvine (2002) argues that teachers' understanding of their roles and of the purposes of education are based on unique cultural and historical perspectives.

To this end, several scholars advocate diversifying the teaching force by recruiting more teachers of color and by making the beliefs, ideologies, attitudes, and dispositions of teacher candidates part of the screening and selection process for teacher education programs (Haberman, 1988a, 1988b, 1991b; Haberman & Post, 1998; Irvine, 1988; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Sleeter, 1992a, 2001; Sleeter et al., 2005; Zeichner, 1995; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996; Zeichner et al., 1998). In fact, traditional screening and selection factors, such as grades and standardized test scores, seem to have little correlation to a teacher's eventual success in diverse and/or urban classrooms (Haberman, 1988b; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas et al., 1993). More indicative is a candidate's proven commitments to a diverse student population. Villegas and Clewell (1998a, 1998b) advocate tapping the paraprofessional pool as a more reliable and diverse source of teachers than the typical undergraduate population. Rethinking who is allowed to become a teacher may be just as important as how we train teachers. Valli (1995), however, challenges this view. While she acknowledges the need for greater diversity, she also argues that emphasizing recruitment alone can abdicate teacher educators of their responsibility to better educate the teacher candidates in front of them and "that the quest for the *ideal* candidates will function as an excuse for those of us responsible for teacher education" (Valli, 1995, p. 128).

Visions of K–12 Schooling: How Should Diverse Groups of Children Be Taught?

Sleeter (2001) argues that, in order to improve multicultural teacher education, we need to start with an end result in mind: What is successful, meaningful, equitable, and just education for all students, and what does teaching look like in the context of this vision? Several teacher educators have articulated just such a vision (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2008; Haberman, 1991b; Irvine, 1990; King, 1994, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1994a; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Sleeter & Grant, 1999; Valli, 1996a, 1996b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). However, these visions of culturally relevant, multicultural, equitable, and socially just education are not always explicitly woven into research on teacher education. In fact, most of the 152 pieces reviewed are quite disconnected from K–12 classrooms and learning: Only ten offered a vision for teacher education based on an explicit vision of K–12 schooling (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009b; Haberman, 1995a; Irvine, 1990; King, 1994, 2004; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Valli, 1996a, 1996b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002); only 16 explicitly connect to K–12 students' learning (Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009b; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Grant & Tate, 1995; Haberman, 1993; Horowitz, Darling-Hammond, & Bransford, 2005; Irvine, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 1999a; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Villegas & Davis, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Weiner, 2000, 2002, 2003); and only 23 conducted research primarily in K–12 classrooms and then linked this classroom-based research to teacher education (e.g., Ball, 2006; Ball & Lardner, 1997; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009b; Darling-Hammond, 2004a, 2004b; Haberman, 1993, 1995; Haberman & Post, 1990; Hollins, 2006; Hollins et al., 2004; Nieto, 2003a, 2003b, 2005b, 2009; Sleeter, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c; Valli, 1995, 1996a, 1996b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

While it is important to note the limited connections between this vision of K–12 schooling and research on diversity and teacher education, it must also be noted that there is a strong vision of what a just and equitable multicultural education for all students is. First and foremost, it considers the multiple purposes of education—and it rejects the narrowing of education solely to employment preparation. Instead, it looks to the role of schooling in a democratic society, in helping students find personal happiness and fulfillment, in cultivating curiosity and a love of learning, and in engendering social critique (e.g., Grant, 1991; Grant & Agosto, 2008; Grant & Tate, 1995; Haberman, 1995b; King, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994a; Sleeter, 2008a). Multicultural education is also committed to antiracist and antisexist pedagogies (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Gollnick et al., 1979; Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 1994, 1999; Sleeter et al., 2005) and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004, 2008; Grant & Agosto, 2008; Irvine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2006b; Nieto, 1999, 2000a, 2005b; Sleeter & Grant, 1999; Sleeter et al., 2005; Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997).

Two frameworks help define multicultural education. In Sleeter and Grant's (1999) typology, there are five approaches to multicultural education: (1) teaching the exceptional and culturally different, (2) human relations, (3) single group studies, (4) multicultural education, and (5) education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. It is this last level—education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist—that is most closely aligned with a social justice or critical multicultural approach (e.g., Grant, 1991; Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Sleeter, 2004a; Villegas, 1988; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a; Zeichner et al., 1998). In education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist, educators are committed to the elimination of oppression, to cultivating students' sense of hope and agency, to connecting critical pedagogy and Freire's notion of *conscientização* to multicultural theories and practices, to teaching resistance and social responsibility, and to enacting a curriculum that privileges knowledge construction, relevance, critical thinking, and democratic practices. Banks's (2004) five dimensions of multicultural education complement the Sleeter and Grant (1999) typology by describing five different ways that multicultural education is enacted: (1) through knowledge construction, (2) content integration, (3) prejudice reduction, (4) equity pedagogy, and (5) empowering school climates and social structures.

Together, these typologies of multicultural education help to define a vision of education that is about far more than the equitable distribution of test scores; rather, "multicultural education is an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students, and students who are members of diverse racial, ethnic, language, and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school" (Banks & Banks, 2001, p. 1). Multicultural education is concerned with identifying and theorizing practices that will achieve these ends, with an emphasis on humanizing, constructivist, and equity pedagogies, such as culturally relevant and responsive teaching (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Sleeter & Grant, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a).

Culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995b)—or culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), cultural synchronization (Irvine, 1990), and culture-centered education (King, 1994, 2004)—is one instantiation of equity pedagogy (J. Banks, 2004). In a culturally relevant approach, teachers use

their knowledge of students' cultures—not only their race and ethnicity but also the nexus of their identities, in as local and specific of a way as possible—to shape their pedagogical practices and to make curricular decisions. In addition, culturally oriented approaches reframe the purposes of education. For example, in a culturally relevant classroom, students engage in social critique, they achieve academically and are engaged in authentic learning, and they develop cultural competence in both their own and the dominant culture (Ladson-Billings, 1995c). Similarly, in a culture-centered approach, "the purpose, methods and content of education are all involved in preparing African American students to understand, preserve and *use* their cultural knowledge and competence to achieve academic and cultural excellence. From this perspective, education should help students develop a 'relevant personality' that includes a collective identity, the skills, knowledge, vision, and motivation to challenge societal injustice and join with others to reinvent the society" (King, 1994, p. 28).

Both multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogy are radically different than the developmentalist, psychologized approach to learning traditionally emphasized in teacher education; they also fly in the face of neoliberal reforms that emphasize standardized tests and global competition as the primary purpose of education. This differing vision of education inevitably produces different visions of successful teaching, and it inevitably leads to different visions of teacher preparation.

Teacher Education in Practice: What Does a Teacher Need to Know, Believe, and Do?

Preparing teachers to enact these visions of education requires, first and foremost, an ideological commitment to multiculturalism and against hegemonic forces that define difference as a problem (Hollins, 2008; Irvine, 1990; King, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2006a; Villegas, 1988; Weiner, 2003). The research on diversity and teacher education is virtually unanimous that ideology, dispositions, and beliefs matter (see Grant & Secada, 1990)—and that no teacher can enact a multicultural education without a commitment to it. However, as King (1991) points out, many teacher candidates espouse such commitments while clinging to beliefs that leave unquestioned structural racism, white privilege, and the normative narratives of American identity. To King (1997) and others, undoing such "miseducation" and "dysconscious racism" is at the heart of teacher education (e.g., Ball, 2000; Cochran-Smith, 2000; Grant, 1991; Haberman, 1993; Hollins, 1990; Irvine, 2003; King & Ladson-Billings, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1994b, 2001; Nieto, 2005; Pagano, Weinter, Obi, & Swearingen, 1995; Sleeter, 1985, 1989, 2004; Valli, 1996a, 1996b; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Weiner, 2003; Zeichner & Grant, 1981; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

Generativity

According to Ball (2009), *generativity* also plays a critical role in the preparation of teachers to work effectively in multicultural classrooms. Generativity refers to a teachers' ability to add to what they learn within teacher education programs by connecting that knowledge to personal-, professional-, and student-centered knowledge in ways that enable them to produce new knowledge that is useful in

curriculum planning and pedagogical problem solving in diverse classrooms. Ball argues that, using generativity, teachers can envision their classrooms as *communities of change* where transformative teaching and learning takes place—where teachers model generative thinking in their teaching so their students will, in turn, use generativity in their classroom and community practices as well.

The social context of schooling. Teacher educators recommend that preservice teachers study structural inequality to analyze sociopolitical structures and then use this understanding of the social context of schooling as the backdrop for pedagogical decision making (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Grant, 1991; Irvine, 2003; King & Ladson-Billings, 1990; Villegas, 1988; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Zeichner & Liston, 1990). However, such experiences must be carefully scaffolded (King, 1991; Sleeter, 1992b, 1996)—otherwise they can foster resistance and hopelessness, particularly among preservice teachers from privileged backgrounds (Sleeter, Torres, & Laughlin, 2001; Zeichner & Liston, 1990). Examples of how teacher educators "scaffold *conscientização*" abound (Sleeter, Torres, & Laughlin, 2001; Hollins, 1990; King, 1997; Sleeter, 1996; Sleeter, Torres, & Laughlin, 2001).

Cultural knowledge. Teacher educators also advocate a focus on cultural knowledge (Banks et al., 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hollins, 2008; Irvine, 2003; King, 1994; Tabachnik & Zeichner, 1993; Zeichner, 1995, 1996). After all, if preservice teachers will be teaching students who come from a different cultural background than their own and if preservice teachers are to enact a culturally relevant pedagogy, they must have knowledge of their students' culture(s). This recommendation, however, comes with important caveats. For one, there is a danger in teaching *about* culture, which can lead preservice teachers to essentialize cultures and cultural difference (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Grant, 1991; Haberman, 1991a; Hollins, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Zeichner, 1996) or to ignore the complex intersections of identity (Grant & Agosto, 2006; Grant & Sleeter, 1985). There is also the danger that a cultural component to teacher education will be relegated to a single course or to a curricular add-on; to be effective and transformative, culture must be woven throughout the entire program (Cochran-Smith, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Tabachnik & Zeichner, 1993; Zeichner, 1996). Preservice teachers need to see culture as integral to learning—and that can only be accomplished if culture is made integral to their own learning (Hollins, 1997, 2008; King, 1994). While cultural coursework is certainly important, preservice teachers also need to engage in cross-cultural and community-based field experiences from the beginning of their teacher education program (Ladson-Billings, 2001; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter & Boyle-Baise, 2000; Pagano, Weiner, Obi, & Swearingen, 1997; Zeichner, 1995, 1996; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996a, 1996b). Again, though, these recommendations come with a caveat: Without reflective coursework and supervision to help scaffold these experiences, they can end up reinforcing stereotypes and misconceptions (Cochran-Smith, 2003a; Grant, 1981; Grant & Secada, 1990; Haberman & Post, 1992; Sleeter, 1992a, 1992b, 2001; Sleeter & Boyle-Baise, 2000; Zeichner, 1995).

The purpose behind culturally based teacher education is not to produce static cultural knowledge. Rather, it is to help preservice teachers learn how to apply and connect cultural knowledge to the specific students in one's classroom (Ball, 2009; Banks et al., 2005; Grant, 1991; Hollins, McIntyre, et al., 2004; Hollins, 2008; Irvine, 2002; King, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Preservice teachers need to learn there are no

magic formulas for good teaching; it is context-specific and unique to the classroom and culture in which it is situated (Grant & Agosto, 2006; Hollins, 1999; Irvine, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1994b). The instructor's job is not only to serve as a bridge between students' cultures and the academic world but also to see students as *individuals* situated within particular cultures and communities and impacted by particular pedagogies (Hollins, McIntyre, et al., 2004; Irvine, 2002; Irvine & York, 1995).

Self-knowledge. One of the dangers in teaching about culture is that it becomes something that belongs to "others" while whiteness is seen as "just normal" (Ladson-Billings, 2006a). Thus, self-examination becomes vital to the scaffolding of *conscientização* regarding culture and the social context of schooling (Cochran-Smith, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hollins, 1999, 2008; King, 1994, 1997; Sleeter, 1996; Sleeter, Torres, & Laughlin, 2001; Zeichner, 1995; Zeichner & Grant, 1981; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). If preservice teachers can see their own ethnic and cultural heritage—if they can begin to understand that their "just normal" whiteness is in fact a culture, and a privileged culture—then they can begin to explore the complex ways that culture functions in learning (Grant, 1991; Hollins, 1990, 1997, 1999, 2008; King, 1991, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2006a; Tabachnik & Zeichner, 1993). Self-awareness can build understanding of the role that our autobiographies play in perpetuating inequality (Grant, 1991; King, 1997). Again, this self-exploration must be scaffolded—otherwise, privileged and oppressive dominant cultural narratives can be reinforced (King, 1991). Starting with preservice teachers' autobiographies and personal conceptions of culture allows teacher educators to engage in a constructivist task, to start where preservice teachers are and move them forward on a continuum of social and cultural awareness (Valli, 1996a, 1996b).

Habits of mind. Ultimately, the purpose of this vision of teacher education is not to instill objective knowledge but to cultivate particular "habits of mind" (Hollins, McIntyre, et al., 2004) that enable teachers to assimilate cultural knowledge, knowledge of the social context, content knowledge, and pedagogical tools into an analysis and improvement of practice (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Hollins, 1999, 2008; Irvine, 1990; King, 1994; Weiner, 2002; Zeichner & Liston, 1990). Such a vision of teacher education eschews the "methods fetish" (Bartolome, 1994), instead promoting "inquiry as stance" (Cochran-Smith, 2003a; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) or a reflective approach to teaching that always considers how any tools and practices can be used to further justice and equity (Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997). Such an approach sees the work of teacher education as having less of a content and technical focus than having a learning and political focus (Cochran-Smith, 2004). As Nieto (2003a) argues, teacher preparation needs to shift its initial focus from questions of what and how to questions of why. In fact, Nieto summarizes the purposes of this kind of teacher education well: Preservice teachers need to be taught to face and accept their own identities, become learners of their students' realities, develop strong and meaningful relationships with students, become multilingual and multicultural, learn to challenge racism and bias, and develop a community of critical friends in order to refocus attention to issues of access, equity, and social justice in multicultural education.

Reflective communities of practice. Such work cannot happen in the isolation of a traditionally run university classroom. Rather, it requires reflective communities of practice—not only among preservice teachers but also among cooperating

teachers, university supervisors, and school-site professionals (Ball, 2009; Cochran-Smith, 2003a, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Hollins, McIntyre, et al., 2004; Hollins, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Nieto, 2000; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996a, 1996b). These reflective communities become a generative, metacognitive space for teachers (both pre- and in-service) to think together about the role of diversity and culture in their classrooms and to work together to develop pedagogies for the students with whom they work. These reflective communities, when supported by critically conscious teacher education, have the power to impact teachers' ideology and beliefs about diversity (Ball, 2000, 2009); they also have the power to cultivate the "habits of mind" (Hollins, McIntyre, et al., 2004) teachers need to successfully teach all students and to make apparent the rigorous, intellectual work of praxis (Cochran-Smith, 2004). Reflective communities of practice also extend teacher education throughout the professional lifespan (Ball, 2009; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Darling-Hammond, 2004a; Hollins, 1993; Irvine, 1990, 2002, 2003; Nieto, 2009; Sleeter, 1992a, 2008b).

These reflective communities of practice—if they are to truly impact learning—require close collaboration between the university and the communities with which the university works. Whether through school-based cross-cultural field experiences (Grant & Koskela, 1986; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Pagano, Weiner, Obi, & Swearingen, 1997; Valli, 1996a, 1996b; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996a, 1996b), community-based service learning experiences (Sleeter & Boyle-Baise, 2000), professional development schools (Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997), rethinking the supervisor-student teacher-cooperating teacher triad (Cochran-Smith, 2004), or making the school the primary site of teacher education (Ball, 2009; Haberman, 1994, 1995a; Haberman & Post, 1998), these communities of practice require embedding teacher education in the school site and then creating the space for all of the educators involved to reflect together on how best to educate the students before them (Sleeter, 2001). Indeed, the success of teacher education for diversity requires close university, school, and community partnerships (Banks et al., 2005; Villegas & Clewell, 1998a, 1998b; Weiner, 1993b; Zeichner, 2003; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

Field experiences. Field work matters. Yet research is overwhelmingly focused on the university and *not* on the field experience, whether on teacher education courses (n = 52), program structures (n = 32), or pedagogies that challenge preservice teachers' identities, dispositions, and ideologies (n = 76). While many researchers assert the importance of the field experience—and particularly the importance of the cooperating teacher—in teacher education (n = 38), there is little research on this. Only 15 of the 152 pieces systematically studied the field experience and/or the cooperating teacher (Cochran-Smith, 2003a; Grant & Koskela, 1986; Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995; Haberman, 1991a, 1994, 1995a; Haberman & Post, 1990, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1999b, 2001; Valli, 1996a, 1996b, 2000; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996a, 1996b). A broader review of literature on diversity and teacher education echoed this finding (Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004).

This is a particularly glaring hole given that much of the work of teacher education falls on the shoulders of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. The cooperating teacher, in particular, has the potential to be a coinvestigator of praxis (Cochran-Smith, 2004); the cooperating teacher also sets the tone of the field experience, particularly through his or her disposition toward multicultural education

(Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995; Haberman & Post, 1990; Pagano, Weiner, Obi, & Swearingen, 1995) or by modeling emancipatory pedagogy (King & Ladson-Billings, 1990). In fact, from Dewey (1904) to Haberman (1995a; Haberman & Post, 1998), teacher educators recognize that the primary site of teacher learning is the school, particularly one's first school with one's first mentor. This is where the habits of "star teachers" are potentially cultivated (Haberman, 1995b; Haberman & Post, 1998)—or where stereotypes are reinforced (Haberman & Post, 1992). Yet there is little research on—or programmatic monitoring of (King & Ladson-Billings, 1990; Sleeter, 2001; Valli, 1996a, 1996b)—field experiences and cooperating teachers. This area begs for research (Cochran-Smith, 2003a; Grant, Elsbree, & Fondrie, 2004; Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Pagano, Weiner, Obi, & Swearingen, 1995; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter & Boyle-Baise, 2000). In particular, Ladson-Billings (2000) and Irvine (2002) urge returning to the classroom of experts, where transformative pedagogies are enacted and where teacher educators and preservice teachers alike can rethink and reshape practice.

Assessing teacher competencies. What kind of pedagogy do teachers educated in programs concerned with diversity enact in their classrooms? How will we assess their competency and our success as teacher educators? As several scholars caution (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009a; Grant & Secada, 1990; Sleeter, 2001; Villegas, 2007; Weiner, 2002), focusing on beliefs is not enough; we must also articulate and measure what competent multicultural teachers *do*, and teacher education programs must then measure their success based on whether or not their graduates actually do these things. Particularly in our era of accountability, reclaiming what constitutes a "highly qualified teacher" for diverse classrooms is important to teacher education. After all, at most institutions, preservice teachers are still being prepared to teach in "idealized schools that serve white, monolingual, middle-class children from homes with two parents" (Ladson-Billings, 1999b, p. 87), where teacher quality is measured by a basic skills test and a liberal arts degree.

Yet teacher educators concerned with diversity agree that these indicators do not guarantee that a teacher is highly qualified to teach in diverse classrooms (Darling-Hammond, 1995, 2004a; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Klein, 1999; Haberman, 1988a, 1988b, 1991b, 1993, 1996; Haberman & Post, 1998; Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Irvine, 1988; Villegas & Clewell, 1998a). Such indicators do not, for example, account for teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, nor do they account for teachers' beliefs about their diverse students (see Enterline, Cochran-Smith, Ludlow, & Mitescu, 2009; Irvine & Fraser, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 2000). If multicultural education requires pedagogical and cultural-content knowledge, if it requires habits of mind that enable teachers to critically analyze the social context and to make pedagogical decisions based on this analysis, and if it requires teachers to develop authentic and respectful relationships with students across differences, how will those competencies be measured? How can we measure teachers' ability to apply what they know about content, pedagogy, and culture to the specific children in their classrooms? How can we use those assessments to evaluate teacher education programs?

The challenge, of course, is assessing teacher competencies in culturally relevant and context-specific ways, without penalizing teachers for practices situated in their community and culture, as Ladson-Billings's (1998) and Irvine and Fraser's (1998) research on the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards showed hap-

pened to some African American teachers. The challenge is to assess competency while also honoring the context- and culture-specific practices of good teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995a).

One approach is the performance assessment, or using observations and portfolios to measure whether practice has changed or grown in relation to a program's objectives (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009a; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Klein, 1999; Enterline, Cochran-Smith, Ludlow, & Mitescu, 2009; Grant & Agosto, 2008; Hollins, 2006; Sleeter, 1985; Zeichner & Wray, 2001). Another approach ties teacher competency to K–12 students' learning (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009a, 2009b; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Hollins, 1993; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Haberman (1994, 1995a) advocates longitudinal assessment—based on the proven and persistent success of a program's graduates in urban schools. After all, just looking at retention rates, it seems that teacher education as currently constructed does not produce effective urban and multicultural teachers. As such, Haberman (1995a) and others (Cochran-Smith, 2003a; Grant & Agosto, 2006; Zeichner, 2003) recommend rethinking teacher educators' qualifications and competencies: Instead of selecting teacher educators based their graduate degree, they should be selected and judged based on their own proven success in urban and multicultural classrooms.

Institutional Support for Diversity: Teacher Education Programs in Practice

Teacher education does not occur in isolation. Commitments to diversity, equity, and multiculturalism are also impacted by the university at large, by K–12 school structures and climates, and by policy at the local, state, and federal level. Acknowledging the interconnectedness of teacher education and these other factors is essential.

For example, in addition to recruiting more diverse teacher candidates, teacher education programs and universities must be structured to make it feasible for more diverse students to attend. Program *structures* impact who can participate: programs that offer teacher education coursework at different hours of the day are more likely to attract candidates who need to work; increasing financial aid and scholarships can help support teacher candidates who might not be able to afford full-time study; multicultural mentoring programs have proven successful at retaining students of color (Darling-Hammond, 1995, 2004a; Gollnick, 1978; Haberman, 1988b; Price & Valli, 1998; Sleeter et al., 2005; Villegas et al., 1993; Villegas & Lucas, 2004). Even rethinking certification has impacted teacher diversity—whether it be by recruiting from the paraprofessional pool and then decreasing time to certification (Villegas & Clewell, 1998a, 1998b) or condensing the field experiences into a one-year, paid internship in a school setting (Darling-Hammond, 1997).

This kind of work must also be supported at the university level through the recruitment and retention of a more diverse university faculty and student body (Gollnick, 1978; Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Price & Valli, 1998; Villegas et al., 1993; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). Within the university curriculum, multiculturalism must be moved from the margins to the mainstream. Rather than approaching ethnic studies requirements as an add-on, multicultural studies must be seen as central to the work of preparing tomorrow's thinkers, leaders, entrepreneurs, and teachers (Gollnick, 1978; Price & Valli, 1998; Sleeter et al., 2005; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996; Zeichner et al., 1998).

Policy—at the local, state, and federal levels—indelibly impacts these commitments (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2004a; Gollnick, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2004; Weiner, 2000; Weiner et al., 2001; Zeichner & Liston, 1990). For example, the funding and regulation of teacher education is impacted by state and federal legislation; such funding and regulation has a direct effect on not only the amount of financial aid and scholarships a program can offer to its students but also on the resources available to develop a culturally responsive teacher education program. Policy also affects schools themselves, which are structured to be resistant to the kind of education promoted by teacher educators concerned with diversity. Educating teachers for diversity requires restructuring schools themselves—partly through policy mandates—in order to foster high-quality education for all students (Darling-Hammond, 2004a; Grant, 1991; Haberman, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b, 1999a; Sleeter, 1992a, 1992c). Yet, Ladson-Billings (1995b) argues, "Too many teacher educators (and teachers) believe that they can implement an effective multicultural education program without effective fundamental change in the classrooms and schools in which they teach" (p. 755).

WHERE ARE WE NOW? DIVERSITY IN EDUCATION AND TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY

In the introduction to the *Handbook of Education Policy Research,* the editors state:

> Education is no longer just about what happens in classrooms and schools, but increasingly about rules and regulations promulgated in state capitals and the federal government designed to improve student academic performance. . . . As "policy" has assumed an increasingly pivotal role in the educational system, a growing number of scholars have turned their attention to the process through which rules and regulations are adopted and the consequences they have on teaching and learning. (Sykes, Schneider, & Ford, 2009, p. 1)

Indeed, a growing number of scholars have also turned their attention to examining and *critiquing* the very "rules and regulations promulgated in state capitals and the federal government," as well as the ensuing mandates generated by professional associations. As we shall see, policy at all levels has been instrumental in shaping the national educational agenda, an agenda that does not pay attention to diversity in the way that scholars of teacher education do. Yet, many who study policy are centrally concerned with diversity—particularly its role beyond citing the achievement scores of students of color or the resegregation of schools (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Grant & Chapman, 2008). Instead of relegating diversity to mere demographic statistics, these scholars and critics argue that Diversity (big D) in education has to do with the multilayered and complex intersections of identity; how these dimensions of identity are privileged and marginalized in schools; what role these identities play in making sense of the world, in learning, and in choosing a life path; and how systemic responses to these identities play out in schools.

Teacher educators concerned with diversity are among these critics because their work is deeply impacted by policy. In fact, the 152 pieces reviewed here are littered

with references to policies and initiatives that have shaped teacher education—from national agendas set by the Coleman Report (1969) and A Nation at Risk (1983) to the standards and competencies set by organizations like NCATE and AACTE. More recently, these scholars have engaged with national debates about "highly qualified teachers" and the impact of accountability and alternative certification on teachers and classrooms. Common to all is the observation that most policies about education, generally, and teacher education, more specifically, ignore multicultural and culturally relevant teacher education.

How and to what extent has policy—and the professional mandates that have grown from it—addressed diversity in teacher education? What connections are there between policy and research? To explore these connections, we look at touchstone policies of the last forty years—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), A Nation at Risk (1983), and No Child Left Behind (2001). We then turn to a current policy debate, deregulation versus professionalization. As we will see, the enduring questions—What do we mean by diversity? What should be the role of diversity in schools? Why does diversity matter? Who should teach diverse groups of children? What should diverse groups of children learn and how should they be taught? What does a teacher of diverse groups of children need to know, believe, and do?—are answered quite differently by policy makers.

Federal Policy Initiatives: Shifting Attention Away From Diversity

At least as far back as the early nineteenth century, educators have been concerned with the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity in education. Take the following statement from William Hamilton (1827) regarding white teachers' capacity to teach black children:

> It has been a policy of white men to give you a high opinion of your advancement when you have made but smattering attainments. They know that a little education is necessary for better accomplishing the menial service you are in the habit of performing for them. They do not wish you to be equal with them—much less superior . . . They will take care you do not rise above mediocrity. (Mabee, 1997, p. 95)

What does it mean to equitably educate all children? What is a socially just education? These sociopolitical questions, of central concern to Hamilton, could have been at the heart of late-twentieth-century federal educational policy—particularly in light of the civil rights movement and *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). As the United States began to imagine what a multiracial and multiethnic democracy might look like, it might have also imagined the role of race and ethnicity in schooling. Would its commitments to diversity be in name only—simply guaranteeing equal access to educational opportunities without reconsidering what those educational opportunities were and who they privileged? Or would its commitments be deeper and more enriched—reconsidering, for example, the role of education in a pluralistic democracy and rethinking teaching and learning in light of student diversity?

Federal educational policy had the opportunity to take seriously the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity and to set an equitable and just reform agenda. Instead, policy answers the enduring questions of diversity and teacher education in quite narrow ways: What do we mean by diversity? *Demographic statistics.* What should be

the role of diversity in schools? *It should not impact learning.* Why does diversity matter? *Because differing outcomes according to race, ethnicity, and class impedes global competition and status.* Who should teach diverse groups of children? *Content-area experts.* What should diverse groups of children learn and how should they be taught? *Basic content knowledge, taught in ways proven successful by scientifically based curriculum.* What does a teacher of diverse groups of children need to know, believe, and do? *Teachers need to know their subjects.* While diversity rhetorically matters, it seems that federal educational policy—as shaped by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), A Nation at Risk (1983), and No Child Left Behind (2001)—has done little to rethink education in light of diversity.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act

The role of diversity in education had the potential to truly flourish with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA (1965)—the most far-reaching federal education legislation ever written and one of the cornerstones of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty. ESEA was born of an era when diversity was at the fore of public consciousness, particularly the relationship among poverty, race, and political marginalization. Race riots were plaguing U.S. cities, and the *Report on the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (1968) concluded that they had resulted from black frustration at a lack of economic opportunity. The Commission expressed an outcry for diversity: "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal" (p. 1). Educators and politicians could no longer ignore the increasing number of social movements based on gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and (dis)ability swirling around them. In fact, on many occasions, schools were the very site of protest. In the era from which ESEA was born, questions about the role of diversity in U.S. society and about racial and economic equity and justice were central.

Yet ESEA was largely silent about diversity. As the touchstone federal education legislation of the civil rights era, it had the potential to invigorate a national commitment to diversity, but it did not. While it directed more resources to low-income students, it did not take a stand on any of the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity. This stands in stark contrast to other policy documents of the era, particularly those published by professional organizations. While none were as politically significant as ESEA, they were nevertheless significant in number, and they included mandates from educational associations (e.g., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD]) urging for increased diversity and multicultural efforts in teacher education.

The era of ESEA was marked by attention not only to diversity but also to the failures of teacher education. Koerner (1963), for example, severely criticized teacher education. He argued that there was little connection between teacher preparation and job performance, that education lacked a common body of knowledge, that there were too few academic requirements for teachers, that there was intellectual weakness among education faculty and students, particularly in graduate programs, and that educational coursework was "puerile, repetitious, dull, and ambiguous" (p. 18). Koerner recommended closing teacher-training colleges and doing away with

the undergraduate education degree, instead having preservice teachers major in an academic subject supplemented by professional courses. Conant (1963) offered another vision. He argued that courses in pedagogy be eliminated in favor of field-based training and that states should require teacher candidates to hold a bachelor's degree, to fulfill student-teaching requirements in state-approved placements, and to hold a teaching certificate endorsed by the university.

Many of Koerner's and Conant's recommendations were taken up by later policies, but—along with diversity—they were largely ignored by ESEA. For legislation that was ostensibly concerned with the elimination of poverty and the resolution of racial issues through the improvement of teachers and teaching for low-income students, ESEA was remarkably silent about diversity and about how to prepare teachers for diversity. This is particularly disappointing given that ESEA—in both its original 1964 legislation and its 1978 reauthorization—devoted significant federal resources to the improvement of the pedagogy in urban and rural schools. Yet the type of pedagogical questions asked by teacher educators—How should diverse groups of students be taught? What do teachers of diverse groups of students need to know, believe, and do?—were for the most part ignored.

A Nation at Risk. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) released A Nation at Risk (1983) nearly twenty years after ESEA. In it, NCEE claimed widespread failure in American schools, linking this failure to the nation's economic challenges and to global competition: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre education performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war" (p. 1). To this, President Reagan added, "I believe that parents, not government, have the primary responsibility for the education of their children. Our agenda is to restore quality to education by increasing competition and by strengthening parental choice and local control" (Carroll, 2008). The reverberations from these statements can be felt today, with emphases on global competition and marketized solutions to school failure.

While A Nation at Risk commented on the importance of equal educational opportunity—"All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost" (p. 2)—it ignored the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity. It ignored *equity* of educational opportunities. Instead, it simplistically attributed failure to teachers and teacher education: too many teachers drawn from the bottom of high school and college classes; teacher preparation curriculum weighed down with courses in educational methods; low teacher salaries deterring candidates; and poorly qualified teachers in math, science, and foreign languages. Schools were failing due to poorly qualified teachers, where poor qualifications were equated with a lack of content knowledge. Its recommendations for reform included higher education standards for teachers, increased professionalization (e.g., performance-based teacher salaries; upward career ladders; incentivizing career entry; teacher-driven career preparation), and the recruitment of content "'experts."' In these recommendations, we hear echoes of Koerner's (1963) and Conant's (1963) critique of teacher education, but we hear nothing about diversity. Although A Nation at Risk was ostensibly concerned with school failure—a concern that, in many ways, has sparked our obsession with the achievement gap—it does not consider the sociopolitical dimensions of educational success and failure. It does not consider the ways

that schooling and education are culturally based or privilege some groups and marginalize others. A Nation at Risk reduces the problem of educational failure to a technical, professional problem—exactly what Cochran-Smith (2004) argues culturally relevant teacher education is not.

In that, A Nation at Risk marked a neoliberal shift. The Reagan administration essentially redirected attention *away* from diversity—not only with A Nation at Risk but also with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act (1984), which watered down federal attention to bilingual education—and instead toward accountability and deregulation. Yet as a result of midcentury social movements, at the time there was actually *increased* attention to diversity and multiculturalism in education—particularly where the diversification of the nation's classrooms was experienced firsthand. But A Nation at Risk and the neoliberal era of educational reform it ushered in hampered that attention.

No Child Left Behind. The No Child Left Behind Act—the 2001 reauthorization of ESEA—was ostensibly engineered to improve education and achievement in America's schools, particularly schools serving low-income students and students of color. NCLB states, "In America, no child should be left behind. Every child should be educated to his or her potential" (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, p. 3). According to proponents, this statement recognizes and affirms the diversity in America's schools by acknowledging the importance of educating *all* students. But what, exactly, does it mean to educate *all* children to their potential? According to the federal law, there are two key components: student outcomes associated with accountability standards and the closing of the achievement gap between students of different socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnic groups, language statuses, and (dis) abilities. To do this, NCLB addresses four areas: (1) mandating teacher and principal accountability for student outcomes; (2) implementing scientifically based curriculum; (3) increasing parental involvement and choice; (4) and expanding local control and flexibility in the management and administration of schools. NCLB promises to focus resources on students poorly served by the existing educational system and to develop more reliable data-tracking and reporting systems.

In all of this, NCLB places great importance on the teacher's role in public education. As such, it requires that all pupils are taught by a "highly qualified teacher," where a "highly qualified teacher" has a bachelor's degree, holds a state teaching license, and has proven that he or she knows the subject(s) he or she teaches by either passing a content-knowledge test or through coursework. In this definition, a teacher's high qualifications are largely determined by content knowledge, particularly as evaluated by paper-and-pencil tests. In fact, almost a decade after its authoring, there are now more than 600 tests used to measure teaching candidates' basic skills and content knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). When coupled with its emphasis on scientifically based curriculum resources—which, in reality, are often teacher-proof, direct instruction curricula—it seems that NCLB finds pedagogical content knowledge and culturally based pedagogy to be of little significance. In fact, in its more than 600 pages, NCLB is silent about multiculturalism and diversity, about the need for culturally competent teachers and about the role of a multicultural curriculum in improving student learning (Day-Vines & Patton, 2003). Despite its rhetorical commitment to diversity and equality, NCLB ignores diversity.

Professionalization v. Deregulation: Today's Teacher Education Policy Debate

In all three of these federal policy initiatives, we see two common threads: a generic emphasis on better educating "all children" and a focus on teacher quality. Since the middle of the twentieth century, the American public has been increasingly concerned with the performance of "all students" in schools—whether out of a concern for civil rights and social justice (ESEA), as a result of cold war posturing (A Nation at Risk), or out of a concern for global economic competition (NCLB). Regardless of the political reasons why, diversity in schools—particularly as connected to low achievement—was a problem to be dealt with. And given that teachers themselves were the constituency failing to "deal with" the problem of diversity, the solution also apparently rested with teacher quality.

While these emphases are shared with teacher educators, policy does not consider these from the same perspective. Instead, policy initiatives argue that diversity should *not* have an impact on student learning—"all students" should achieve equally, if only they are provided with teachers who know their subject matter. This contrasts with those who argue that differential achievement is directly connected to the melting of diversity into an amorphous group of "all students" and that teachers need a specific set of skills, knowledge, and dispositions to teach diverse groups of students—which includes deep understanding of how social stratification and racial hierarchies have served to oppress and dehumanize *all* students. Nevertheless, the policy presence of these issues ensured that teacher quality and the better education of "all students" were front and center in education reform. After all, with attention focused on the failures of teacher education—with, for example, A Nation At Risk (1983) declaring that "too many teachers are being drawn from the bottom of high school and college classes" and that teacher education was weighted down with courses in educational methods instead of insisting teachers "meet high educational standards" (p. 3)—the handwriting was on the wall for immediate and deep reform in teacher education.

Teacher educators were forced to respond to issues of teacher quality and student diversity, and respond they did: They formed a series of professional organizations and committees that offered their own reform recommendations. For example, the Holmes Group in *Teachers for Tomorrow's Schools* (1986), and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession in *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986), both argued that teachers' knowledge should be grounded in the humanities and sciences, that the undergraduate teacher education program should be eliminated, and that teacher education should become a postbaccalaureate program. However, they remained committed to the important role of teacher education in teachers acquiring the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to better educate all students.

Not all reformers agreed. The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, in *The Teachers We Need and How to Get More of Them: A Manifesto* (1999), argued that teacher education was an unnecessary hurdle that deterred the best and the brightest from entering the profession. In fact, this disagreement is at the heart of the teacher education policy debate today. Dill (1996) refers to it as the teaching-as-profession versus teaching-as-craft debate, Rotherham and Mead (2003) describe it as the teacher professionalism versus competitive certification debate, and Cochran-Smith and

Fries (2001) call it the professionalization versus deregulation debate. In essence, it is a debate about whether to establish stronger professional standards for teachers or whether to do away with institutionalized teacher preparation. In other words, is teacher education part of the solution to the "problem" of teacher quality and student diversity, or is it itself the problem? While this is at the heart of contemporary policy debate, we would argue that it still ignores fundamental questions about the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity in schools and learning.

Teacher educators and the professionalization agenda. The Holmes Group—a consortium of ninety-six universities responding to critiques of teacher education such as that in A Nation at Risk (1983)—sought to advance teaching as a true profession and not a "semi-profession" (e.g., Etzoni, 1969; Lortie, 1975) by improving both the preparation of teachers and the quality of K–12 schooling. Their recommendations, based on scholarly research, focused on strengthening connections between schools of education and the rest of the university, particularly the colleges of arts and sciences, and strengthening links with educational allies and partners, such as K–12 schools and teachers (Holmes Group, 1986).

The efforts initiated by the Holmes Group, along with those of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986), formed a community of scholars, organizations, and teachers devoted to reforming teacher education policy and procedures. The key members of this community of reformers have included Judith Lanier, Dean of Education at Michigan State University and president of the Holmes Group, and Linda Darling-Hammond, Executive Director of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), as well as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teachers (NCATE), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). This reform community receives support from the Carnegie Corporation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Ford Foundation, and the DeWitt Wallace Reader's Digest Fund.

Together, this association of reformers—particularly NCTAF—has issued a series of reports and recommendations for the professionalization of teacher education. In these, one sees repeated calls for more detailed teacher competency standards, a restructuring of teacher education, and increased attention to the achievement of "all students." Yet while diversity is named as part of the reform vision for teacher education, it is often done so in ways that do little to advocate for multicultural and culturally relevant teacher education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. A blue-ribbon panel issued the NCTAF report, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (1996). According to *What Matters Most,* the mission of NCTAF was "to provide an action agenda for meeting America's educational challenges, connecting the quest for higher student achievement with the need for *teachers who are knowledgeable, skillful, and committed to meeting the needs of all students"* (emphasis added; NCTAF, 1996, p. 4). *What Matters Most* intended to offer what NCTAF considered "the single most important strategy for achieving America's educational goals: A blueprint for recruiting, preparing and supporting excellent teachers in all of America's schools," with this blueprint focused on "ensuring that all communities have teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to teach so that all children can learn and that all school systems are organized to support teachers in this work" (NCTAF, 1996,

p. 3). *What Matters Most* identified several key barriers to sound teaching and learning, including low expectations for student performance, unenforced standards for teachers, major flaws in teacher preparation, slipshod teacher recruitment, inadequate induction for beginning teachers, lack of professional development and rewards for knowledge and skill, and K–12 schools that were structured for failure rather than success.

In calling attention to teacher quality and by connecting teacher quality to "recruiting, preparing, mentoring and retaining" teachers, the report argued that teacher quality was a key factor in improving American education and that teacher preparation—*professionalization*—was highly correlated with improving student learning. Throughout most sections of the report, NCTAF called attention to diversity, as expressed by the phrase "all students," in relation to teachers' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. In that, *What Matters Most* goes farther than the federal policy documents that were its impetus in tackling the learning and achievement of "all students." For example:

> Concern about "at risk" children—those who drop out, tune out, and fall behind—cannot be addressed without teachers who know how to teach students who come to school with different learning needs, home situations, and beliefs about what education can mean for them (NCTAF, 1996, p. 10).
>
> Teaching in ways that help diverse learners master challenging content is much more complex than teaching for rote recall or low-level basic skills. Enabling students to write and speak effectively, to solve novel problems, and to design and conduct independent research requires paying attention to *learning*, not just to "covering the curriculum." (NCTAF, 1996, p. 38)

A follow-up document, *Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching* (Darling-Hammond, 1997), reported on progress toward having a high-quality teacher in every classroom. *Doing What Matters Most* drew on data about the conditions of teaching that had recently become available and examined policy changes that had occurred. The report addressed diversity in a similar manner to *What Matters Most*:

> However, few teachers have had any opportunity to learn how to teach students with disabilities . . . just one-fourth of the teachers serving these [limited English proficient] children had received any training in strategies or teaching new English language learners . . . today's teacher will serve at least four or five students with specific educational needs that she has not been prepared to meet. In addition, she will need considerable knowledge to develop curriculum and teaching strategies that address the wide range of learning approaches, experiences, and prior levels of knowledge the other students bring with them as well. And she will need to know how to help these students acquire much more complex skills and types of knowledge than ever before (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 7).
>
> Reforms, we have learned over and over again, are rendered effective or ineffective by the knowledge, skills, and commitments of those in schools. Without know-how and buy-in, innovations do not succeed (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 7).
>
> Recruitment needs to focus not only on ensuring that we have enough teachers, but also on recruiting a diverse teaching force that represents the American population if majority and minority students are to experience diverse role models. (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 15)

Certainly and as demonstrated, the professionalization argument as articulated by NCTAF addresses diversity in education, even paying explicit attention to low-income students, students of color, English language learners, and "at-risk" students. In addition, NCTAF advocates paying far more attention to diversity than the deregulation camp, as we shall see—going so far as to build professional competency standards around diversity.

That said, while NCTAF is clear as to who should teach diverse students—"teachers who are knowledgeable, skillful, and committed to meeting the needs of all students" (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 4)—it deals with the other enduring questions regarding diversity and teacher education more implicitly than explicitly. In other words, when reading through both *What Matters Most* and *Doing What Matters Most,* it is often left up to the reader to decide in teaching "all children" what the role of diversity is, why diversity even matters to education, what diverse groups of children should learn and how they should be taught, and what, specifically, a teacher needs to know, believe, and do in order to teach diverse groups of students. Answers to these questions are alluded to with statements like, "Concern about 'at risk' children . . . cannot be addressed without teachers who know how to teach students who come to school with different learning needs, home situations, and beliefs about what education can mean for them" (NCTAF, 1996, p. 10), or, the teacher "will need considerable knowledge to develop curriculum and teaching strategies that address the wide range of learning approaches, experiences, and prior levels of knowledge the other students bring with them as well" (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 7). Something different is clearly needed, but what that different preparation is remains vague—NCTAF does not connect the professionalization of teacher education for the benefit of "all students" with multicultural and culturally relevant research or practice.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The professional accrediting organization for schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States, NCATE is a nonprofit, nongovernmental alliance of thirty-three professional, education, and public organizations representing millions of Americans who support quality teaching (NCATE, 2009). NCATE is one of the profession's primary mechanisms for establishing high-quality teacher preparation, doing so via six professional standards used to accredit teacher preparation institutions. Standard 4 specifically attends to diversity:

> The [program] designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations.
>
> In addition, the language of social justice and diversity is used throughout descriptions of NCATE's aims: "NCATE standards require that professional education programs prepare candidates who operationalize the belief that all students can learn; demonstrate fairness in educational settings by meeting the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner." (NCATE, 2009, pp. 6–7)

Given that one of NCATE's six professional accreditation standards is the "diversity standard" and given the emphasis on preparing teachers to teach "all students,"

NCATE's attention to diversity seems obvious. However, even in an explicit "diversity standard," the details of what it means to educate all students, what it means to "operationalize the belief that all students can learn," and what it means to "demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity" is open to interpretation. Does this mean that teachers should engage in culturally relevant pedagogy? Does it mean that they should teach a multicultural curriculum or a mastery-driven approach to basic skills? Does it mean teachers work from a color-blind perspective or a culturally centered one? While a certain amount of vagueness certainly provides "wiggle room" for the demonstration of the "knowledge, skills and professional dispositions" required in a particular teaching context—in other words, a certain amount of vagueness honors the context-specific nature of good teaching—such vagueness (including the use of platitudes like "all students can learn") also allows for the superficial treatment of diversity. It allows teacher educators to deal with the demographic statistics of diversity without grappling with the sociopolitical dimensions.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). National Board certification is intended to measure a teacher's practice against high and rigorous standards. NBPTS was created in 1987 after the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession released *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* Shortly after its release, NBPTS issued its first policy statement in the form of teacher competency standards, *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do* (1987). These standards are NBPTS's vision of master teaching. There are five core propositions that serve as the foundation for National Board for Certified Teachers' (NBCTs) knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs, with diversity addressed in Proposition 1: "Teachers are committed to students and their learning." The following statements are taken from Proposition 1:

- NBCTs are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn.
- They treat students equitably. They recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice.
- NBCTs understand how students develop and learn.
- They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.
- They are concerned with their students' self-concept, their motivation and the effects of learning on peer relationships (NBPTS, 1987, p. 1).

Diversity as expressed in proposition 1 of *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do* is narrowly conceived. Again, the NBPTS standard flattens out diversity to platitudes: "all students can learn"; "treat students equitably"; "respect cultural and family differences"; and "concerned with their students' self-concept." Such vagueness makes it difficult to understand what teacher education for diversity actually looks like—in some cases, even leading successful, culturally relevant pedagogues to be denied National Board certification (see Irvine & Fraser, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). According to INTASC's website, it is "a consortium of state education agencies and national

educational organizations dedicated to the reform of the preparation, licensing, and on-going professional development of teachers." INTASC believes that "an effective teacher must be able to integrate content knowledge with the specific strengths and needs of students to assure that *all* students learn and perform at high level." *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue* (1992) articulates a common core of teaching knowledge and skills that should be acquired by all new teachers, followed by specific standards for eight disciplinary areas and/or levels of schooling. Although all of the standards are not yet available online, for the three standards where information is available (art, foreign language, and special education), one principle in each standard deals with diversity: "Principle #3—The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners" (INTASC, 2007, p. 22). Both NBPTS and INTASC are united in their view that the complex art of teaching requires performance-based standards and assessment strategies that are capable of capturing teachers' reasoned judgments and that evaluate what they can actually do in authentic teaching situations.

INTASC's *Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing, Assessment and Development* does not address diversity so much as it addresses "diverse learners." Conflating diversity with "diverse learners," however, essentializes diversity by ignoring students' group history and cultures. What's more, there is little mention of the role of culture in teaching and learning or how teachers use cultural and contextual knowledge to make their reasoned judgments and pedagogical decisions in authentic teaching situations.

Policy reformers and the deregulation agenda. It is reasonable to argue that seeds were planted for the deregulation agenda with the release of the Coleman Report (1966). The U.S. Office of Education commissioned a study of the equality of educational opportunities, particularly in light of ESEA's (1965) emphasis on increasing funding and other educational inputs for low-income schools. Were inputs equalizing? If they were, what were the effects? What the study found was that equality of inputs did not have as strong of an effect on outputs as policy makers hoped. The ramifications of this finding continue to resonate in today's professionalization and deregulation policy debate:

> The major virtue of the study as conceived and executed lay in the fact that it did not accept [the input] definition, and by refusing to do so, has had its major impact in shifting policy attention from its traditional focus on comparisons of inputs (the traditional measures of school quality used by school administrators: per-pupil expenditures, class size, teacher salaries, age of building and equipment, and so on) to a focus on output. (Coleman, 1972, p. 149)

The Coleman Report (1966) shifted attention from inputs to outputs. A Nation at Risk (1983), in particular, sounded the alarm regarding America's educational failures, not only reenergizing the emphasis on outputs but also narrowing input attention to teacher quality—equity in funding, curriculum, and school structures were not nearly as important as a teacher's content knowledge. Teacher quality was at the heart of the report's urgent and sharp rhetoric: "A nation at risk . . . [whose] educational foundations . . . are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people" (NCEE, 1983, p. 1). This

sharp rhetorical flourish around "a rising tide of mediocrity" led to unprecedented pressure on policy makers and politicians to improve achievement and to do so by improving teacher quality. Manno (1994) describes this time:

> The nation's states became hotbeds of education reform. Elected officials (such as governors, legislators, and mayors) and lay people (such as business leaders and newspaper editors) set out to wrest control of education from the education experts (school superintendents, school boards, and other members of the education establishment). These "civilians" began to demand that the "education experts" make themselves accountable to the public. (p. 3)

Both implicitly and explicitly, A Nation at Risk (1983) argued that the input-focused and resource-based strategies of President Johnson's War on Poverty—as implemented through ESEA (1965)—had failed to improve the outputs of American education and that it was time to shift educational policy in a new direction. Moreover, setting this new direction would not be left up to "educational experts" who had allowed the rising tide of mediocrity to consume American education on their watch (Manno, 1994). Proponents of this new direction in educational reform argued that, in order to engender globally competitive student achievement, education had to be wrested free from the grips of mediocre educators: Policy makers needed to focus on promoting more choice in school selection (e.g., voucher programs) as well as the deregulation of principal and teacher selection and licensure. In relation to teacher education, this approach specifically advocated that teachers not be prepared at teacher education institutions; instead, people should be allowed to teach if they knew their subject, if they had a desire to teach, and if they were willing to work and learn the *craft*—instead of the *profession*—of teaching from master teachers. Stoddard and Floden (1995) describe this impetus toward deregulation:

> The movement towards school district-based teacher education followed a decline in the public's confidence that colleges can recruit and adequately prepare enough effective teachers. Critics argued that teacher education programs had little substance and that their lack of rigor and low academic standards actually discourage talented individuals from entering the teaching profession . . . From this perspective, college-based programs of teacher preparation are viewed as barriers to raising professional standards in teaching and need to be bypassed. Alternate route programs are designed to provide an alternative means of entry into teaching for individuals who do not wish to take the college route and to offer school districts the freedom to recruit, hire and train teachers. (p. 3)

Additionally, some states (e.g., New Jersey, California) argued that they were experiencing a shortage of qualified teachers that university teacher education programs were unable to rectify. In 1983, New Jersey created the first alternative pathway to certification to "attract a new market for teaching—liberal arts graduates—and transition them into elementary and secondary teaching without going through a traditional college teacher education program. This solution to teacher quantity and quality demands began the alternative teacher certification movement, and the nation took notice" (Feistrizer, 2008, p. 7). Feistrizer, a major proponent of deregulation, also notes that during this same period, Texas justified its recently developed alternative certification pathways by arguing that they would bring more black and Latino college graduates into teaching. Proponents of choice and/or deregulation in-

clude Chester Finn (2003), Dale Ballou and Michael Podgursky (1997, 1999, 2000), Emily Feistrizer (2008), the Fordham Foundation (1999), the Heritage Foundation (2009), the Pioneer Institute (2006), and the Manhattan 31 Institute (2000).

Our review of the writings by proponents of deregulation shows little attention to diversity—neither the demographic statistics of diverse classrooms and their achievement levels nor the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity and learning. Moreover, when answering the enduring questions about teacher education and diversity, proponents of deregulation do so with little attention to diversity: The content of schooling, the training of teachers is color-blind and subject-specific. Diversity appears to have little bearing on teaching or learning and little if any bearing on improving American education.

If addressed at all, diversity is invoked when arguing for reform in the selection of teachers. Unencumbered by having to jump through the hoops of schools of education, alternative routes would better attract high-quality teachers to teach (poor and urban) students and they would better attract highly qualified minorities to teaching (Shen, 1997; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). In fact, much of the writing in the deregulation camp critiques the recommendations and findings of professionalization advocates. For example, Ballou and Podgursky (1997) challenge statements such as the following:

> The findings of both qualitative and quantitative analyses suggest that policy investments in the quality of teachers may be related to improvement in student performance . . . this analysis suggests that policies adopted by states regarding teacher education, licensing, hiring, and professional development may make an important difference in the qualifications and capacities that teachers bring to their work. (Darling-Hammond, 2000a, p. 1)

However, Ballou and Podgursky (1997) argue:

> The commission overstates policy implications, ignoring critical limitations of the research. In many instances, the commission flatly misreports and misrepresents what these studies show. . . . [T]he commission's statement that teacher qualifications account for 40% of the measured variance in student scores is flatly incorrect: indeed, it is a statistical solecism. (pp. 8, 13–14)

While the professionalization camp bases its arguments regarding the importance of teacher education on the quality of classroom teachers, the deregulation camp summarily dismisses these findings. Whether related to diversity and the achievement of "all students" or not, deregulation advocates argue that teacher education does not affect teacher quality.

Learning from the debate. What is immediately obvious from looking across the professionalization and deregulation debate is that each side is grounded in an ideological point of view. Professionalization advocates believe strongly that controlling quality of inputs—particularly teacher quality—is in the public interest and that this public interest is best protected by stronger regulation, standardization, and professionalization. Deregulation advocates believe just as strongly that attention to outputs is best for the individual and that this individual interest is protected by doing away with regulation and the monopoly of education experts. In

many ways, the deregulation and professionalization debate falls along traditional dividing lines in American political thought. Cochran-Smith (2001) summarizes the difference between deregulation and professionalization:

> Many of the most contentious debates about the outcomes question in teacher education stem from two fundamentally different approaches to teacher education reform and from two fundamentally different views of the purposes of schooling. The first, which is intended to reform teacher education through professionalization so that all students are guaranteed fully licensed and well-qualified teachers, is based on the belief that public education is vital to a democratic society. The second, which is intended to reform teacher education through deregulation so that larger numbers of college graduates (with no teacher preparation) can enter the profession, is based on a market approach to the problem of teacher shortages that feeds off erosion of public confidence in education. (p. 527)

WHERE ARE WE GOING? CONNECTING RESEARCH TO POLICY

In *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future,* NCTAF (1996) makes five recommendations for improving education, in general, and the quality of teaching, in particular. It recommends that teacher educators and education professionals:

1. Get serious about standards, for both students and teachers
2. Reinvent teacher preparation and professional development
3. Fix teacher recruitment and put qualified teachers in every classroom
4. Encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skill
5. Create schools that are organized for student and teacher success (p. 11).

In many ways, these echo the research on teacher education and diversity. Reinventing teacher preparation is what scholars recommend when they argue that teacher education is failing urban schools (Haberman, 1994) and that "something other than conventional preparation is necessary" (Ladson-Billings, 1994b, p. 138). Fixing teacher recruitment is what Villegas and Clewell (1998a, 1998b) and Haberman and Post (1998) recommend when arguing for a more diverse teaching force. Creating schools that are organized for success is what Ladson-Billings (1995b) calls attention to when warning educators that they cannot "implement an effective multicultural education program without effective fundamental change in the classrooms and schools in which they teach" (p. 755).

What distinguishes the research of teacher educators concerned with diversity from the recommendations of NCTAF and other policy-minded organizations is their explicit commitment to and concern with multicultural education and culturally relevant pedagogy, the cultural dimensions of learning, the social context of schooling, and the sociopolitical dimensions of diversity and identity in pluralistic and democratic education. These explicit and nuanced commitments are missing from policy discourse—even among advocates of improving education for "all children." In policy discourse—whether in federal policy initiatives or the professionalization-deregulation debate—there seems to be no mention of preparing "the teacher as activist, as agent for social change, as ally in anti-racist initiatives" (Cochran-Smith

& Fries, 2001, p. 5). Without this explicit vision, however, the commitment to "all children" threatens to become nothing more than an empty slogan.

This, then, is the challenge for scholars of teacher education and diversity: To bring these explicit commitments into the policy arena, where the path for teacher education is shaped, mandated, and financed; to bring them to bear in such a way that their centrality to our pluralistic and democratic society is obvious and that makes clear that a just, equitable education for "all students" cannot be realized without them:

> As we establish the grounds and groundwork for the outcomes question, one of the challenges we face is how to keep social justice—particularly issues of race, class, and language background—on the agenda. At the same time that a professional consensus has emerged around an image of the professional teacher as knowledgeable, reflective, and collaborative, another image has emerged of the effective teacher of children of color and of children whose first language is not English and/or whose culture is not Western European in origin. This other image of the professional teacher is of one who constructs pedagogy that is culturally relevant, multicultural but also socially reconstructionist, anti-racist, anti-assimilationist, and/or aimed at social justice. In short, the professional teacher is one who teaches in a way that bell hooks has called emancipatory or "transgressive." (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001, p. 6)

There is a rich body of scholarship putting forth this vision of the professional teacher, a body of scholarship speaking directly back to the policies of teacher quality, deregulation, accountability, and standardization. This scholarship speaks back to policy—but policy makers don't seem to be listening. If they were, wouldn't the research and recommendations of those truly committed to better educating "all children"—research that even includes documentation of successful practices in schools and communities usually deemed as failing and as "the problem"—be a part of the policy conversation?

There is a clear disconnect between policy and the research on teacher education and diversity. What is the reason? Of course, there is a political dimension—this research stands in clear opposition to the neoliberal reforms, including the deregulation agenda, perpetuated by federal policies since A Nation at Risk. But even among allies, such as professionalization advocates, there seems to be scant attention to the work and recommendations of scholars of teacher education and diversity. Perhaps this disconnect stems from the limitations of this body of research mentioned earlier: A thin empirical base; a lack of longitudinal and large-scale studies; few connections between teacher education and the K–12 classroom and student learning; a lack of research on how specific components of teacher education (e.g., the field study, the cooperating teacher) impact teacher learning; a vague vision for assessing teacher education's effectiveness in terms of multicultural outcomes; a lack of exemplars or programs that are successfully educating teachers for diversity; and a still somewhat narrow conception of diversity in education.

If "education is no longer just about what happens in classrooms and schools, but increasingly about rules and regulations promulgated in state capitals and the federal government" (Sykes, Schneider, & Ford, 2009, p. 1), and if scholars of teacher education and diversity are truly committed to enacting a more just and equitable education, then they must find a way to be heard. Where, then, must the field go in

order to impact policy and to be heard by policy makers? Based on the conceptual review conducted here—of both research and policy—there are several areas that need further research, in addition to the need for more empirical, longitudinal, and large-scale studies:

- How do we assess high-quality teacher education for diversity? What competencies and "standards"—what multicultural outcomes—are we measuring our work against, and what tools will we use to assess? How does this assessment connect to K–12 teaching and learning?
- What are the roles of supervisors and cooperating teachers—the teacher educators who, arguably, have the largest impact on preservice teachers, and yet are undertrained and understudied? How do restructured field experiences (e.g., community-based field experiences, cultivating reflective communities of practice) align and improve these teacher education influences? What impact does this improvement have on K–12 teaching and learning?
- What do we find when we follow multicultural teacher education program graduates into their classrooms? What does their practice look like? What impact does the ideological work of teacher education—the cultivation of "habits of mind"—have on K–12 classroom practice and student learning?
- How do we connect individual teachers' and teacher educators' work to larger systemic forces—to programmatic structures, to bureaucratic pressures, to sociopolitical forces? How do we help our preservice teachers to navigate and push back against these forces in order to endure and be successful in urban and multicultural schools?
- What effect does the deregulation of teacher education have on the quality of multicultural and culturally relevant teachers? Do alternative pathways attract more diverse teacher candidates? Are alternative pathways more or less successful at meeting the needs of urban and underserved schools? What is the connection between deregulation and the practices of culturally relevant pedagogy and multicultural education? How does the training provided in alternative pathways impact teachers' multicultural competencies? How does deregulation impact the learning and achievement in multicultural and urban schools?
- What programs and pathways are successful at educating culturally competent teachers? What distinguishes these programs and pathways?
- What can be learned from global and transnational teacher education work on diversity and equity?

Some scholars of teacher education and diversity are already heeding these calls. Cornbleth (2008), for example, followed preservice teachers into their student-teaching classrooms in order to understand how their beliefs about diversity both shaped and were shaped by their student teaching experience. Similarly, Anderson and Olsen (2006) followed graduates of an urban teacher education program into their first year of teaching in order to ascertain their experiences with professional development, particularly how professional development—when combined with their preservice preparation and school setting—shaped these teachers' attitudes about their profession and their career trajectories. Ball's (2006, 2009) decade-long cross-national study followed South African and U.S. teachers who completed a

professional development course into schools where diverse students from poverty backgrounds were clustered in order to ascertain what happened to these teachers in the teacher education course that significantly developed their teaching. It demonstrates how teacher education can foster generative thinking and positive attitudes about diversity among teachers using writing as a pedagogical tool to facilitate and document teacher change. Finally, Watson et al. (2006) surveyed first-year urban teachers on their understandings of effective urban teaching versus effective teaching in order to gauge their dispositions about and attitudes toward urban students. What they found was a deficit-laden view—a finding that has deep implications for teacher preparation. From all of this research following program graduates into their classrooms, these researchers are able to make recommendations for improving teacher education and, ultimately, improving K–12 education and student learning.

In fact, these studies point the way toward the direction that research on diversity and teacher education needs to heed if it wants to impact not only the policy conversation but also the quality of K–12 students' education and learning. These are the questions that research on teacher education and diversity needs to ask if it wants to, as Ladson-Billings (1999a) describes, help "students to move out of categories and into their full humanity":

> 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? (Ladson-Billings, 1999a, p. 242)

NOTES

*With research contributions by Aaliyah Baker, Stefan Breuck, Phillip Caldwell, Lauren Gatti, Kerry Kretchmar, Alison Leonard, Cate Pautsch, Katherina Payne, Mary Perkinson, and Melissa Sherfinski.

1. The sixteen scholars are Arnetha Ball, Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Linda Darling-Hammond, Donna Gollnick, Carl Grant, Martin Haberman, Etta Hollins, Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Joyce King, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Sonia Neito, Christine Sleeter, Linda Valli, Ana Maria Villegas, Lois Weiner, and Ken Zeichner.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L., & Olsen, B. (2006). Investigating early career urban teachers' perspectives on and experiences in professional development. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57(4)*, 359–77.

Baldwin, J. (1963). A talk to teachers. *Saturday Review*, 42–44.

Ball, A. (2000). Preparing teachers for diversity: Lessons learned from the U.S. and South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16(4)*, 491–509.

Ball, A. (2006). *Multicultural strategies for education and social change: Carriers of the torch in the U.S. and South Africa*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ball, A. (2009). Toward a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 46(1)*, 45–72.

Ball, A., & Lardner, T. (1997). Dispositions toward language: Teacher constructs of knowledge and the Ann Arbor Black English case. *College Composition and Communication, 48(4)*, 469–85.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1997). Reforming teacher training and recruitment: A critical appraisal of the recommendation of the National Commission on Teaching and American's Future. *Government Union Review, 17(4)*, 1–53.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1999). Teacher training and licensure: A layman's guide. In Karstoroom, M., & Finn, C. (Eds.), *Better teacher, better schools* (pp. 31–82). Washington, DC: Thomas Fordham Foundation.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: What is the evidence? *Teachers College Record, 102(1)*, 5–27.

Banks, C. (2005). *Improving multicultural education: Lessons from the intergroup education movement.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 3–29). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.) (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*, fourth edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, L., Darling-Hammond, L., Duffy, H., & McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should know and be able to do.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bartolome, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64(2)*, 173–94.

Bilingual Education Act. (1984). Pub. L. No. (98–511), 98 Stat. 2370.

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

Buras, K. (2008). *Rightist multiculturalism: Core lessons on neoconservative school reform.* New York: Routledge.

Carroll, C. (2008). Morning bell: "An act of war." Retrieved July 24, 2009, from http://blog.heritage.org/2008/04/22/morning-bell-an-act-of-war/

Clark, K., & Plotkin, L. (1972). A review of the issues and literature of cultural deprivation theory. In Clark, K. et al. (Eds.). *The educationally deprived: The potential for change* (pp. 47–73). New York: MARC.

Clewell, B., & Villegas, A. (1999). Creating a nontraditional pipeline for urban teachers: The pathways to teaching careers model. *Journal of Negro Education, 68(3)*, 306–17.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 70(2)*, 157–90.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 17(5)*, 527–46.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003a). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 5–28.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003b). The multiple meanings of multicultural teacher education: A conceptual framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30(20)*, 7–26.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2008). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 2008, New York City.

Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman, A., & Pine, G. (2009). Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and students' learning. *Action in Teacher Education, 31(2)*, 17–32.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 931–75). New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. K. (2001). Sticks, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 30(8),* 3–15.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69–110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2008). Research on teacher education: Changing times, changing paradigms. In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, J., & Demers, K. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.), (pp. 1050–93). New York: Routledge.

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

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research in the next generation.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., Mitescu, E., Shakman, K., & the Boston College TNE Evidence Team (in press). Just measures: Social justice as a teacher education outcome. *Teacher Education and Practice.*

Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education, 115,* 347–77.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Coleman, J. (1966). *Equal educational opportunity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Coleman, J. (1972). The evaluation of "Equality of educational opportunity." In Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D. (Eds.), *On equality of educational opportunity* (pp. 149–50). New York: Vintage Books.

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

Cornbleth, C. (2008). *Diversity and the new teacher: Learning from experience in urban schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Inequality and access to knowledge. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465–83). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000a). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child.* New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Educational Policy Analysis, 8(1).* Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004a). The color line in American education: Race, resources, and student achievement. *Du Bois Review, 1(2),* 213–46.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004b). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College Record, (106)6,* 1047–85.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A., & Klein, S. (1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Day-Vines, N., & Patton, J. (2003). The perils, pitfalls, and promises of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: Implications for the education of African American and other minority learners. *T/TAC Link Lines*, 1–5.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2007). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 1–55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1904). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: MacMillan.

Dill, V. (1996). Alternative teacher certification. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 932–60). New York: MacMillan.

Enterline, S., Cochran-Smith, M., Ludlow, L., & Mitescu, E. (2009). Learning to teach for social justice: Measuring change in the beliefs of teacher candidates. *New Educator, 4*, 1–24.

Etzoni, A. (1969). *Semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers.* New York: Free Press.

Feistrizer, E. (2008). *Alternate routes to teaching.* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Gay, G. (1993). Building cultural bridges: A bold proposal for teacher education. *Education and Urban Society, 25(3)*, 285–99.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gollnick, D. (1978). *Multicultural education in teacher education: The state of the scene.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Gollnick, D. (1995). National and state initiatives for multicultural education. In Banks, J., & Banks, C., (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 44–64). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Gollnick, D. et al. (1979). *Analysis of teacher education's need for materials and training related to sex equity: Final report.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

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

Grant, C. (1981). Education that is multicultural and teacher preparation: An examination from the perspectives of preservice students. *Journal of Educational Research, 75(2)*, 95–101.

Grant, C. (1982). Educational research and teacher training for successfully teaching LEP students. In *Proceedings of the second national research symposium on limited English proficient student issues: Focus on evaluation and measurement* (Vol. 2) (pp. 431–55). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

Grant, C. (1991). Culture and teaching: What do teachers need to know? In Kennedy, M. (Ed.), *Teaching academic subjects to diverse learners* (pp. 237–56). New York: Teachers College Press.

Grant, C., & Agosto, V. (2006). What are we tripping on?: Transgressing the fault lines in research in the preparation of multicultural educators. In Conrad, C. & Serlin, R. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook for research in education* (pp. 95–115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grant, C., & Agosto, V. (2008). Teacher capacity and social justice in teacher education. In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., Demers, K., & McIntyre, D. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 175–202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grant, C., & Chapman, T. (2008). *History of multicultural education.* New York: Routledge.

Grant, C., Elsbree, R., & Fondrie, S. (2004). A decade of research on the changing terrain of multicultural research. In Banks, J. & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 184–207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, C., & Koskela, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experience. *Journal of Educational Research, 79(4),* 197–204.

Grant, C., & Millar, S. (1992). Research and multicultural education: Barriers, needs and boundaries. In Grant, C. (Ed.), *Research & multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream.* London: Falmer Press.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In Houston, W. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403–22). New York: Macmillian.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1985). The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Review, 37(2),* 97–118.

Grant, C., & Tate, W. (1995). Multicultural education through the lens of the multicultural education research literature. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 145–66). New York: Macmillan.

Grant, C., & Zozakiewicz, C. (1995). Student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors: Interrupting the multicultural silences of student teaching. In Larkin, J., & Sleeter, C. (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula* (pp. 259–78). Albany: Sate University of New York Press.

Haberman, M. (1988a). Proposals for recruiting minority teachers: Promising practices and attractive detours. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4),* 38–44.

Haberman, M. (1988b). *Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools.* New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Haberman, M. (1991a). Can cultural awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teaching Education, 4(1),* 25–31.

Haberman, M. (1991b). The rationale for training adults as teachers. In Sleeter, C. (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education* (pp. 275–97). Albany: SUNY Press.

Haberman, M. (1993). Predicting the success of urban teachers (The Milwaukee Trials). *Action in Teacher Education, 15(3),* 1–5.

Haberman, M. (1994). Preparing teachers for the real world of urban schools. *Educational Forcum, 58,* 162–68.

Haberman, M. (1995a). Dimensions of excellence in programs preparing teachers for urban poverty schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 70(2),* 24–43.

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

Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In Sikula, J., Buttery, T., & Guyton, E. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed.), (pp. 747–60). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Haberman, M. (2000). Urban schools: Day camps or custodial centers? *Phi Delta Kappan, 82(3),* 203–8.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1990). Cooperating teachers' perceptions of the goals of multicultural education. *Action in Teacher Education, 12(3),* 31–35.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1992). Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income or minority children? *Midwestern Educational Researcher, 5(2),* 29–31.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1998). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory into Practice, 37(2),* 96–104.

Heritage Foundation. (2009). *The Carte: How special interests block real education reform.* Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.

Hollins, E. (1982). The Marva Collins story revisited. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32(1),* 37–40.

Hollins, E. (1990). Debunking the myth of a monolithic white American culture; or, moving toward cultural inclusion. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34(2),* 201–9.

Hollins, E. (1993). Assessing teacher competence for diverse populations. *Theory into Practice, 32(2),* 93–99.

Hollins, E. (1997). Directed inquiry in preservice teacher education: A developmental process model. In King, J., Hollins, E., & Hayman, W. (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 97–112). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hollins, E. (1999). Relating ethnic and racial identity development to teaching. In Sheets, R., & Hollins, E. (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices: Aspects of human development* (pp. 183–93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hollins, E. (2006). Transforming practice: Structured dialogue spurred educators at two underachieving schools to fuel their own professional development. *Educational Leadership, 63(6),* 48–52.

Hollins, E. (2008). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hollins, E., & Guzman, M. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477–548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hollins, E., McIntyre, L., DeBose, C., Hollins, K., & Towner, A. (2004). Promoting a self-sustaining learning community: Investigating an internal model for teacher development. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17(2),* 247–64.

Hollins, E., & Spencer, K. (1991). Restructuring schools for cultural inclusion: Changing the schooling process for African American youngsters. *Journal of Education, 172(2),* 89–100.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Teachers for tomorrow's schools.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Horowitz, F., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Educating teachers for developmentally appropriate practice. In Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2009). INTASC Standards development. Retrieved July 12, 2009, from http://www.ccsso.org/projects/interstate_new_teacher_assessment_and_support_consortium/Projects/Standards_Development/

Irvine, J. (1988). An analysis of the problem of disappearing black educators. *Elementary School Journal, 88(5),* 503–13.

Irvine, J. (1989). Beyond role models: An examination of cultural influences on the pedagogical perspectives of black teachers. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(4), 51–63.

Irvine, J. (1990). *Black students and school failure: Policies, practices, and prescriptions.* New York: Praeger.

Irvine, J. (2002). *In search of wholeness: African American teachers and their culturally specific classroom practices.* New York: Palgrave.

Irvine, J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Irvine, J., & Fraser, J. (1998). "Warm demanders": Do national certification standards leave room for culturally responsive pedagogy of African American teachers? *Education Week, 17(35),* 56–57.

Irvine, J., & Hill, L. (1990). From plantation to schoolhouse: The rise and decline of black women teachers. *Humanity and Society, 14(3),* 244–56.

Irvine, J., & York, D. (1995). Learning styles and culturally diverse students: A literature review. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 484–97). New York: Macmillan.

Jacobson, M. (1998). *Whiteness of a different color: European immigrants and the alchemy of race.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kennedy, M. (2007). Defining a literature. *Educational Researcher, 36(3),* 139–47.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60(2),* 133–46.

King, J. (1994). The purpose of schooling for African American children: Including cultural knowledge. In Hollins, E., King, J., & Hayman, W. (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 25–59). Albany: State University of New York Press.

King, J. (1997). "Thank you for opening our minds": On praxis, transmutation, and black studies in teacher development. In King, J., Hollins, E., & Hayman, W. (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity* (pp. 156–69). New York: Teachers College Press.

King, J. (2004). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 349–78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

King, J. (2005). A transformative vision of black education for human freedom. In King, J. (Ed.), *Black education: A transformative research agenda* (pp. 3–17). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Koerner, J. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Beyond multicultural illiteracy. *Journal of Negro Education, 60(2),* 147–57.

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994b). Who will teach *our* children? Preparing teachers to successfully teach African American students. In Hollins, E., King, J., & Hayman, W. (Eds.), *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 129–58). Albany: SUNY Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34(3),* 158–65.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research in multicultural education* (pp. 747–59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995c). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32(3),* 465–91.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Teaching in dangerous times: Culturally relevant approaches to teacher assessment. *Journal of Negro Education, 67(3),* 255–67.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999a). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24,* 211–47.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999b). Preparing teachers for diversity: Historical perspectives, current trends, and future directions. In Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G., (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 84–123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51(3),* 206–14.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006a). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 37(2),* 104–9.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006b). "Yes, but how do we do it?" Practicing culturally relevant pedagogy. In Landsman, J., and Lewis, C. (Eds.)., *White teachers/diverse classrooms: A guide to building inclusive schools, promoting high expectations, and eliminating racism* (pp. 29–42). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Lewis, O. (1966). *La vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty.* New York: Random House.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lucas, T., Villegas, A., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59(1),* 361–73.
Mabee, C. (1979). *Black education in New York State: From colonial to modern times.* New York: Syracuse University Press.
Manhattan Institute. (2000). New York City conference on school choice event transcript. Retrieved August 15, 2009, from http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/huber.htm
Manno, C. (1994). *Outcome-based education: Has it become more affliction than cure?* Retrieved July 12, 2009, from http://www.americanexperiment.org/main.php
Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1997). Teacher education for cultural diversity: Enhancing the capacity of teacher education institutions to address diversity issues. In King, J., Hollins, E., & Hayman, W. (Eds.), *Meeting the challenge of diversity in teacher preparation* (pp. 23–39). New York: Teachers College Press.
Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1998) Teacher education's responsibility to address diversity issues: Enhancing institutional capacity. *Theory into Practice, 37(2),* 88–95.
Montalto, N. (1982). The intercultural education movement, 1922–1941: The growth of tolerance as a form of intolerance. In Weiss, J. (Ed.), *American education and the European immigrant: 1840–1940* (pp. 142–60). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2002). *What teachers should know and be able to do.* Arlington, VA: NBPTS.
National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1979). *Standards for the accreditation of teacher education.* Washington, DC: NCATE.
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2009). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions.* Washington, DC: NCATE.
Nieto, S. (1994). Lessons from students on creating a chance to dream. *Harvard Educational Review, 64(24),* 392–426.
Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51,* 180–87.
Nieto, S. (2003a). Challenging current notions of "highly qualified teachers" through work in a teachers' inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54,* 386–98.
Nieto, S. (2003b). *What keeps teachers going?* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nieto, S. (2005). *Why we teach.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nieto, S. (2009). From surviving to thriving. *Educational Leadership, 66(5),* 8–13.
Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
Nye, R. (1960). *The cultural life of the new nation, 1776–1830.* New York: Harper Row.
Olneck, M. (2004). Immigrants and education in the United States. In Banks, J., and Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 381–403). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Pagano, A., Weiner, L., Obi, R., & Swearingen, J. (1995) How student teaching in an urban setting affects teacher candidates' career motivations. *Urban Review, 27(1),* 51–76.
Pagano, A., Weiner, L., Obi, R., & Swearingen, J. (1997). How teaching in the urban setting affects career motivations of beginning teachers: A longitudinal study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Phillips, M. R. (1940). The Negro secondary school teacher. *Journal of Negro Education, 9(3),* 482–97.

Pioneer Institute for Policy Research. (2006). *Charter school facts: Paper No. 1.* Boston, MA: Pioneer Institute.

Price, J., & Valli, L. (1998). Institutional support for diversity in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 37(2),* 114–20.

Rotherham, A., & Mead, S. (2003). *Teacher quality: Beyond No Child Left Behind—A response to Kaplan and Owings (2002).* Reston, VA: NASSP Bulletin.

Shen, J. (1997). Has alternative certification policy materialized its promise? A comparison between traditionally and alternatively certified teachers in public schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19,* 276–83.

Sigerman, H. (2000). An unfinished battle, 1848–1865. In Cott, N. (Ed.), *No small courage: A history of women in the United States.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sleeter, C. (1985). A need for research on preservice teacher education for mainstreaming multicultural education. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5(3),* 205–15.

Sleeter, C. (1989). Doing multicultural education across the grade levels and subject areas: A case study of Wisconsin. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 5(3),* 189–203.

Sleeter, C. (1992a). *Keepers of the American dream: A study of staff development and multicultural education.* Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Sleeter, C. (1992b). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender, and social class locations. *Educational Foundations, 6* (Spring), 7–32.

Sleeter, C. (1992c). Restructuring schools for multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43(2),* 141–48.

Sleeter, C. (1995). An analysis of the critiques of multicultural education. In Banks, J., & Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teaching for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52(2),* 94–106.

Sleeter, C. (2004). Critical multicultural curriculum and the standards movement. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 3(2),* 122–38.

Sleeter, C. (2008a). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24,* 1947–57.

Sleeter, C. (2008b). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., Demers, K., & McIntyre, D. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 175–202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sleeter, C., & Boyle-Baise, M. (2000). Community service learning for multicultural teacher education. *Educational Foundations, 14(2),* 33–50.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1999). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentiss Hall.

Sleeter, C., Hughes, B., Meador, E., Whang, P., Rogers, L., Blackwell, K., et al. (2005). Working an academically rigorous, multicultural program. *Equity and Excellence, 38(4),* 290–98.

Sleeter, C., Torres, M., & Laughlin, P. (2001). Scaffolding conscientization through inquiry in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31(1),* 81–96.

Smith, J., & Hodkinson, P. (2007). Relativism, criteria, and politics. In Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 411–34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stoddard, T., & Floden, R. (1995). *Traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification: Issues, assumption and misconceptions.* East Lansing, MI: National Center of Research on Teaching.

Sykes, G., Schneider, B., & Ford, T. (2009). *Handbook of education policy research.* New York: Routledge.

Tabachnick, B., & Zeichner, K. (1993). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 19(4),* 113–24.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. (1999). *The teachers we need and how to get more of them: A manifesto.* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *A guide to education and No Child Left Behind.* Jessup, MD: Education Publications Center.

U.S. Kerner Commission. (1968). *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Valli, L. (1995). The dilemma of race: Learning to be colorblind and color conscious. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46(2),* 120–29.

Valli, L. (1996a). Learning to teach in cross-cultural settings: The significance of personal relations. In Rios, F. (Ed.), *Teacher thinking in cultural contexts* (pp. 282–307). New York: SUNY Press.

Valli, L. (1996b). Trusting relations, preservice teachers, and multicultural schools. In McIntyre, D. J., & Byrd, D. (Eds.), *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience* (pp. 26–40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Valli, L. (2000). Facing the urban, diversity challenge: Teacher education in the United States. In Scott, A., & Freeman-Moir, J. (Eds.), *Tomorrow's teachers: International and critical perspectives on teacher education* (pp. 123–42). Christchurch, New Zealand: Canterbury University Press.

Valli, L., Cooper, D., & Frankes, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. In Apple, M. (Ed.), *Review of Educational Research, 22,* 251–304. Washington, DC: AERA.

Villegas, A. (1988). School failure and cultural mismatch: Another view. *Urban Review, 20(4),* 253–65.

Villegas, A. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58(5),* 370–80.

Villegas, A., & Clewell, B. (1998a). Increasing the number of teachers of color for urban schools: Lessons from the Pathways National Evaluation. *Education and Urban Society, 31(2),* 42–61.

Villegas, A., & Clewell, B. (1998b). Increasing teacher diversity by tapping the paraprofessional pool. *Theory into Practice, 37(2),* 121–30.

Villegas, A., & Davis, D. (2008). Preparing teachers of color to confront racial/ethnic disparities in educational outcomes. In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., Demers, K., & McIntyre, D. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 583–605). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum & Associates.

Villegas, A., et al. (1993). *Teaching for diversity: Models for expanding the supply of minority teachers. A policy issue perspective.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach.* Albany: SUNY.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2004). Diversifying the teacher workforce: A retrospective and prospective analysis. In Smylie, M., & Miretzky, D. (Eds.), *Developing the teacher workforce* (pp. 70–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Watson, D., Charner-Laird, M., Kirkpatrick, C., Szczesiul, S., & Gordon, P. (2006). Grappling with definitions, grappling with difference. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57(4),* 395–409.

Weiner, L. (1993a). Choosing teaching as a career: Comparing motivations of Harvard and urban college students. Paper presented at the Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association.

Weiner, L. (1993b). *Preparing teachers for urban schools: Lessons from thirty years of school reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Weiner, L. (2000). Research in the 90s: Implications for urban teacher preparation. *Review of Educational Research, 70(3),* 369–406.

Weiner, L. (2002). Evidence and inquiry in teacher education: What's needed for urban schools? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 254.

Weiner, L. (2003). Why is classroom management so vexing to urban teachers? *Theory into Practice, 42(4),* 305–12.

Weiner, L., Rand, M., Pagano, A., Obi, R., Hall, A., & Bloom, A. (2001). Illuminating the impact of state educational policy promoting school reform on curriculum and instruction programs. *Educational Policy, 15,* 644–73.

Wilson, S., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations.* Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching & Policy.

Woodson, C. (1933/2008). *The mis-education of the Negro.* New York: Classic House Books.

Zeichner, K. (1995). Preparing educators for cross-cultural teaching. In Hawley, W., & Jackson, A. (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations* (pp. 397–419). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity in the United States. In Craft, M. (Ed.), *Teacher education in pluralistic societies: An international review* (pp. 141–58). New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teacher's College Record,* 105(3), 490–515.

Zeichner, K. (2007). Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education. 58(1),* 36–46.

Zeichner, K., & Grant, C. (1981). Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers: A re-examination of the pupil control ideologies of student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 7(3),* 298–314.

Zeichner, K., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., & Valli, L. (1998). A research informed vision of good practice in multicultural teacher education: Design principles. *Theory into practice, 37(2),* 163–211.

Zeichner, K., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In Houston, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 525–47). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1990). Teacher education and the social context of schooling: Issues for curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal, 27(4),* 610–36.

Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996a). Community field experiences and teacher preparation for diversity: A case study. In McIntyre, D., & Byrd, D. (Eds.), *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience* (pp. 41–61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996b). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In Zeichner, K., Melnick, S., and Gomez, M. (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176–96). New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K., & Wray, S. (2001). The teaching portfolio in U.S. teacher education programs: What we know and what we need to know. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(5),* 613–21.