A CASE STUDY OF TEXAS REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER MULTICULTURAL/DIVERSITY TRAINERS' PERCEPTION OF TEACHER RESISTANCE AND STRUCTURAL BARRIERS TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation

by

ERONIF IBRAHIM

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2007

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

A CASE STUDY OF TEXAS REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER MULTICULTURAL/DIVERSITY TRAINERS' PERCEPTION OF TEACHER RESISTANCE AND STRUCTURAL BARRIERS TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation

by

ERONIF IBRAHIM

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee,	Patricia J. Larke
	M. Carolyn Clark
Committee Members,	Norvella Carter
	Christine Stanley
Head of Department,	Dennie Smith

December 2007

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

A Case Study of Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers' Perception of Teacher Resistance and Structural Barriers to Multicultural Education. (December 2007)

Eronif Ibrahim, B.A., Florida Memorial College; M.S., Florida State University

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Patricia J. Larke
Dr. M. Carolyn Clark

This qualitative case study of eight veteran Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers examined their perceptions of structural barriers and teacher resistance to a voluntary program of Multicultural/Diversity Training (MDT). It also explored how they made sense of their roles in light of their social locations. Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews of the trainers, observations of MDT sessions, and examination of relevant documents. Data were analyzed using the constant comparative method.

Three themes associated with structural barriers emerged: contextual factors, lack of administrative support, and the Texas system of accountability, particularly high stakes testing. The contextual factors were differences in regional cultures, the autonomy of the Education Service Centers, and the voluntary nature of MDT. Lack of administrative support for MDT is crucial because teachers often take administrative response to school reform as their cue for action or inaction. In Texas, high stakes testing exerts influence at every educational level, particularly on teachers in relation to curriculum, instruction, student placement and professional development choices.

Teacher resistance to MDT occurred in the training sessions and in the classroom setting. During the training sessions teachers resisted MDT because it challenged deeply held beliefs and encouraged self-examination, personal disclosure, and discussions of race/ethnicity and culture. Resistance in the educational setting was manifested in maintenance of a Eurocentric perspective, and in school practices such as negative attitudes toward multicultural education and MDT, placement of students of color in special education and lower tracks, and negative attitudes toward all people of color.

Ultimately, trainers suggest that they are enmeshed in a system that seeks to maintain the status quo, and that too many teachers have low expectations for students who are different from themselves and conform to a deficit model when dealing with those students.

DEDICATION

To Fatima Ibrahim

For her confidence in me and support of this work

and

To Hattie Whitted Sapp

“Mama”, mentor, friend and confidant, she loved me unconditionally, instilled a deep sense of confidence and self worth, enabled me to disclose my deepest thoughts and feelings, and allowed me to construct my own reality while respecting the right of others to do the same. She lived her faith, taught me the value of spirituality, creativity, and empathy and encouraged me in the struggle for human dignity and equity in society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

> What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun? Or fester like a sore—and then run? Does it stink like rotten meat? Or crust and sugar over—like a syrupy sweet? Maybe it just sags like a heavy load. Or does it explode?
>
> —Langston Hughes

Drs. Patricia Larke, Norvella Carter and Hasana Alidou-Ngame offered an opportunity for me to fulfill a dream deferred. In 1977, I had completed the coursework toward the doctorate when family concerns caused me to abandon the program. While at a crossroads concerning my career, these three women came to our school district to talk about the doctoral program at Texas A&M University. I was impressed and eventually decided to pursue my dream. They have each, in their own way, been a continuous inspiration to me, and I will always be grateful for our first serendipitous meeting.

My co-chairs Drs. Patricia Larke and M. Carolyn Clark have shown more patience and genuine concern than any individual pursuing a degree could expect. The journey toward completing this degree has been fraught with challenges to my mind, body and spirit. Dr. Clark, while encouraging me to complete the degree, understood the need for me to attend to pressing personal concerns. Dr. Larke transcended all expectations of a mentor to quietly but firmly guide, and sometimes prod, me when I felt that I could not possibly meet the challenge before me.

Committee members, Drs. Novella Carter and Christine Stanley, never lost confidence in me through the delays and full stops. They were supportive as well as celebratory in my achievements. Dr. Patrick Slattery opened a new world of possibility by encouraging me to study philosophy more deeply and guiding me on that path, while

Dr. M. Carolyn Clark helped me to see the world in different ways and to ask questions differently. Dr. Larke extended the lens of multicultural education, which filtered and refocused my critical nature. Dr. Gwen Webb-Johnson extended counsel, friendship, and good humor as she encouraged me to follow my own academic and creative instincts in my work. For all those mentioned above, thank you seems too little, but the thank you is genuine, heartfelt and accompanied with my deepest respect.

The participants in this study are committed educators who took the time from a demanding schedule to share their experiences, insights and struggles with me. They were articulate, reflective and honest, enabling me to retrieve data in richness beyond my expectations. Thank you for your collegiality and good humor; we had fun.

Drs. Hilary Standish and Vickie Moon-Merchant were tireless and critical peer reviewers as well as friends. If "a friend in need is a friend indeed," then I found supportive friends in Texas—Nancy Cavazos, Brenda Meloncon, Dr. Earnestyne Sullivan and David "Sully" Sullivan, B. J. Wellborn, Pamela and Ivan Cavenall and Erin Kracht. Whoever said you cannot go home again was wrong. The last test on this journey toward the Ph.D. came in Tallahassee, FL. Old and dear friends as well as new friends contributed to my completion of this final passage. I am indebted to Robert Dean Perkins, Jr., Trudie "Mom" Perkins, Jacqueline Perkins, Joyce Harris, my brother, Roy Leon Williams, Jr. and Veronica Grimes, Tallahassee, FL; Gary and Linda Slaughter, Jacksonville, FL; and Eddie Slaughter, Buena Vista, GA . The North Carolina connection was not to be outdone. Carlton Vailes and Veronica Bailey, Dr. Beverly Rose, Grace Adams-Square and William" Bill" Square stepped up to assist. Thank you all for food, clothes, shelter, financial resources, and, most importantly, for the emotional and spiritual support that I needed in order to “beat the odds.”

NOMENCLATURE

CPRE	Consortium for Policy Research in Education
CSR	Comprehensive School Reform
ESEA	Elementary Secondary Education Act
ESC	Education Service Center
MDT	Multicultural Diversity Training
M/DTS	Multicultural/Diversity Trainers
ME	Multicultural Education
PD	Professional Development
TEA	Texas Education Agency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iii

DEDICATION v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

NOMENCLATURE ix

TABLE OF CONTENTS x

LIST OF TABLES xiv

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

- Introduction 1
- The Reality of Plurality in the State of Texas 4
- The Texas Education Agency 10
- Regional Education Service Centers 10
- Statement of the Problem 11
- Purpose of the Study 13
- Research Questions 13
- Resistance and Multicultural Theories 13
- Definition of Terms 14
- Significance of the Study 16
- Organization of the Study 17

II LITERATURE REVIEW 19

- The Context of Reform of Education in the United States 19
- John Dewey and the “Liberal” Progressives 20
- Reproduction Theory 22
- Resistance Theory—A Spark Extinguished 38
- Reproduction and Resistance—Critiques 39
- A Liberatory Philosophy of Education 41
- Henry Giroux and Counterculture 46

CHAPTER Page

Multicultural Education 57
Definition of Multicultural Education 58
Approaches to Multicultural Education 60
Structural Issues in Multicultural Education 68
Resistance to Multicultural Education 79
Professional Development—A Vehicle for Change 85
Audience for Professional Development 86
Best Practices for Professional Development 87

III METHODOLOGY 95

Introduction 95
Design of the Study 96
The Constant Comparative Method 99
Use of Participant Narratives 101
The Pilot Study 103
General Design of the Study 106
The Population 106
The Panel, the Sampling, the Participants, and the Interview Context 108
The Participants 110
The Interview Context 116
Data Collection and Analysis 117
Establishing Trustworthiness 122
Summary … 126

IV FINDINGS……… 127

Introduction 127
Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Network Trainer Profile 128
Meet Monica 138
Formation of the State-wide Multicultural/Diversity Network and its Training, Program and Curriculum 140
The Participants—A Composite 142
Characteristics and Major Concerns of Individual Participants 143
Multicultural Trainers—Up Close and Personal 143
Carolyn … 144
Crystal …. 149
Connie …. 153
Adrianne and Juanita 157

CHAPTER Page

Adrianne… 158
Juanita … 161
Angelica 167
Brenda …. 170
Socks …… 174
Summary … 181

V FINDINGS………………….. 183

Introduction 183
Structural Barriers to Multicultural/Diversity Training 186
Contextual Factors as Inhibitors to MDT 186
Texas, Where Difference Is Large 189
Lack of Administrative Support—Districts and Campuses 201
Accountability and Multicultural/Diversity Training 207
The Dumping Ground 208
Resistance to MDT in Training Sessions and in the Classroom Setting 217
Teacher Resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training 217
Educators Resist the Structure and Content of MDT 218
Educators Resist the Structure of REACH 220
Educators Resist the Content of REACH 224
Educators Respond Differentially to REACH and COP 229
Educators Resist MDT in the School Setting 229
A Eurocentric Perspective—From the Sidewalk to the Classroom 230
Maintenance of a Eurocentric Perspective 231
Educators Display Negative Attitudes toward Multicultural Education and MDT 233
Campus Culture 235
Lack of Knowledge—Mistreatment of Students 238
Students of Color in Lower Tracks and Special Education—What Do You Expect? 247
Attitudes toward Families and Communities of Color—The Misunderstood and the Exotic 251
Summary 257

VI SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 258

Introduction 258
Structural Barriers to MDT` 262
Teacher Resistance to MDT 267
Findings Support Ideological Resistance 268

CHAPTER Page

Findings Support Pedagogical Resistance... 273
Summary of Findings.. 278
Significance of the Study 280
Recommendations for Further Research 283

REFERENCES ……….. 285

APPENDIX A ….. 317

APPENDIX B 318

VITA 320

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1.1 Student Demographics by Race/Ethnicity 6

1.2 Teacher Demographics by Race/Ethnicity 7

1.3 Student Test Scores by Race/Ethnicity 7

4.1 Profile of Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers 130

4.2 Multicultural/Diversity Trainer Educational Preparation 132

4.3 Training Program Used by Multicultural/Diversity Trainers 133

4.4 Becoming a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer 133

4.5 Area of Specialization, Major Function at ESC, Percentage of Time on Multicultural/Diversity Training 134

4.6 Desired Changes to Multicultural/Diversity Training Program 135

4.7 Why Make Changes to the Multicultural/Diversity Training Program 136

4.8 How to Affect Changes to Multicultural/Diversity Training Program 137

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> Domestically and internationally, cross-cultural contact is the norm…Any student who emerges into our culturally diverse society speaking only one language and with a monocultural perspective on the world can be legitimately be considered educationally ill prepared and perhaps even culturally deprived.
>
> —Jim Cummins

Introduction

In her monograph, Gay (1994) provides a framework for understanding the important issues surrounding multicultural education. Among these issues is an explication of the need for multicultural education, which includes social realities, cultural and human development, and teaching and learning. The reality of diversity in the United States is that it is highly pluralistic, socially stratified, and racially divided (Gay, 1994). Despite this reality, there is a widely held belief that American society should be homogenized; however, this homogenization scenario may have deleterious effects for some segments of society and deny acceptance of diversity. The “real” image of the United States population resembles a “salad bowl” rather than the illusionary “melting pot”, and many culturally different individuals have not only stopped trying to play at being White but, in fact, embrace their difference. “They insist that there is no inherent contradiction between allegiance to their own ethnic heritages and being an American. Instead these dual identities are complimentary and should be respected and promoted” (Gay, p. 6).

Gay avows that diversity of race, culture, ethnicity, social class, religion, language and

---

This dissertation follows the style of the *American Journal of Educational Research.*

national origin is a fundamental feature of interpersonal interactions and community structures," but that in its "formal aspects, such as institutional policies, practices, and power allocation, Anglocentric and middle class cultural values predominate " (Gay, 1994, p. 4). She points to the organization and government of schools as one example. When schools support the values of one group, those who are not members of that group are placed at a disadvantage, and they are often marginalized and rendered invisible. For students of color and students who are poor the impact is often revealed in academic underachievement. Multicultural education seeks to address these issues by reforming schools into inclusive sites where all students can become successful.

Among the social realities of life in the United States are its changing demographics (Banks & Banks, 1995; Cochran-Smith, 2003; Dilworth, 1992; Hodgkinson, 2001, 2002; Gay, 1984; Gay & Howard, 2000). In addressing this issue, Gay and Howard (2000) make a compelling argument that teacher education programs must prepare European Americans to teach ethnically diverse student of color, and explicit preparation is required because of the increasing "racial, cultural and linguistic divide between teachers (predominately European American) and K-12 students (increasingly from ethnic groups of color)" (p.11**).** They, like Christine Bennett (1995), are doubtful of the effectiveness of many current preservice programs to prepare teachers for the challenge of diverse students in the 21st century.

U. S. Department of Education statistics confirm the "demographic divide." According to their figures, over eighty five percent of K-12 teachers were European American; the number of African American teachers was declining, Latino and

Asian/Pacific Islander American teachers increased only slightly and Native Americans comprised less than 1% of the national teaching force. In opposition, student enrollments among diverse groups were increasing. While sixty-four percent of K-12 students were European American, the other 36% was distributed among groups of color: “17% African American, 14% Latinos, 4% Asian/Pacific Islander Americans, and 1% Native Americans. It was predicted that these enrollment trends would continue, and that the greatest increases would occur among Asian/Pacific Islanders (32%) and Latinos (21%); the prediction has become reality.

Unlike the Commission on Multicultural Education (1973), many people in the United States believe that there is a single acceptable way to live, look, and behave as an American and a human being. The commission, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NCATE), made three affirmations: 1) cultural diversity is a valuable resource; 2) multicultural education is education that preserves and extends the resource of culture rather than merely tolerating it or ‘melting it away; and 3) a commitment to cultural pluralism should permeate all aspects of teacher preparation programs in the United States (Baptiste & Baptiste, 1980). In 1976 NCATE added multicultural education to its standards, “requiring that institutions seeking accreditation show evidence that multicultural education was planned for (by 1979) and then provided (by 1981) in all programs in teacher preparation” (Gollnick, 1992 in Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 3). Cochran-Smith explains that although most teacher education programs report the incorporation of multicultural perspectives and content into the curriculum, independent examinations such as Gollnick (2001) contradict their claims. Several critics conclude that little change has occurred (Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1996; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). Still others place at issue the forms that multicultural education has taken in many teacher education programs. Jenks, Lee and Kanpol (2001) described a "conservative multiculturalism;" its focus is on assimilation and preparing minorities for economic competition in the mainstream, (Cochran-Smith, 2003, p. 3.)

On the other hand, Cochran-Smith explains that the "demographic imperative" (Banks & Banks, 1995; Dilworth, 1992) has been used to conclude that the education community must act to ameliorate the "deeply embedded disparities" in the educational system in the United States. She like other scholars (Gay & Howard, 2000; Hodgkinson, 2001 points to three areas which comprise the "demographic imperative": the diverse student population, the homogeneous teaching force, and the "demographic divide."

Another point put forth by Gay and Howard in relation to population diversity is that it is more concentrated in certain areas or regions of the country such as major metropolitan areas and the southwestern United States. Archival data from the U. S. Census Bureau and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) support this observation and hold special concern for the State of Texas.

The Reality of Plurality in the State of Texas

According to U. S. Census Bureau (2005), Texas ranks third in the nation among states for percentages of the population five years and older who speak Spanish, major language spoken in Texas other than English. Viewing U. S. Census data (2005) on the percentage of people who speak Spanish at home, Texas moves to the number one position followed by California and New Mexico. This figure represents a percentage increase over the year 2003 when Texas and New Mexico were tied for first place at 28.2 percent.

The Bureau also reports data by counties in the United States and people five years and over who speak Spanish at home. In 2003, four Texas counties were listed in the top ten; by 2004, two Texas counties held the number one and two positions. Texas has seven counties represented in the top twenty of 233 U. S. counties, making it one of the most diverse or bilingual states in the United States.

The demographics of the student population and the teacher pool in Texas, as well as performance of major student populations on TASS/TAKS comprise an element of contextualization for this study. Table 1.1 shows student demographics (excluding charter schools) among African, Hispanic, European American and “Other.” Demographic data includes 2002 and 2004 figures. In 2002, of these students, 50.4% were economically disadvantaged, 12% were enrolled in Special Education and 13% were served by Bilingual/ESL programs. By 2004 economically disadvantaged students accounted for 52.8%, 12% were enrolled in Special education and 14% were served by Bilingual/ESL programs. Over this two year period, the African American and Other category of the student population remained stable, the Hispanic American population increased and the European student population declined. The economically disadvantaged population increased, the Special Education population remained stable, and those served by Bilingual/ESL programs increased.

Against these student demographics (Table 1.2), between 2002 and The Hispanic American teacher pool increased by 1%, while the African American and European teacher pool decreased by the same percentage; the category Other, remained the same. Essentially, while the student population becomes increasingly non-European and poor, the teacher pool remains largely European, middle class and, presumably, female, especially in the lower grades.

These data, taken with TAAS/TAKS scores by ethnicity (Table 1.3), represented illustrate that Texas is one of the states most affected by each element of the demographic imperative: a diverse student population, a homogeneous teacher pool, and a demographic divide (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Gay, 1994; Gay & Howard, 2000).

Table 1.1 Student Demographics by Race/Ethnicity (Represented in Percentages)

STUDENTS	2002	2004	CHANGE
Total number of students (Excluding Charter Schools)	4,099,674	4,250,754	151,080 +
% African Americans	14	14	
% Hispanic American	42	44	2+
% European Americans	41	39	2-
% Other	3	3	
Economically Disadvantaged	50.4	52.7	2.3+
Special Education	12	12	
Bilingual/ESL	13	14	1+

Source: Texas Education Agency. (2002/2004). Snapshot Summary Tables: State Totals.

Table 1.2 Teacher Demographics by Race/Ethnicity (Represented in Percentages)

TEACHERS	2002	2004	CHANGE
% African Americans	9	8	1-
% Hispanic Americans	18	19	1+
% European Americans	73	72	1-
% Other	1	1	

Source: Texas Education Agency. (2002/2004). Snapshot Summary Tables: State Totals.

Table 1.3 Student Test Scores by Race/Ethnicity (Represented in Percentages)

TASS/TAKS	2002 TASS	2004 TAKS	CHANGE
All Tests Taken	85.5	67.9	17.6-
Reading	91.4	85.4	6-
Mathematics	92.8	76	16.8-
Science	Not tested	72.4	
Social Studies	Not tested	90.7	
African American	77.6	53	24.6-
Hispanic American	79.8	58.3	21.3-
European American	92.5	80.7	11.8
Other	93.1	84.4	8.7-
Economically Disadvantaged	78.3	56.7	21.6-

Source: Texas Education Agency. (2002/2004). Snapshot Summary Tables: State Totals.

Much of the foregoing discussion has centered on teacher education programs but it is essential for K-12 education since these programs, for the most part, supply the teacher pool. It is also important because preservice teacher attitudes and assumptions, like those of the students they will teach, result from their culture; Gay (1994) reminds us that culture “shapes human behavior, attitudes, and values” and that “deeply ingrained cultural socialization becomes problematic when the schooling process operates on one cultural model to the exclusion of others or when culturally different children are expected to set aside all their cultural habits to succeed in school” (p. 7). The effects for students can be devastating, Gay explains:

> Such a demand is not only unreasonable, but it is impossible to achieve. Attempts to comply with it may lead to cultural adaptation, marginality, alienation and isolation. With the exception of adaptation, none of these responses is conducive to maximizing the human wellbeing and academic success of students.

In light of possible injurious effects to students, particularly students of color and students who are poor, both Gay (1994) and Spindler (1987) agree that the incompatibilities and discontinuities between the culture of school those of different ethnic groups need to be major issues of analysis in making decisions about educational programs and practices that reflect and promote cultural diversity (Spindler in Gay, 1994, p. 7). Multiculturalists affirm that when educators claim to treat all students alike or like human beings, they are creating a paradox. A person’s humanity cannot be separated from his culture or ethnicity (Gay, 1994, p. 6). Lisa Delpit (1995) warns educators that if one does not see color, one does not really see children.

The discontinuity between the cultures of poor and ethnic minority students and the culture of schooling affects their academic underachievement and failure (Nieto, 2000). Moreover, caught in the ambivalence of success and failure in schools that transmit a culture of domination, the learning of children of color and poor students is further hindered by factors of invisibility, alienation, and resistance (Hanley, 2002).

Because of such admonitions (Sleeter, 1992a; Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000) some policy makers, teacher educators, school administrators, practitioners, preservice teachers, students and communities are concerned that too many of our teachers are unprepared or unwilling to meet the challenges that accompany demographic changes in our student population (Bennett, 1995; Gay, 2000; Rodriquez, 1998; Sleeter, 1992b). While this challenge is most often directed to teacher education programs to prepare teachers to work effectively with students from diverse backgrounds, it should be extended to inservice teachers.

In 1977 Giles and Gollnick conducted a study of national and state policies on multicultural education and concluded:

> Legislative intent of both federal and state education laws appears most often to be concerned with protecting the rights of cultural and ethnic minorities in and effort to insure equal educational opportunity rather than preparing all students to know about and function effectively in a multicultural society (p. 156).

Though states have endorsed, and in some cases mandated, diversity or multicultural education in their official documents, implementation has been slow, fragmented, and, in too many cases, ineffective (Gollnick, 2001). Teacher preparation programs in the state of Texas are now required to offer multicultural education courses to perspective teachers and the regional education service centers require Multicultural/Diversity Training for its Alternative Certification candidates; however, many veteran teachers have not been exposed to the field through systematic coursework. One source of information for these veteran teachers would be through staff/professional development activities offered by the State of Texas. A brief overview of TEA and the regional educational service centers and their structure and functions is discussed below.

The Texas Education Agency

Educational governance in the State of Texas resides in the Texas Education Agency, the Commissioner of Education, and the State Board of Education. The focus of this discussion is the Texas Education Agency, particularly its Regional Educational Service Centers. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) as established in 1884 was "secretarial in character" (Eby, 1925, p. 237). Three major events ushered in changes in structure and power within education governance.

First, in the early 1900s new responsibilities (i.e. classifying high schools, classification of colleges, inspection and accreditation of high schools, and oversight for the new textbook) were assigned the Agency through changes in law (Eby, cited in Hutto, Fisher & Czaja, 2002, p. 72). Second, by 1925, TEA was reorganized to include eleven divisions: 1) administration with general supervision over the entire state school system; 2) high school supervision; 3) rural schools; 4) Negro schools; 5) vocational education; 6) statistics; 7) credits and accounts; 8) certification of teachers; 9) textbook administration; 10) correspondence and supplies; and 11) State Board of Examiners (Eby, cited in Hutto, Fisher & Czaja, 2002, p. 72). The third major change involved the reorganization and downsizing of TEA which took place during the 1990s and which also changed the character and responsibilities of the Regional Educational Service Centers.

Regional Educational Service Centers

The Regional Educational Service Centers had their beginnings in 1965 as a result of the need to provide support and services to school districts in the areas of films, equipment, and media (Gaines, 2002). “Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and authorized Title III funds to meet these needs. In 1967, the Texas State Legislature authorized funds in addition to those provided by Title III and established 20 regional lending libraries across the state” (Gaines, p. 53).

The present structure for Multicultural/Diversity Training resulted from the 1996 decentralization of functions (i.e. assessment, parental involvement, special education, multicultural/diversity) from the State level to the more localized Regional Educational Service Center level. These Educational Service Centers provide the link between the Texas Educational Agency and the school districts in their role to “distribute the information, materials, and training necessary for the successful implementation of statewide educational initiatives” (Gaines, p. 67). The regional educational service centers’ training role is central to this study because one of the training functions is to provide Multicultural/Diversity Training, hereafter referred to as MDT, to practicing teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The focus in most school, when there is an effort to implement multicultural education, is on content integration, and often takes the form of an “add-on” or a celebration of heroes and holidays rather than content fully integrated into the curriculum. Regardless of the form, teachers must “buy into” the need for multicultural education before they will attempt to initiate a program. The fact that the teacher pool remains overwhelmingly female, White, and middle class is problematic in that the majority of these teachers come from monocultural, insulated environments, have had little contact or interaction with people who are different from themselves, and are generally unaware of their privileged position in relation to the increasingly diverse student population of urban schools, many of whom are ethnic and language minority and poor students, (King, 1991; Gay, 2000; Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Launey Roberts and Lillian Poats (2002), specifically discuss the issue of cultural and ethnic diversity in Texas schools, and point out:

> Too frequently, teachers and administrators seem unaware of the problems related to racial, cultural, and/or individual difference, or educators may deny the existence of the problem. It has been argued that the normal response at the school level is to simply continue as before, in effect denying that any changes are necessary (Roberts & Poats, 2002, p. 139).

Resistance theory has traditionally dealt with the oppositional behavior of marginalized students to mainstream curriculum and to school in general. What is less clear is how and why teachers resist multicultural education despite research which points to the positive effects of culturally responsive teaching on the achievement of students of color (Au, 1985; King, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Gay, 2000).

In Texas, the Regional Educational Service Centers, in the form of MDT, provide a vehicle for teachers to begin to develop the knowledge and skills that are necessary to more effectively educate all children, particularly, culturally, linguistically, economically, educationally (CLEED) students, (Larke, Webb-Johnson & Carter 1996). However, according to Texas Education Agency (TEA) data, MDT workshops are the least attended workshops in the agency’s catalogue of offerings. The trainers and the training programs are available to veteran teachers; the teachers, whether for personal or structural reasons, are not voluntarily using the services. Thus, there is a need to understand why teachers resist MDT.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of Educational Service Center Multicultural/Diversity trainers with educators in MDT sessions and in schools. Another purpose is to identify and understand any structural barriers that prevent effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training. A final purpose is to gain a greater understanding of how these trainers view their roles and how they justify their activities in light of the incongruence surrounding the training process.

Research Questions

The guiding research question was: What factors affect resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training in the State of Texas? Supplemental questions were drawn from this central concern.

More specifically, the questions were:

1. How is resistance to multicultural/diversity training manifested by educators who participated in the training sessions and by those who the trainers encounter in the school setting?
2. What were the structural and personal barriers that impeded or prevented the trainers from effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training?

Resistance and Multicultural Theories

Resistance theory and multicultural education theory provide the theoretical framework for the study. Literature from the field of professional development is also essential, and included, for understanding the nature of the program under study in light of research on factors that contribute to program effectiveness.

Definition of Terms

Multicultural education: An idea, a process, an educational reform movement whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female 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, 1992, 2000).

Diversity: A more inclusive term than multicultural education, it includes a wider range of differences, including students with physical disabilities and mental disorders, and other marginalized groups who are not a traditional focus of multicultural education (i.e. gays and lesbians and children of mixed parentage).

Resistance: Oppositional behavior of an individual or group of individuals to another individual, idea, action which usually occurs in an interactive environment involving power relationships (domination/subjugation). Embedded in the concept is the idea of acceptance and/or change. Resistance is manifest as active, passive, and as absent (Higginbotham, 2000).

Ideological resistance: Resistance to ideology refers to feelings of disbelief, defensiveness, guilt, and shame that Anglo-European preservice teachers (and teachers) experience when they are asked to confront racism and other oppressive social norms in class discussions [or training situations]. (Rodriquez, 1998, p. 589)

Pedagogical resistance: Pedagogical resistance refers to the roles that teachers feel they need to play to manage conflicting messages about what they are expected to do from their co-teachers and administration (cover the curriculum and maintain class control) and from their multicultural advocates (implement student-centered, culturally sensitive, constructivist class activities) and what they desire to do as teachers. The definition was drawn from Alberto Rodriquez's conceptualization of pedagogical resistance of preservice teachers (Rodriquez, 1998, p, 389).

Hegemony: In the educational setting the concept is intertwined with both ideological and pedagogical domination of oppositional ideas, attitudes, and behaviors with preference given to the dominant or "mainstream" ways of knowing, doing, and being. Ideological hegemony (Gramsci, 1995a) works on and through individuals to secure their consent to the basic ethos and practices of the dominant society (Giroux, 1983a, 1983b).

Structural resistance: refers to formal and informal institutional/organizational impediments to program implementation.

Educational Service Centers (ESCs): The 20 regional offices of the Texas Education Agency.

Federal initiatives: For purposes of this study, federal initiatives refer to those laws and policies affecting issues of social justice, particularly in the educational setting.

Culturally responsive teaching: Alternately referred to as culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1994) or culturally congruent (King, 1991), the concept is based on certain philosophical and pedagogic assumptions: 1) all students can learn, 2) learning is interactive, 3) knowledge is a socially constructed process, 4) more “real” learning takes place when content and practice are relevant to and compatible with the cultural predisposition of the learner, and 5) the teaching/learning environment should be one of caring and respect (Gay, 2000; Pang, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994; King, 1991).

CLEED students: Culturally, linguistically, economically, educationally, diverse students (Larke, Webb-Johnson & Carter 1996).

Race: a local geographic or global human population distinguished as more or less a distinct group by genetically transmitted and physical characteristics

Racism: refers to institutional and individual processes that create and reinforce oppressive systems of race relations whereby people and institutions engaging in discrimination adversely restrict, by judgment and action the lives of those whom they discriminate.

Ethnicity: Common ancestry through which individuals share behavioral attitudes, beliefs, lifestyles, foods, spirituality, and language

Stereotypes: unreliable generalizations about a group

Prejudices: negative attitudes toward an entire group. Both stereotypes and prejudices prejudge a person based on assumptions, both are learned and support a larger system of social relationships. A key characteristic of racial prejudice has been an overt desire to maintain social distance from stigmatized groups.

Significance of the Study

This study is directed at Educational Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers because, in Texas (and most other states), professional development efforts (whatever forms it takes) have been primarily directed at teachers and these state level educators and their programs occupy the "front line" position in veteran teacher training.

This study is significant for at least four reasons: 1) to provide baseline data for continued study of veteran teacher preparation to meet the challenge of an increasingly diverse student population; 2) to challenge State Education Agencies (SEAs) to reassess the structure, content, and process of their efforts to prepare teachers for diversity; 3) to inform Education Service Centers of the need to include an effective evaluation process as a major component of program (professional development) initiatives; and 4) to encourage other researchers to focus on veteran teachers, who beyond their experience, influence the campus and classroom behaviors of new teachers, the interactions between teachers and students, and ultimately, the learning outcomes of the students in their charge.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. Chapter I provided background and an overview of the research, including the purpose, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations. Chapter II provides a review of literature pertinent to the study, including reproduction and resistance theory (macro level), multicultural education, resistance theory (micro level), and a brief discussion of effective professional development practices. Chapter III elaborates the processes of instrument development (survey instrument), participant selection, data collection and data analysis. Chapter IV describes the context of the study and presents the findings of the survey which is used to produce

“A Profile of Multicultural/Diversity Trainer in the State of Texas.” The chapter also presents a profile of each of the participants as individuals and trainers. The findings support the idea that participants are variously situated on multicultural and diversity issues because of their gender, socio-economic and cultural locations as well as their life experiences (Sleeter, 1992b); thus, Chapter IV examines the unsolicited stories told by the participants in the interview context.

Chapter V discusses the categories and themes which emerged from the use of the Constant Comparative or categorical method of analysis. It is divided into two parts. Part A related the trainers’ perception of structural impediments to MDT while the second part examines trainer perception of micro level resistance as individual and interactional properties and processes.

The final chapter of the dissertation provides my interpretation of the data in light of the research questions and the literature. One of the advantages of the use of qualitative methods of analyses is that it allows the researcher to examine divergent as well as convergent themes. I end the chapter with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

> Pedagogy is, in part, a technology of power, language, and practice that produces and legitimates forms of moral and political regulation, that construct and offer human beings particular views of themselves and the world. Such views are never innocent and are always implicated in the discourse and relations of ethics and power.
>
> —Henry Giroux

The Context of Reform of Education in the United States

The major purpose of Horace Mann and many of his business supporters in establishing the first public school system in Massachusetts was to produce an assimilated, pliant labor pool for the industrializing nation (Cremin, 1957). That purpose remained relatively unchallenged until the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. Since that time, the history of education reform in the United States has been compared to a pendulum. It swings from one pole to the other, with philosophical, theoretical, and pedagogical perspectives recurring in cyclical waves of successive reactionary movements.

Approaches to education emerged and have swung as a pendulum from authoritarian theories such as perennialism, essentialism, behaviorism, and positivism to more nonauthoritarian theories such as progressivism, reconstructionism, humanism and constructivism (Johnson, Dupuis, Musial, Hall & Gollnick, 2002). Each movement had implications for the curriculum, pedagogy practices and students and resulted from a particular philosophical perspective. Successive movements on each side of the authoritarian/nonauthoritarian continuum incorporated principles and practices from their predecessors, and as iterations of these theories recur, neither theory is pure in its manifestations or exclusionary.

In our present environment of high stakes testing, recognizable tenets of the authoritarian movements are recurring while, concurrently, multicultural education theorists, researchers and practitioners espouse many principles characteristic of the more nonauthoritarian theories. Nonetheless, from the “perennial school” of the 1920s with it emphasis the on the 3Rs to the progressive movement with its child-centeredness to the radical ideas of the 1960s and the 1970s and the back to basics movements of the 1980s and beyond, one of the most enduring figures in American education has been John Dewey. The next section presents a discussion of the “progressive” education movement as typified in the philosophic and pedagogic work of Dewey because it is to this movement that early reproduction and resistance theorist addressed their arguments.

John Dewey and the “Liberal” Progressives

John Dewey’s work overshadowed that of most philosophers of education in the United States during the twentieth century (Noddings, 1995a). He wrote extensively on social and political philosophy. Dewey viewed democracy as a form of “associated living” consonant with the methods of science; he was particularly interested in the connection between democracy and education. In his preface to *Democracy and Education* (1916) he describes the work as “an endeavor to detect and state the ideas implied in a democratic society and to apply these ideas to the problems of the enterprise of education” (Preface, iii).

As Dewey explores the connection between democracy and education his most enduring ideas and concepts in regard to education emerge. In his conception, the aim of education is more education. Education thus functions as a means and an end (Dewey, 1916). A second and, often distorted, concept of Dewey's is education as growth. The prerequisites for growth are immaturity and dependence, construed by many as negatives. However, from Dewey's perspective these are positive elements in that immaturity suggests potentiality and dependence portends interdependence, a characteristic of associated living. The process of growth begins at birth, however, as the process is mediated by the formal education system, Dewey reflects on the role of the student in the classroom and in relation to the teacher.

Experience is central to Dewey's conception of education and it has two important features—meaning and affect. First, an experience is not a mere exposure or passive undergoing; it has to mean something to the one undergoing it. Second, experience is social and cultural. So, when Dewey talks about experience in the context of education, he emphasizes personal meaning and social interaction, "For an experience to be educative it must be built on or connected to prior experience…it must have meaning for students here and now" (Dewey, p.30).

Dewey put forth three propositions about the role of the educational system which Bowles & Gintis (1976) contend are flawed because of the contradictory goals of education for democracy and education for profit. The first proposition is that schools should integrate youth into the various occupational, political, familial, and other adult roles required by an expanding economy and a stable polity. In Dewey's (1916) words, education is “the means of [the] social continuity of life” (p. 2). Bowles and Gintis dubbed this the “integrative” function.

Second, acknowledging inequality in economic privilege and social status as inevitable, “giving each individual a chance to compete openly for these privileges is both efficient and desirable” (Bowles and Gintis, p. 21). According to Dewey:

> It is the office of the school environment…to see that each individual gets an opportunity to escape from the limitations of the social group in which he was born, and to come into living contact with a broader environment (Dewey, 1916, p. 20).

This second function, Bowles and Gintis called “egalitarian.”

Finally, education is viewed as “a major instrument in promoting the psychic and moral development of the individual” (Bowles and Gintis, p 21). Dewey maintained, “The criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies the means for making the desire effective in fact. The education process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end” (Dewey, 1916, p. 53). Bowles and Gintis refer to this final function as the “developmental function.”

Bowles and Gintis’ (1976) theory of reproduction turns the reform process on its head; they believe the society has to be changed before schools can become truly democratic institutions, since the capitalist system is at the core of the problem of inequality in schools. To make their point, these authors take Dewey’s propositions about education and democracy to task.

Reproduction Theory

In order to examine resistance we must examine the historical roots of the concept. Resistance theory emerged as a reaction to theories of reproduction. Leading proponents of reproduction theory include Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976), Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Pierre Boudieu and Jean-Claude Passeron (1977), who will be discussed in order to illuminate the similarities, differences, and focus among their approaches. The more detailed discussion will center on the seminal work of Bowles and Gintis (1976), which is seen by many scholars as the encapsulating representation of reproduction theory. This body of research in the sociology of education, along with resistance theory, represents the differences between "macro" and "micro" analysis which dominated the field of sociology and which was criticized, among others, by Dewey (1916), Freire (1998a) and Mehan (1992). "The macro includes structural forces conceptualized at the societal level, including economic constraints and capitalist demands, while the micro includes individual or group actions and responses to constraints imposed on social actors," (Mehan, 1992, p. 1).

In their study, Bowles and Gintis argue that "in promoting what John Dewey called the 'social continuity of life' by integrating a new generation into the social order, the schools are constrained to justify and reproduce inequity rather than correct it," (Bowles & Gintis, p. 102). The authors use class analysis, which is based on the proposition that patterns of dominance and subordination which exist in the work place are perpetuated in the schools, to elucidate their position.

They acknowledge that the "perpetuation of these social relationships, even over relatively short periods, is by no means automatic" and explain:

> As with living organisms, stability in the economic sphere is the result of explicit mechanism constituted to maintain and extend the dominant patterns of power and privilege. We call the sum of these mechanisms and their actions the reproduction process (Bowles & Gintis, p. 126).

The authors identify three mechanisms as the foundation for discussing the reproductive function of the educational system -- reproducing consciousness, the correspondence principle, and family structure and job structure (Bowles & Gintis, p. 126-131). Although family structure and job structure are important, in discussing Bowles and Gintis (1976), the focus is on reproducing consciousness and the correspondence principle since family structure is prominent in Bourdieu (1977) and Bourdieu and Passeron's (1977) theoretical work on cultural capital, and job structure is a key element in Paul Willis' (1981) study of resistance.

In the United States, education has been touted as the universal remedy for inequality and the major vehicle for upward mobility**.** Bowles and Gintis (1976) challenge the two major strands of liberal theory in education – the "democratic school" as represented by John Dewey and his colleagues and followers and the "technocratic-meritocratic school" as represented by "policy maker's reactions to the 'rediscovery' of poverty and inequality in America during the decade of the 1960s" (p. 23).

The authors employ John Dewey's (1916) propositions as an exemplar of the liberal theory of education, in order to identify and challenge three functions that "liberal" reformers posit as the role of the educational system. As indicated above, Bowles and Gintis dubbed these functions integrative, egalitarian, and the developmental function. Having labeled Dewey's functions as such, they recount that Dewey argued the "necessary association" of these functions while the "technocratic-meritocratic" school only argues their mutual compatibility. This alternative, technocratic-meritocratic, view is based on a conception of the "economy as a technical system, where work performance is based on technical competence." Thus, "inequality of income, power, and status…is basically a reflection of an unequal distribution of mental, physical and other skills" (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 23). As reflected in educational policies, unequal opportunity in acquiring skills was identified as the major problem. Consequently, if the education system provides the opportunity for all students to develop to their fullest capacity, upward mobility and more economic equality will follow. If inequalities remain after this process, they can be attributed to "human differences in intellectual capacities or patterns of free choice" (Bowles and Gintis, p. 24; Sleeter, 1989).

The authors argue that both strands in liberal education view poverty and inequality as "consequences of individual choice or personal inadequacies, not as the outgrowth of our economic institutions. The problem, clearly, is to fix up the people, not to change the economic structures that regulate our lives," (p. 26). Bowles and Gintis hold that the school's role as provider of labor to satisfy capitalist interest, on the one hand, and its espoused purpose of preparing students for citizenship in a participatory democracy on the other hand are in conflict—their aims are diametrically opposed. A democratic political system aims to insure maximal participation of the majority in decision-making, protect minorities against the prejudice of the majority, and protect the majority against any undue influences on the part of an unrepresentative minority. The capitalist economic system, on the other hand, which the authors characterize as totalitarian, is concerned with keeping participation in decision-making by the majority (the worker) at a minimum, and protecting a single minority (capitalist and managers) against the wills of the majority, and subjecting the majority to the maximal influences of the single unrepresentative minority.

From Bowles and Gintis' perspective, it is clear that education in the U.S. is "too weak an influence on the distribution of economic status and opportunity to fulfill its promised mission", as Horace Mann coined the phrase, "as the Great Equalizer," (p.48). The authors reiterate that the elite, having called a détente on brute force, resorted to control in one form or another through a combination of compromise, structural change, and ideological accommodation," (Bowles and Gintis, p. 127, Gramsci, 1871) accomplished through reproducing consciousness, the correspondence theory, and family and job structure.

"Reproducing Consciousness"

Bowles and Gintis contend that what schools do is prepare youth psychologically for work. In that effort, the consciousness of workers [students] – "beliefs, values, self-concepts, types of solidarity and fragmentation, as well as modes of personal behavior and development – are integral to the perpetuation, validation, and smooth operation of economic institutions" so that "the reproduction of the social relations of production depends on the reproduction of consciousness," (p. 127). The economic system will be embraced to the extent that two factors cohere. First, the perceived needs of the individual are congruent with the types of satisfaction the system can provide. Second, individuals perceive organization for change as futile, a condition that is facilitated by the fragmentation of subordinate classes (divide and conquer), and which results, according to the authors, is not only a cultural phenomena, but "must be reproduced through the experiences of daily life…everyday life itself often acts as an inertial stabilizing force" (p. 128).

> In the workplace such mechanisms as power relations and hiring criteria are organized to reproduce the workers' self concept, the legitimacy of their assignments within the hierarchy, a sense of technological inevitability of the hierarchical division of labor itself, and the social distance among groups of workers in the organization (p. 129).

Bowles and Gintis affirm that the reproduction of consciousness cannot be achieved by these direct mechanisms alone, the initiation of youth into the economic system is facilitated by a series of institutions, including the family and schools. The dominant class has two main objectives, the production of labor power and the reproduction of institutions and social relationships which make the conversion of labor power into profit possible (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). The authors delineate four ways that educational institutions are structured to meet those objectives: 1) schools produce the technical and cognitive skills required for the job; 2) the education system legitimate economic inequality through its "objective" and "meritocratic" orientation, thus reducing discontent over the hierarchical division of labor and the process through which individuals attain stratified positions; 3) schools produce rewards, and label personal characteristics associated with staffing in the world of work; and 4) through its "pattern of status distinctions, schools reinforce "the stratified consciousness on which fragmentation of economic classes is based [divide and conquer] (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 129). The authors concede that these elements alone are insufficient to fully initiate youth into the structure of work; appropriate social relations constitute a second element in the process

“The Correspondence Principle”

According to the authors, “the educational system helps to integrate youth into the economic system through a structural correspondence between its social relations and those of production;” further, schools develop the “personal demeanor, modes of self-presentation, self-image, and social stratification which are the crucial ingredients of job adequacy” (p. 131).

> Specifically, the social relationships of education – the relationships between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work – replicate the hierarchical division of labor. Alienated labor is reflected in the student’s lack of control over his or her education, the alienation of the student from curriculum content, and the motivation of school work through a system of grades and other external rewards rather than the student’s integration with either the process (learning) of the outcome (knowledge) of the educational “production process.” Fragmentation in work is reflected in the institutionalized and often destructive competition among students through continual and ostensibly meritocracy ranking and evaluation. By attuning young people to a set of social relationships similar to the work place, schooling attempts to gear the development of personal needs to its requirements. (Bowles and Gintis, p.131)

Beyond the aggregate level, schools accomplish this task first by feeding workers into different levels within the occupational hierarchy, and correspondingly, toward internal organization comparable to the hierarchical division of labor (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 132; Oakes, 1985; Willis, 1981). Second, differences in the social relationships among and within school, in part reflect both the social backgrounds of the student body and their likely future economic positions. (Anyon, 1980; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Bourdieu, 1977; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) Third, differential socialization patterns of schools attended by students of different social classes do not arise by accident. Rather they reflect the fact that the educational objectives and expectations of administrators, teachers, and parents (as well as the responsiveness of students to various patterns of teaching and control) differ for students of different social classes (Anyon, 1981; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Heath, 1983; Oakes, 1985; Willis 1977). Fourth, differences in social relationships of schooling are further reinforced by inequalities in financial resources (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Kozol, 1991).

Beyond the structural level, the authors point out that the same behaviors are rewarded in school as at work. Juxtaposing the research of Gene Smith (1967), Richard Edwards (1972), Peter Meyers (1975) and their own, Bowles and Gintis identify five general traits—agreeability, extroversion, work orientation, emotionality, and helpfulness—which proved stable across different samples of students, and claim that only work orientation was related to school success. They used Smith's (1969) definition of work orientation, "'strength of character—including such traits as 'not a quitter, conscientious, responsible, insistently orderly, not prone to daydreaming, determined, persevering…'" (p. 135). Edwards (1972), in studying supervisor ratings of employees, identified a cluster of three personality traits ranked highest: rules orientation, dependability, and internalization of the rules of the firm; rules orientation was most valued at the lowest levels of the hierarchy while internalization of norms was most valued at the highest levels and dependability was most valued at the intermediate level. Edwards work convinced the authors to apply the same forms to high school students in order to provide a link between personality development in school and the requirements of job performance.

Bowles and Gintis along with Peter Meyer (1975) developed sixteen pairs of personality traits and obtained the grade point averages, IQ scores, and college-entrance-examination SAT-verbal and SAT-mathematics from the official records of 237 members of a senior class at a New York high school. They found the expected result that the cognitive scores provided the best single predictor of grade point average, surmising “that grading, based on cognitive performance is perhaps the most valid element of the ‘meritocratic ideology’” (p. 136). More important was the finding that the personality traits offered comparable predictive value.

> The only significant penalized traits are precisely those which are incompatible with conformity to the hierarchical division of labor—creativity, independence, and aggressivity. (p137)

All of the other traits, which the authors expected to be rewarded were, “and significantly so” (p. 137). Those traits included: perseverant, dependable, consistent, identifies with school, empathizes orders, punctual, defers gratification, externally motivated, predictable, and tactful. The authors subsequently consolidated the sixteen traits into three “personality factors”: 1) submission to authority, which included consistent, identifies with school, punctual, dependable, externally motivated, and persistent; 2) temperament, which included not aggressive, not temperamental, not frank, predictable, tactful, and not creative; and 3) internalized control, which included empathizes orders and defers gratification. Bowles and Gintis’ theory was confirmed as submission to authority was found to be the factor most rewarded. For their sample, the personality traits most rewarded on the job were those, likewise, rewarded in school.

While the correspondence theory seems viable in terms of grading practices, the authors accede that the empirical data on grading does not fully explain the educational system's reproduction of the social division of labor because: 1) it is the overall structure of social relations of the educational encounter that reproduces consciousness, not just grading; 2) personality is not the only personal attribute indicated in the data; others include modes of self presentation, self-image, aspirations, and class identification; 3) measuring personality traits is complex and difficult and their study reveals only a small part of the dimensions; and 4) traits revealed in school and relevant to job performance differ by educational level, class composition of schools, and the student's particular educational track. (p. 139).

The real significance of the foregoing discussion lies in a presupposition that given similar levels of education and IQ, personality traits become significant for job as well as school performance and the placement of individuals within the hierarchy of both. Bowles and Gintis do not argue that the educational system adds to or subtracts from "the degree of inequity and repression originating in the economic sphere…Rather, it reproduces and legitimates a preexisting condition in the process of training and stratifying the work force," (p.265). The third requirement for social reproduction, family structure and job structure, foreshadow the work of Bourdieu (1977), Bourdieu and Passeron, (1977) and Willis (1981), which follow in the next section.

At the macro level, Bowels and Gintis evaluate the system, which has emerged historically, as a facilitator of economic productivity and the "ethos of individuality and personal freedom as repressive and anachronistic, an obstacle to further human progress" (p.365).

> The many must daily acquiesce to domination by the few, giving rise to the systemic perpetuation of extensive inequalities – not only between capital and wage labor, but among working people as well. The stability and security of these economic power relationships require the creation and reinforcement of distinctions based on sex, race, ethnic origins, social class, and hierarchical status. (Bowles and Gintis, p. 265)

The authors conclude their argument for the inability of either social or technocratic forms of liberal theory to achieve the outcomes it predicts—integration, equality, and individual development—because of the inherent contradiction between the objectives of liberal reform and the objectives of the capitalist system of production.

> The educational system serves -- through the correspondence of its social relations with those of economic life -- to reproduce economic inequality and to distort personal development. Thus, under corporate capitalism, the objectives of liberal educational reform are contradictory: It is precisely because of its role as producer of an alienated and stratified labor force that the educational system has developed its repressive and unequal structure. In the history of U. S. education, it is the integrative function which has dominated the purpose of schooling, to the detriment of the other two liberal objectives. More fundamentally, the contradictory nature of liberal educational reform objectives may be directly traced to the dual role imposed on education in the interest of profitability and stability; namely, enhancing workers' productive capacities and perpetuating the social, political, and economic conditions for the transmission of the fruits of labor into capitalists profit. (p. 48-49)

Researchers and theorists have critiqued Bowles and Gintis' theory on several grounds. Hugh Mehan (1972) identified three areas of deficiency, and numerous other scholars support his analyses. First, the theory is economically deterministic (Apple, 1983; Giroux, 1983; Sleeter, 1989). Another deficiency is that it exaggerates the integration between the demands of the capitalist elite and the organization of schooling (MacLaren, 1980, 1998); MacLeod, 1987). Further, "It reduces to the same kind of functionalist argument it presumably replaced," (Karabel and Halsey, 1977, p. 40). The works of Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) draw attention to the cultural dimension of reproduction theory broadening the more economically deterministic approach offered by Bowles and Gintis. Bourdieu coined the term cultural capital, to refer to the general cultural background, knowledge, dispositions and skills that are passed generationally form parents to their children in the family.

Pierre Bourdieu and his colleague Jean Claude Passeron (1977), extend the theoretical discourse. The major theoretical proposition of *Reproduction* is that "every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force, adds its own specifically symbolic force to those power relations." (p. 4). In part one of the text, the authors highlight this imposition as "an arbitrary cultural scheme, and a type of pedagogic action on the part of the dominant group or class" (Preface, viii). They proceed to make use of social class as a means of examining social selection in the educational system. Their propositions and analysis rest on the presuppositions of a theory of classes and dominant groups.

There is a general conception of the division of society into such groups and classes, which according to the authors, results in "the imposition of a culture and in pedagogic action as symbolic violence," (Preface, viii). In a narrower sense, a set of derivative propositions define the dominant class and groups in a particular society and then link the "specific manifestation of pedagogic action with the basic characteristics of a determinate social structure" (Preface, viii). In other words, those in power define themselves and others and postulate their superiority, and the superiority of everything associated with them (i.e. taste, ideas, culture) through a process of inculcation (i.e. education) which the dominated group(s) internalize, and, in effect, perpetuate the domination of the powerful or dominant group (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Grant & Sleeter, 1996**;** Swartz, 1993).

Key terms in Bourdieu's sociological thought are social field, capital, and habitus, which serve to explain the process. Habitus is adopted through upbringing and education. The concept translates on the individual level into, "a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment…as well as fundamental dimension of all social life. Bourdieu argues that the struggle for social distinction is a fundamental dimension of all social life. It refers to social space and is bound up with the system of dispositions (Habitus). Social space has a very concrete meaning, the space of social positions and the space of lifestyles -- more concretely, a gap, a relational property existing only in and through its relation with other properties.

All actions take place within social fields, which are arenas for the struggle for resources. Individuals, institutions and other agents try to distinguish themselves from others and acquire capital [a means], which is useful or valuable in the arena. Michael Apple (1978) reflects that at the center of this perspective is a recognition that advanced industrial societies such as the United States "ubiquitously distribute not only economic goods and services but also certain forms of cultural capital, i.e. "that system of meaning, abilities, language forms, and tastes that are directly and indirectly defined by dominant groups as socially legitimate" (Apple, 1978, p. 496). However, Giroux (1981) admonishes:

> This should not suggest that primary agencies of socialization in the United States simply mirror the dominant mode of economic production and function to process passive human beings into future occupational roles. This over-determined view of socialization and human nature is both vulgar and mystifying. What is suggested is that the assumptions, beliefs and social processes which occur in the primary agencies of socialization neither "mirror" wider societal interests nor are they autonomous from them. In other words, the correspondence and contradictions that mediates between institutions like school and the larger society exist in dialectical tension with each other and vary under specific historical conditions. (Giroux, 1981, p. 40).

The work of Jay MacLeod (1987) supports Giroux's interpretation. MacLeod used Bourdieu and Passeron's concept of cultural capital as the framework for his ethnographic study, and, according to Mehan (2001), makes an even greater contribution as he examines the aspirations of two groups of youth who experience similar home/school daily life environments, but whose perspectives on their life trajectories are totally different. The "Hallway Hangers" (predominantly White youth) and the "Brothers" (predominantly Black youth) lived in the same housing projects, but responded differentially to their environments. The Hallway Hangers reacted in ways that were reminiscent of Willis' lads: cutting classes, acting out, smoking, drinking, using drugs, dropping out, and committing crimes. They availed themselves of very opportunity to "oppose the regimen of the school and to resist the achievement ideology," (p. 66). In contrast, the Brothers internalized, and attempted to fulfill, socially approved rules. They attended classes, conformed to rules, studied hard, participated in sports, rejected drugs and cultivated girlfriends

The fact that two different groups of students reacted so differently to objectively similar socio-economic conditions challenges both economically and culturally deterministic reproduction theories. Mehan's (2001) critique acknowledges the actions of the Hallway Hangers as a vindication of Bourdieu's theory. "Confronting a closed opportunity structure, they lowered their aspirations and openly resisted the educational institution and its achievement ideology" (p. 66); however, he points out that neither Bowles and Gintis or Bourdieu and Passeron would fair well at explaining the actions of the Brothers.

MacLeod identified two important mediating factors, which may have accounted for the different reactions. First, the Brothers thought that racial inequality had been ameliorated over the past 20 years as a result of the civil rights struggle and subsequent legislation. Second, the families of the Brothers aspired to professional occupations for their children and put forth a great deal of effort into achieving that goal (i.e. strict curfews, high expectations for academic achievement). The parents of the Hall Hangers, on the other hand, allowed their sons to do as they pleased and did not monitor their schoolwork. Ethnicity and family life served as mediators between social class and attainment, "leading to an acceptance of the achievement ideology by the Brothers and a rejection of it by the Hallway Hangers" (Mehan, 2001, p. 67).

> **…**The cultural attitudes and practices of these youth cannot be traced directly to structural influences or dominant ideology. The "Hall Hangers," and the "Brothers," "view, inhabit, and help construct the social world" (Mehan, 2001, p. 66).

MacLeod, like Giroux (1983), shows that the interface between the cultural and the structural is central to our understanding of inequality.

Mehan (1972) criticizes Bourdieu and Passeron on the same grounds as he did Bowles and Gintis and adds that their theory valorizes the dominant culture while devaluing working class culture (Lamont and Lareau, 1988; Lareau, 1987; Mehan, 2001). Bourdieu (1989) insisted that his theory is not deterministic, however, Mehan (1992, 2001) and others then challenged him on three additional issues: first, for not treating the cultural sphere as an object in its own right, second, for depicting cultural form and practices as a reflection of structural forces conceptualized at the societal level (Apple, 1986; Giroux, 1983, Macleod, 1987; Willis, 1981), and third, for treating parents, teachers, and especially students as bearers of cultural capital (Giroux, 1983; Macleod, 1987). As articulated by McLeod (1987) and Mehan (2001), though more subtle than Bowles and Gintis (1976), the theory remains reductionist and, though Bourdieu stresses the arbitrariness of cultural capital, he seems to valorizes elite culture.

The work of researchers such as Bowles and Gintis and Bourdieu and Passeron represent the macro level of research in the sociology of education, which is conceptualized at the societal level, and includes economic constraints and capitalist demands. In Willis' study of "the lads", which follows, structure is important, but his research is conceptualized more at the micro level, which includes individual and group actions and responses to constraints imposed on social actors (Mehan, 2001). Dewey (1938) and Freire (1998b) challenged "Either-Or" propositions and false dichotomies; Mehan (2001) reiterates the warning as he describes the macro-micro level analysis as creating false dichotomies, reifying social structure and relegating "social interaction to a residual status," (p.62). Willis (1977), MacLaren (1980, 1998) and McLeod (1987) looked more closely at the everyday lives of high school students and, in so doing, deepened our understanding of inequality; their work augurs a reconceptualization of micro-macro interrelationships as they introduce culture, interject human agency and “open the black box of schooling,” (Mehan p. 65).

Resistance Theory – A Spark Extinguished

As with many theories, the works of particular individuals come to embody the theoretical perspective. In the case of resistance theory, Paul Willis and his “lads” are that embodiment. Willis (1981) offers a glimmer of hope as he challenges the determinism of reproduction theory by interrogating the cultural level of schools and the function of human agency. His is a three-year ethnographic study on the transition from school to work of non-academic working class boys during their last two years of schooling and into the early months of work. In the preface to *Learning to Labor,* Aronowitz described Willis’ approach as an integration of ethnography into the theory of reproduction in order to explain what Bowles and Gintis left out, the processes by which “working class kids get working class jobs.”

Ultimately, the lads not only maneuver themselves into working class jobs, they participate in behaviors that marginalize women/girls and racial and ethnic minorities and, unwittingly, become complicit in the maintenance of the status quo for themselves and others. They support the system against which they resisted. Examining the “lads” resistance from a more positive perspective, however, the lads offer hope.

With the “lads”, Willis challenged more simplistic methodological and theoretical assumptions of the new radical scholarship. Assessing the capacity of the counterculture among those who are “objects of educational manipulation,” he showed how these youth, through their own activity and ideological development, reproduced themselves as a working class. Thus, Willis’ findings oppose the manipulation theses of radical critiques by demonstrating that working class “lads” create heir own culture of resistance. What scholars such as Giroux (1983) find worth is the possibility of human beings to recreate their world. The goal is to turn negative forms of resistance into critical consciousness in service of equity and social justice through reconceptualization and reconstruction.

Reproduction and Resistance—Critiques

What distinguishes Willis’ work from Bowels and Gintis (1976) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) is his introduction of the importance of human agency in the process of reproduction and that of counter culture, which opposes the patterns of domination within school settings. Willis presents a somewhat romanticized version of “the lads” and the counter culture they create. While on the one hand they establish “inner meaning, rationality and the dynamic of the cultural processes and contribute to the working class culture in general, on the other, more unexpectedly, they contribute to maintenance and reproduction of the social order. To Willis’ claim that the “lads” rejection of the school was partly a result of their “deep insights into the economic conditions of their social class under capitalism,” Mehan (2001) counters:

> …their cultural outlook limited their options; equating manual labor with success and mental labor with failure prevented them from seeing that their actions led to a dead end: low paying jobs. (p. 66)

Giroux (1981) speaks to what he views as the shortcomings of reproduction theories, even the resistance as depicted in Willis' study; however he recognizes the possibility in the unfortunate outcome for the lads. Willis' findings invite "a language of possibility" (Giroux, 1983), and a restoration of hope (Freire, 1998; Greene, 1996).

In his article, "Hegemony, Resistance, and the Paradox of Educational Reform" (1981), Giroux presents a comprehensive description and critique of reproduction and resistance theories from the perspective of he calls radical educational theory. He asserts:

> In the current debate over the political, social and economic functions of schooling, the discourse of radical educational theory appears to be caught in a paradox whereby its attack on existing relations between schools and other more powerful institutions in the dominant society tend to end up strengthening those relationships." (p. 3)

The author avers that radical theories provide "both institutional and interactional analyses of the process of schooling…that reveal the economic and political character of schooling" (p. 3). He readily acknowledges that theorist such as Gramsci, 1995b; Althusser, 1971; Bourdieu, 1977 and Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Bowles and Gintis, 1976 and Willis, 1981) have played a significant role in "exposing the ideological assumptions and processes behind the rhetoric of neutrality and social mobility characteristic of both conservative and liberal views of schooling…and represent an important break from idealist and functionalist paradigms in educational theory" (p. 3); however, for him, their analyses remain problematic. According to Giroux, radical educational theory supports the "logic of the existing order." For the author, the major weakness of radical education theory resides in its "refusal to posit a form of critique that demonstrates the theoretical and practical importance of counter-hegemonic struggles both within and outside the sphere of schooling," (p. 3). Giroux's (1983) advances the idea of the importance of a counter-hegemonic theory in advancing social justice by reconceptualizing resistance as unreflective acts of opposition into resistance as a positive praxis for liberation (hooks, 1994, Freire, 1998a, 1998b; Sleeter, 1989; Sleeter and Grant, 1994).

In transition to a reconceptualization of counter hegemonic opposition into a theory of resistance it seems appropriate to briefly revisit the undergirding concepts and principles that are constitutive of the philosophy, theory and practices of Paulo Freire, because he advanced such a form of critique and influenced many contemporary critical theorists, including Giroux and others such as bhooks, Donald Macedo and Peter MacLaren. Sleeter and Grant (1994) also point to Freire as they elaborate education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist.

A Liberatory Philosophy of Education

Paulo Freire was among the foremost educational theorists advocating the need for conscious raising in the newly literate. Although his early work was specific to adult education among peasants in his native Brazil, his philosophical and pedagogical perspectives have proliferated education in developed countries throughout the world; the United States is no exception. Scholars representing diverse epistemological stances (i.e. interpretive, critical and postmodern) embrace his work. It seems important to discuss the major framework and concepts that Freire put forth since many of the critical theorists who took a turn, in the mid-1980s, away from macro analysis to explore the micro level processes of schooling used his work as a point of departure.

Freire (1998a) offers an emancipatory educational philosophy and critical pedagogy which has helped to transform our thinking about education in the United States as he influenced the thinking of critical scholars who interrogate more traditional perspectives. Freire's work refers to a "culture of silence" which keeps oppressed people submerged in a situation where critical awareness is almost an impossibility and indicts schools as complicit in that silencing. He moves his argument forward from one basic premise, which is that man's reason for being is to become a Subject who "acts upon and transforms his world" (Shaull, Preface, p. 14).

In 1970 when Freire introduced the concept, conscientizavao, which he defined as "learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality," (Freire, 1998a, Preface, 17), it is ironic that he identified "fear of freedom," on the part of the oppressed, as a major inhibiter to developing conscientizavao.

Freire advocates a "dialogic and problem-posing education toward creating a world in which it will be easier to love," (Preface, 22). He described contradiction as denoting the conflict between opposing social forces and dialectic as pertaining to the nature of logical argumentation – the juxtaposition or interaction of conflicting ideas/forces. Fear of freedom is manifest in the oppressed as being afraid to embrace freedom and in the oppressor as being afraid of losing the 'freedom' to oppress," (p. 28). The oppressor according to Freire uses prescription, the imposition of one individual's choice upon another, "transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed into one that conforms to the prescriber's consciousness", (p. 29), to maintain dominance. So the behavior of the oppressed is a prescribed behavior, following as it does the guidelines of the oppressor" (p. 29). In contrast, praxis is defined as "reflection and action upon the world to transform it," (p. 33). To achieve this goal, "the oppressed must confront reality critically, simultaneously objectifying and acting upon that reality," (p. 33). Freire (1998a), and Giroux (1998), describe teachers as "cultural workers" and contend that, in educational settings, teachers can affect such ability by aiding students to shed false perceptions.

Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed is a pedagogy of people engaged in the fight for their own liberation; however both the oppressed and the oppressor must be among the developers of this pedagogy," (p. 35-36). In formal education systems, he is talking about voice, which is a necessary ingredient for true dialog. One must hear the voices of students, parents and the community in dialog with the voice of former oppressors – Freire maintains that "systematic education can only be changed by political power, [versus] educational projects, carried out with the oppressed in the process of organizing them" (p. 36).

The pedagogy of the oppressed as a humanist and liberationist pedagogy has two stages: unveiling and, through praxis, commitment to transformation. With this accomplished, Freire affirms, "the reality of oppression has already been transformed, this pedagogy ceases to belong to the oppressed and becomes pedagogy for all people in the process of permanent liberation," (p. 36).

The nature of the oppressor consciousness is to "transform everything surrounding it into an object of its domination," (p. 40).

> As long as the oppressed remain unaware of the causes of their condition, they fatalistically ‘accept’ their exploitation. Until this occurs, they will continue disheartened, fearful, and beaten,” (p. 46). Discovery cannot be purely intellectual but must involve action; nor can it be limited to activism, but must include serious reflection: only then will it be a praxis,” (p. 47).

What teachers and students must do is engage in liberating dialogue, which is life affirming humanizations rather than monologue, which Freire describes as an instrument of domestication. Thus, dialogue, praxis, and co-intentional education become the cornerstones of a liberating pedagogy:

> Teacher and students, co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as permanent re-creators,” (p. 51).

Freire portrays traditional educational models as “the ‘banking’ concept of education” and an instrument of oppression. He supports “the problem-posing concept of education” as an instrument of liberation. With the ‘banking’ concept, teacher and students are in contradiction; with the problem-posing concept, student-teacher contradiction is superseded and education becomes a mutual process. It is world mediated; so that “people as incomplete beings are conscious of their incompletion and their attempt to be more fully human” (p.52).

Freire believed that in its most ubiquitous state, “Education is suffering from narration sickness,” (p. 52).

> The teacher (Subject) the patient, listening students (Objects) turned into “containers”, into “receptacles” to be filled by the teachers. The better she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better student they are…instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize and repeat…Projecting an absolute

> ignorance onto another, a characteristic of the pedagogy of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry," (p. 53).

Freire rejects this "banking model" this model as authoritarian but does not advocate lawless permissiveness (Dewey 1916; Freire, 1998a). He further affirms that one is not the opposite of the other, "the opposite of either manipulative authoritarianism or lawless permissiveness, is democratic radicalism" (Freire, 1998a, p. 64). What Freire reveals concerning the use of such a model is, "The humanism of the banking approach masks the effort to turn women and men into automatons – the very negation of their ontological vocation to be more fully human," (p. 55). However he projects that eventually the contradictions may "lead formerly passive students to turn against their domestication and the attempt to domesticate reality," (Freire, 1998a, p. 56; Willis 1981).

In a conversation with Donald Macedo who, along with Dale Koike and Alexandre Oliveira, translated Tea*chers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare Teach* (1998b), Freire avows, "I do not want to be exported. It is impossible to export pedagogical practices without reinventing them," (Preface, p. xi). Giroux takes up that challenge as he reconceptualizes the resistance that Freire predicted into an appropriate version of "education as the exercise of freedom" in an advanced industrial society. He affirms Freire's faith in a problem posing education, believes that "at the outset the teacher-student contradiction must be resolved" (Freire, 1998a, p. 60), and that one vehicle through which this resolution can be achieved is through critical pedagogy, his conception of dialogics. Giroux recognizes the twofold imperatives of context and social transformation, both "primary in fashioning any viable form of cultural politics and crucial to developing a ‘language of critique and possibility’ that is as self-critical as it is socially responsible (Giroux, 2001, Introduction, p. xx).

Henry Giroux and Counterculture

Among contemporary theorist, Henry Giroux extends Freire’s arguments into an analysis of American educational practices. He advocates critical literacy, a form of literacy that is directed to the analysis of individual and collective problems. His rationale aligns with Freire’s concept of conscientization; if people do not have the capacity and power to criticize, they may accept the messages of the dominant culture, thus becoming accomplices in their own exploitation -- hegemony. In calling for a pedagogy that is critical, some may view Giroux’s ideas, like those of Freire and Dewey, as utopian; however, he points to the work of Willis (1981) and others as an indication that “neither students nor teachers resemble the ‘social puppet’ image that emerges in the writings of the reproduction theorist (Giroux, 2001, p. 200).

In the case of Willis’ ‘lads,’ resistance was manifest, in great degree, as a matter of style and subsumed at the informal level of schooling, although recognized and tacitly approved at every level of the school hierarchy. Giroux has labeled this form of resistance as symbolic resistance because it is limited to the world of cultural symbols such as dress, taste, language and the like. What his critical pedagogy requires is that this form of opposition be transformed into a form of resistance that is “linked to political action and control” (Giroux, 2001, p. 200).

Giroux (1988) defines resistance as “a personal space” in which the logic and force of domination is contested by the power of subjective agency to subvert the process of socialization" (p. 162). Giroux points out that resistance can take many forms, ranging from "an unreflective and defeatist refusal to acquiesce to different forms of domination", as illustrated by Willis' 'lads', to "a cynical, arrogant, or naïve rejection of oppressive forms of moral and political regulation" (p. 162). Giroux (1983a) advances a counter-hegemonic theory of resistance when he states that the power of resistance is in celebration "not of what is but what could be" (p. 242). "It is this resistance that provides an entrée into education for social change;" Giroux had argued the need 'to develop strategies in schools in which oppositional cultures might provide the basis for a viable political force'" (Sleeter, 1996, p. 10).

Giroux acknowledges that teachers attempting to carry out the project of critical pedagogy within the formal institution of schooling, which he differentiates from education, will encounter structural and ideological constraints that both impede and facilitate, in varying degrees, their chances to develop critical modes of pedagogy (Giroux, 2001). He offers three propositions to these teachers. First, teachers must start with their own social and theoretical perspectives regarding their views about society, teaching and emancipation. Teachers cannot escape their own ideologies so, as teachers, we need to understand how issues of race, class, gender and culture affect the way we think and act (Giroux, 2001; Sleeter, 1989; Sleeter & McLaren, 1996) and how to minimize the negative "effects on our students of the 'sedimented' histories that reproduce dominant interests and values" (Giroux, 2001, p, 241). Teachers work under constraints, but within those constraints, they structure and shape classroom experiences and need to reflect upon what interests guide their behavior.

Second, teachers must strive to make school democracy possible (Dewey, 1916; Giroux, 2001). In schools this means building alliances with other teachers. “The cellular function of teaching, according to Giroux, is one of the worst aspects of the division of labor,” (Giroux, 2001, p. 242).

> The Taylorization of the work process, as it is manifested in schools, represents one of the greatest structural constraints that teachers face, i.e. it isolates and reifies hierarchical forms of decision making and authoritarian modes of control. (p.242)

The principles of democratic practices must also be made manifest in student teacher relations in the classroom and in other sphere of school activity (Dewey, 1916, 1938; Freire, 1970).

Finally, teacher must be willing to take risks (Freire, 1998b; Giroux, 2001; bhooks, 1994). Cognizant that critical pedagogy involves linking critique to social transformation, commitment to such action places individuals and groups at risk of losing jobs, security, and, in some instances, friends.

Giroux’s views on schooling and culture were revealed through a interview (1992); he describes radical education as consisting of three traits: 1) it is interdisciplinary in nature, 2) it questions the fundamental categories of all disciplines, and 3) it has a public mission of making society more democratic. Another trait of radical education is that it joins theory and praxis (Giroux, p. 10).

When asked how he understood empowerment, Giroux stated that it is the “ability to think and act critically” (p.11). He extended his meaning by underscoring the “double reference” implied in the notion--to the individual and to the society. Dewey (1916) believed that the freedom and human capacities of the individual must be developed to their maxim, but, for Giroux, “individual power must be linked to democracy in the sense that social betterment must be the necessary consequence of individual flourishing” (p. 11).

Radical educators, from Giroux’s perspective, must perceive schools as social forms, which should inform the capacities of people to think, to act, to become subjects as well as to be able to understand the limits of their ideological commitments. That, he surmised is a radical paradigm. As Dewey’s expresses in his educational creed, Giroux believes that radical educators’ belief systems require that “the relationship between social forms and social capacities get educated to the point of calling into question the forms themselves” (p. 11). On the other hand, he believes the dominant educational philosophies strive to educate people to adapt to social forms rather than critically interrogate them. As such Giroux embraces democracy as “a celebration of difference, the politics of difference” (p. 11). Resistance occurs because the dominant philosophies fear this kind of interrogation (Giroux, 1992).

Much of the fear that is generated in response to a radical approach to education stems from the fact that such a paradigm would question the foundations of the status quo. Giroux posits that the languages in the field of education that have dominated are for the most part instrumentalized, that is:

> The purpose of schooling either privileged certain groups of elites who become the managers of society or narrowed the scope of education so severely that schools become mere factories to train the work force. Traditionalists lack a language of possibility about how schools can play a major role in shaping public life. (p. 11)

It is because of this lack of language that I moved from Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) and others through Willis (1981) to Freire (1998a) and then to Giroux (1983, 1992, 2001). They, as successors to and elaborators upon the concepts of Marx (1867) Gramsci (1995a) Authusser (1971) and other Marxist, neo-Marist and radical theorist, provided a language to address domination, oppression and the mechanisms of control. Willis (1981) with his 'lads' and MacLeod (1987) with his "Hall Hangers" and "The Brothers" sparked a fire of hope as they demonstrated the inadequacy of deterministic theories of reproduction. Freire carried the torch toward a realm of possibility, and radical theorist such as bhooks, Giroux and MacLaren, influenced by Freire, were propelled into an examination of the everyday existence of students' lives in schools and who, by exploring the cultural dimension of schooling, intersected with several multicultural theorist, among them Carl Grant and Christine Sleeter whose approaches to multicultural education are significant points of analysis for this study.

Freire (1998a) warned against exportation of pedagogical practices and Dewey (1916) talked about democracy as a way of life that has to be made and remade by each generation (p. 12). Giroux agrees and states that in making democracy a way of life in schools one has to interrogate the relationship between pedagogy and power. With this statement he enters the realm of cultural studies, which includes resisting difference, and the return of critical pedagogy. Giroux notes that cultural studies cannot be characterized by a particular ideology or position, a point elaborated made by Geneva Gay (1994) in her synthesis of multicultural education. Giroux makes the following distinction between cultural studies and the Marxist paradigm, unlike the Marxist paradigm:

> cultural studies does offer a terrain through which cultural borders can be refigured, new social relations constructed, and the role of teachers and cultural workers as engaged critics rethought within the parameters of a politics of resistance and possibility. It is within this shifting and radical terrain that schooling as a form of cultural politics can be reconstructed as part of discourse of opposition and hope. (p. 176)

Giroux reconceptualized resistance as moving from hegemony and hopelessness to opposition and hope, takes the lens off the student and places it on the teacher, challenges the teacher paradigm of Willis, and offers a theoretical framework rather than mere description and/or criticism, although that is important. He states that there is much evidence to support the fact that more teachers than not support the former paradigm and questions how to get them to change. Giroux acknowledges that one response is multicultural education, and admits that he has problems with the field; however, he chose to engage the perspective because that is what policy calls for at this time in this place.

Giroux's liberatory theory of border pedagogy puts forth seven dimensions, which resemble Grant and Sleeter's (1994) education that is multicultural cultural and social reconstructionist. The descriptions below are either paraphrased of taken verbatim from Giroux (1992, p. 174-176).

1. "Difference must be seen in relational terms that link a broader politics that deepens the possibility for reconstructing democracy and schools as democratic public spheres. This means organizing schools and pedagogy around a sense of purpose and meaning that makes difference central to a critical notion of citizenship and democratic

life" (p. 174): a) difference as a basis for extending the struggle for equality and justice to the broader spheres of life vs celebration; b) discourse of difference and voice elaborated within, rather than against, a political solidarity; c) refusal to create a hierarchy of struggles; and d) take up notions in which particularity, voice, and difference provide the framework for democracy.

2. Critical educators must provide the conditions for students to engage in cultural remapping as a form of resistance [as opposed to Willis' lads]. That is students should we given the opportunity to engage in systematic analyses of the ways in which the dominant culture creates borders saturated in terror, inequality, and forced exclusion.

3. Similarly**,** students should be allowed to rewrite difference through the process of crossing over into cultural borders that offer narratives, languages, and experiences that provide a resource for rethinking the relationship between the center and the margins of power as well as between ourselves and others (i.e. in school segregation, labeling, tracking, etc), (p. 174).

4. The concept of border pedagogies suggest not only opening diverse cultural histories and space to students, but also understanding how fragile identity is as it moves into borderlands crisscrossed with a variety of languages, experiences, and voices. There are no unified subjects here, only students whose voices and experiences intermingle with the weight of particular histories that will not fit into the master narrative of a monolithic culture. Such borderlands should be seen as sites for both critical analysis and as potential source of experimentation, creativity, and possibility…There is more at risk than giving dominant and subordinated subjects the right to speak or allowing the

narratives of excluded differences to be heard. There is also the issue of making visible those historical, ideological, and institutional mechanisms that have both forced and benefited from such exclusions, (p. 174-175).

5. Border pedagogy needs to highlight the issue of power in a dual sense. First power has to be made central to understanding the effects of difference from the perspective of historically and socially constructed forms of domination. Second, teachers need to understand more clearly how to link power and authority in order to develop a pedagogical basis for reading differences critically. Difference cannot be merely experienced or asserted by students. It must be read critically by teachers who, while not being able to speak as or for those who occupy a different set of lived experiences, can make progressive use of their authority by addressing differences as a historical and social construction in which all knowledges are equally implicated in relations of power. Teacher authority can be used to provide the conditions for students to engage difference not as the proliferation of equal discourses grounded in distinct experiences, but as contingent and relational constructions that produce social forms and identities that must be made problematic and subject to historical and textural analysis. "Teachers and cultural workers must take responsibility…for the knowledge they organize, produce, mediate, and translate into the practice of culture" (p. 175) versus becoming deskilled because of dependence upon textbooks and packaged curriculum.

6. Border pedagogy also points to the importance of offering students the opportunity to engage the multiple references and codes that position them within various structures of meaning and practice. In part, this means educating students to

become media literate in a world of changing representations. It also means teaching students to critically read not only how cultural texts and images are regulated by various discursive codes but also how cultural texts express and represent different ideological interests and how they might be taken up differently by students. More broadly, border pedagogy points to the need to establish conditions of learning that define literacy within rather than outside of the categories of power and authority. This suggests providing students with the opportunities to read texts as social and historical constructions, to engage texts in terms of their presences and absences, and to read texts oppositionally. This means teaching students to resist particular readings while simultaneously learning how to write their own narratives. (p. 176)

7. Border pedagogy points to the need for educators to rethink the syntax of learning and behavior outside the geography of rationality and reason. For example, racist, sexist, and class discriminatory narratives cannot be dealt with in a purely limited, analytical way. As a form of cultural politics, border pedagogy must engage how and why students make particular ideological and affective investments in these narratives. But this should not suggest that educators merely expand their theoretical and pedagogical understanding of how meaning and pleasure interact to produce particular form of investment and student experience; rather, it points to a pedagogical practice that takes seriously how ideologies are lived, experienced, and felt at the level of everyday life as a basis for student experience and knowledge. It means restructuring curriculum so as to redefine the everyday as an important resource for linking schools to the traditions, communities, and histories that provide students with a sense of voice and

relationship to others. To accomplish this goal, Giroux urges educators and researchers to view school and the process of schooling "outside the box" of traditional as well as more orthodox radical perspectives.

> The ways in which students experience is produced, organized, and legitimated in schools has become an increasingly important theoretical consideration for understanding how schools function to produce and authorize particular forms of meaning and to implement teaching practices consistent with ideological principles of the dominant society. Rather than focusing exclusively on how schools reproduce the dominant social order through forms of social and cultural reproduction or on how students contest the dominant logic through various forms of resistance, radical educators have attempted more recently to analyze the terrain of schooling as a struggle over particular ways of life. In this view the process of being schooled cannot be fully conceptualized within the limiting parameters of the reproduction resistance model. Instead, being schooled is analyzed as part of a complex and often contradictory set of ideological and material processes through which the transformation of experience takes place. In short, schooling is understood as part of the production and legitimatization of social forms and subjectivities as they are organized within relations of power and meaning that enable or limit capacities for self and social empowerment. (p. 180)

Giroux criticizes the fact that within critical education theories, the issue of pedagogy has been treated in one of two ways: 1) as a method whose status is defined by its functional relation to particular forms of knowledge, or 2) as a process of ideological deconstruction of text. In the first approach, close attention is given to the knowledge chosen for use in a particular class. Often the ways in which students actually engage such knowledge is taken for granted. It is assumed that if one has access to an ideologically correct comprehension of that which is to be understood, the only serious question to be raised about pedagogy is one of procedural technique; that is, should one use a seminar, lecture, or some other teaching technique. In the second approach, pedagogy is reduced to a concern with analysis of the political interests that structure particular forms of knowledge, ways of knowing, and methods of teaching." (p. 181) For example, specific styles of teaching might be analyzed according to whether or not they embody sexist, racist, and class-specific interests, serve to silence students, or promote practices that deskill and disempower teachers. In both approaches, what is often ignored is the notion of pedagogy as a form of cultural production and exchange that addresses how knowledge is produced, mediated, refused, and represented within relations of power both in and outside of schooling." (p. 181)

In Giroux's view, the issue of critical pedagogy demands an attentiveness to how students actively construct the categories of meaning that prefigure how they produce and respond to classroom knowledge. By ignoring the cultural and social forms that are both authorized by youth and simultaneously serve to empower or disempower them, educators run the risk of complicity in silencing and negating their students.

> This is unwittingly accomplished by educators' refusing to recognize the importance of those sites and social practices outside of schools that actively shape student experience and through which students often define and construct their sense of identity, politics, and culture. The issue at stake is not one of relevance but of empowerment. (pp. 181-182)
>
> It is equally true that people produce themselves. Just as labor is an active agent in the process of production and never a passive commodity, so too, human beings are active in their own reproduction, pursuing their own ends and resisting the designs of others, (p. 278).

In a presentation at the annual convention of the American Education Research Association (AERA) in New Orleans (2002) Asa Hilliard responded to an attendee's comment by stating that there would be no need for multicultural education if educator would teach the truth. Giroux joins Hilliard as he extends hope to teachers in individual classrooms.

> Even within the individual classroom, the dissident teacher can become an effective subversive through teaching the truth; through inspiring a sense of collective power and mutual respect; through demonstrating that alternatives superior to capitalism exist; to fighting racist, sexist, and other ideologies of privilege through criticizing and providing alternatives to a culture that [devalues students]. (Giroux, 1983, p. 274).

Christine Sleeter (1996) links Giroux's arguments to the specific discipline of multicultural education as she recalls the early stages of the field and its current challenges in light of changes that have taken place over the last twenty [to thirty] years:

> Multicultural education developed in the ferment of the 1960s and early 1970s, receiving its major impetus from the rejection of racial minority groups to racial oppression; it subsequently was joined to some extent by feminist groups rejecting sexual oppression. It was grounded in a vision of equality and served as a mobilizing site for struggle within education. However, due to changes over the past twenty years in the social and political context of multicultural education, many educators interpret its meaning quite differently today. Consequently, the field needs to speak to oppression and struggle more explicitly now than it did in its inception. (Sleeter, 1996, p.59)

Sleeter's position supports education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist, one among several perspectives on and alternative approaches to multicultural education. Sonia Nieto (2000) posed the question, how are critical pedagogy and multicultural education linked? Geneva Gay (1995) had answered the question as she described them as "mirror images." The two function together, according to Sleeter, "as a form of resistance to dominant modes of schooling" (p.2).

Multicultural Education

In 1994, Geneva Gay provided a synthesis of research in multicultural education that is used as the framework for this review. Several topical areas have been omitted, reduced or incorporated into other sections (i.e. The Need for Multicultural Education in

Chapter I), while other areas such as structural issues have been added to reflect the focus and context of the present study. The discussion opens with a rationale for the multiple definitions of multicultural education, a phenomenon that has been troublesome for many who are new to the field and proceeds to describe several approaches to the field as a function of philosophical perspectives.

Definition has presented problems for those who endeavor to understand multicultural education (hereafter referred to as ME), for those who would implement some form of ME, and for those who criticize the field. The multiplicity of definitions and the different approaches can be confusing to novice practitioners, and critics often appropriate limited manifestations of ME as representative of the entire field in an effort to discredit it. Gay (1994) provides intelligibility to the quandary.

Gay (1994) explains that ME means different things to different people as a result of different disciplines; vantage points of sociology, psychology, or economics render differing views of the key components of schooling, but there is agreement on substance, for example: common set of assumptions, common concerns, common guidelines for action, and the desire to make pluralism and ethnic diversity integral parts of the educational process (p.1). She recommends, "When planning for ME in school programs, it is important to allow different conceptions of ME to be expressed in the decision making process rather than insist on one definition" (p.1).

Definition of Multicultural Education

Gay (1994) emphasizes the essential point that among the various definitions of ME, there are several points in common, among them are ideas about what ME programs should include. Those common elements are: 1) ethnic identities, 2) cultural pluralism, 3) unequal distribution of resources and opportunities, and 4) other socio-political problems stemming from long histories of oppression. She affirms:

> At best, multicultural education is a philosophy, a method of educational reform, and a set of specific content areas within instructional programs. Multicultural education means learning about, preparing for, and celebrating cultural diversity, or learning to be bicultural. And it requires changes in school programs, policies, and practices. (p. 3)

For purposes of this study three definitions are pertinent. James Banks (2000) definition of multicultural education as an idea, a process and an educational reform movement to change the structure of educational institutions so that all students have an equal chance to achieve academic success, provides a general perspective and situates multicultural education in the terrain of other educational reform movement in the United States. Carl Grant's (1994a) definition points to the ideals of the U. S. as a democratic society as set forth in its founding documents:

> Multicultural education is a philosophical concept and an educational process built upon the philosophical ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and human dignity contained in the U. S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. It recognizes, however, that equality and equity are not the same thing; that is, equal access does not necessarily guarantee fairness. Multicultural education is a process that takes place in schools and other educational institutions, and informs all subject areas and other aspects of the curriculum. It prepares all students to work actively toward structural equality in the organizations and institutions of the United States. Like all good educational strategies, it helps students to develop positive self-concepts and to discover who they are, particularly in terms of their multiple group memberships. Multicultural education does this by providing knowledge about the history, culture, and contributions of the diverse groups that have shaped the history, politics, and culture of the United States.
>
> Multicultural education acknowledges that the strength and richness of the United States are the results of its diversity. (Grant, p. 171)

Sonia Nieto (2000) defines multicultural education in a sociopolitical context. It is significant because of its critical focus on the structural elements of schooling.

> Multicultural education is a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. It challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers reflect. Multicultural education permeates the schools' curriculum and instructional strategies, as well as the interactions among teachers, students, and families, and the very way that school schools conceptualize the nature of teaching and learning. Because it uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (*praxis*) as the basis for social change, multicultural education promotes democratic principles of social justice. (Nieto, 2000, p. 305)

The seven basic characteristics of multicultural education in Nieto's definition are: multicultural education is antiracist, important for all students, pervasive, education for social justice, a process, and critical pedagogy (p. 305).

Approaches to Multicultural Education

Gay (1994) summarizes the most widely accepted models or approaches to multicultural education, and describes them as "developmental, cumulative, and somewhat historical" (p. 15). Christine Bennett, James Banks, Ricardo Garcia, Sonia Nieto, Geneva Gay, Christine Sleeter, Carl Grant, and Margaret Gibson were among the scholars who made these contributions. Two models, Banks (1993) and Sleeter and Grant (1988, 1993), seem to encapsulate features of most of the models in the field while providing some clarity concerning the essence of multicultural education.

The Banks (1992) model as summarized by Gay consists of four approaches: 1. Teaching about contributions of culturally different groups and individuals; 2. An additive approach in which multicultural lessons and units of study are supplements or appendages to existing curricula; 3. A transformation approach in which the basic nature of curriculum and instruction are changed to reflect the perspective and experiences of diverse cultural, ethnic, racial, and social groups; and 4. A decision making and social action approach that teaches students how to clarify their ethnic and cultural values, and to engage in socio political action for greater equality, freedom, and justice for everyone (Gay, p. 15).

Sleeter and Grant's (1988, 1994) model initially consisted of four approaches, but was expanded to include a fifth. The approaches are: 1) teaching culturally different students to fit into mainstream society; 2) a human relations approach that emphasizes diverse peoples living together harmoniously; 3) the single group studies approach, which concentrates on developing awareness, respect, and acceptance of one group at a time; 4) focusing on prejudice reduction, providing equal opportunities and social justice for all, and the effects of inequitable power distribution on ethnic and cultural groups; and 5) education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist and teaches students to become analytical and critical thinkers and social reformers who are committed to redistribution of power and other resources among diverse groups. Gay (1994) extrapolated three general approaches which are elegant and useful for those needing a more concise conception of how to approach multicultural education -- teaching content about cultural pluralism, teaching culturally different students, and using cultural pluralism to teach other academic subjects and intellectual skills.

For purposes of this study; however, Sleeter and Grant's approached are useful in that they cover the spectrum of possibilities for an in-depth understanding of multicultural education as well as available options for implementation that are congruent with the levels of readiness of multiple audiences. Following is a more elaborated explanation of Sleeter and Grant's (1994) model.

Sleeter and Grant (1994) describe five approaches to multicultural education; the use of either approach or a combination of one or more, if one has the choice, is a reflection of the philosophical/ideological orientation of the user. The approaches are: 1) the Teaching the Culturally Different Approach; 2) the Human Relations Approach; 3) the Single Group Approach; 4) the Multicultural Education Approach; 5) and the Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist Approach. These approaches overlap, and educators sometimes use more than one simultaneously.

Proponents of the teaching the culturally different approach seek to raise the academic achievement of students of color through culturally relevant teaching. The authors reviewed seventeen articles and eleven books that advocate this approach which is something mainly done with students of color. The goal is to help them develop competence in the public culture of the dominate group as well as a positive group identity. Literature treats various aspects of culture or language over attention to unequal social relations. There is an emphasis on building bridges to facilitate individual achievement and social mobility. Instruction receives greatest attention – i.e. ways to modify instructional processes to make them more compatible with students' learning and communication style.

Grant and Sleeter identify four major weaknesses to this approach: 1) It shows a commitment to student achievement, but is weak in its development of recommendations for practice, for example, monolithic treatment of Hispanic and/or Asian Americans (p. 424); 2) There is little specific information about how to teach children of color (p. 425); 3) There is little discussion of goals; and 4) The suggestions for curricula are less well developed than suggestions for instruction

Primarily, the approach is too limited, because it puts the burden of eliminating racism on people of color and their teachers rather than on the general population and especially Whites.

Advocates of the human relations approach are concerned with “getting along.” Students are urged to understand the commonalities among all people by understanding social and cultural differences, but it does not take into account differences in institutional and economic power. The authors reviewed nine articles and five books advocating this approach. Much of the literature, according to Sleeter and Grant, was written by educator in response to problems arising from school desegregation efforts which explains its practical orientation toward helping students understand of their culturally different peers.

The weaknesses identified with this approach are. 1) There is a lack of linkage between application, theoretically and conceptually, with social psychology and theory on intergroup conflict; 2) There is no conceptual linkage with crosscultural differences; 3) There is a lack of development of long term goals; and 4) Issues such as poverty, institutional discrimination and powerlessness are mot substantially addressed. [nor is the issue of “White privilege” addressed]

The focus of the single group studies approach is the histories and contemporary issues of oppression of people of color or women or gays and lesbians, or low socioeconomic groups. Two books and nine articles which advocate this approach were reviewed. In the authors' conception, "Single Group Studies consist of lessons and units that focus on the experiences and culture of one group" (p. 428). Sleeter and Grant state that this approach pays least attention to goals and the two authors who discuss goals approach them differently:

> King (1980) writes that multiethnic should 'develop an acceptance, appreciation and empathy for the rich cultural and linguistic diversity in America' (p. 7) while Banks (1983) writes that it should 'help students develop the ability to make reflective decisions so that they can resolve personal problems, and through social action, influence public policy and develop a sense of personal efficacy' (p. 116). (Sleeter and Grant, 1987, p. 428)

Language is a major topic of this approach along with curriculum and instruction and the literature focuses on prescription and application more than goals or theory. Weaknesses of the approach include: 1) Lack of attention to stratification and social action, and 2) A tendency to ignore multiple levels of diversity.

The multicultural education approach promotes the transformation of the educational system to reflect the ideals of democracy in a pluralistic society. Students are taught content using instructional methods that value cultural knowledge and differences (Hanley, 2002). Forty-seven books and nineteen articles were reviewed. Gollnick (1980) summarized the five major goals which most advocates accept: 1) promoting strength and value of cultural diversity…2) human rights and respect for cultural diversity…. 3) alternative life choices for people….4) social justice and equal opportunity for all….and 5) equity distribution of power among members of all ethnic groups, (p. 9) (In Sleeter and Grant, 1987, p. 429). Several authors provide information about cultures of American racial groups (Banks, 1984, Gold, Grant & Rivlin, 1977; others focus on culture as an anthropological concept (Gibson, 1976; Gollnick & Chinn, 1986; still others discuss bilingualism and cultural pluralism as goals for society (Epps, 1974; Stent, Hazard, & Rivlin, 1973). Sleeter and Grant report that social stratification receives less attention than culture. “Most of the literature focuses on race and ethnicity. Gender is included mainly in the form of separate chapters in books, and social class is included primarily in discussion of the social class characteristics of ethnic groups” (p. 431). The focal points of discussions of policy and legal matters are state and national policy regarding ethnicity, language and issues of school reform.

Sleeter and Grant divide what they characterize as “well developed models” into three categories: 1) those that describe development in the teacher or student (Baker, 1978; Baker 1983; Banks, 1981; Cross, Long & Ziajka, 1978; Kendall, 1983); 2) those that offer different approaches to implementation of multicultural education (Banks, 1984, Gay, 1975, Garcia, 1979); and 3) those that provide methods for examining different aspects of instruction (Baptiste, 1979; Clasen, 1979, Grant, 1977a; Payne, 1983, 1984; Sizemore, 1979). Teaching guides, most of which offer lesson plans rather than entire units, are more plentiful than discussions of curriculum and instruction. According to Sleeter and Grant, Multicultural Education is the most popular approach, “although the absence of project descriptions showing it in operation suggests it is not the main approach implemented.

Goals are the point most frequently discussed, and there is so much agreement on these that the material became repetitive," (p. 432). There are, however, unresolved issues of goals and scope such as: 1) the relative emphasis that should be given to culture as opposed to social stratification; 2) the extent to which the topics of social class, gender, and handicap are included and/or discussed; 3) the lack of discussion of policy. For example, should the U. S. government mandate the use of nonracist materials in schools that receive federal funding or demonstrate its support of ME through the explicit funding of research and development in the area or are there areas in existing policies that need to be more rigorously enforced? 4) the lack of carryover from models to teaching guides; 5) the instructional process is virtually overlooked in the literature. The literature that discusses curriculum tends to prescribe what should be included; few examine or develop curriculum theory; 6) the teaching guides provide much help for elementary teachers, but much less for secondary teachers, where the need may be greater; 7) the majority of teaching guides and discussions of implementation are written for the individual classroom teacher; there is little discussion of school or system-wide practices that need change. Sleeter and Grant conclude:

> …the Multicultural Education approach has well-developed statements of goals, several promising models of curriculum and instruction, and many teaching guides. In order to progress, however, the literature should grapple with the relationship of social stratification to culture, as well as consider the integration of race, class, gender factors when examining oppression. Authors should also endeavor to connect the approach more directly with established bodies of inquiry on educational history and social policy, curriculum theory, the hidden curriculum and the sorting function of schools. (Sleeter and Grant 1987, p.434)

The education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach seeks to teach student about oppression and discrimination, and to develop change agents who will participate in a more equitable society (Hanley, 2002). Seven articles and three books “conceptualize multicultural education as an approach to education that prepares young people to take social action against social structural inequity (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, p. 435). Most advocates of this approach extend the goals of the multicultural education approach to help students “gain a better understanding of oppression and inequality and ways in which these problems can be eliminated” (Suzuki, 1984, p. 308). Sleeter and Grant count it as strange that so few advocates of the approach elaborate on social structural inequality, “since it central goal is preparing future citizens to make social structural changes that will uphold equality (p. 435-436). Gender and social class are treated more consistently in this approach.

The authors note that that two policy discussions are “substantive, Hernandez-Chavez (1977) on bilingual policy and Appleton’s (1983) description and evaluation of federal policy on ethnicity and schooling. At the time of their analysis, Sleeter and Grant found no instructional models and little was written about curriculum and instruction. The authors describe this as the least developed approach and state that there is less consensus about what to call it: “some, like Suzuki call it multicultural education …other authors concerned with race, class and gender issues call their approaches emancipatory (Gordon, 1985), transformative education (Giroux, 1985) and critical teaching (Shor, 1980). Sleeter and Grant feel that agreement on a term will help advance the approach and cite lack of material on achieving the goals in schools as a risk of having the approach passed over “as a good, but impractical, or unrealistic idea” (p. 436).

Neo-Marxist and critical theorists insist that the central issue for multiculturalism turns on how institutionalized racism is produced and how it can be dislocated and obliterated (Morris, 2001). If education is to become truly democratic and equitable, interrogating how sociopolitical structures reproduce racism becomes essential (Giroux, 1995; McCarthy, 1993; Morris, 2001; Nieto, 1996; Sleeter, 1993; Solomon, 1995). Critical theorists argue that merely attempting to change beliefs and attitudes of students while ignoring larger sociopolitical issues is not enough. Sonia Nieto asserts:

> To the extent that it [multicultural education] remains education to help students get along, or to "sensitize" them to one another – without tackling the central issues of stratification and inequity – multicultural education becomes another approach that only scratches the surface of educational failure, (Nieto, 2000, p. 9).

Structural Issues in Multicultural Education

Sonia Nieto (2000) identifies nine structural and organizational issues that provide examples of school policy and practices that relate to multicultural education: tracking, testing, the curriculum, pedagogy, physical structure, disciplinary policies, limited role of students, limited role of teachers, and limited role of community involvement. While all of these elements are important, four factors are highlighted because they relate directly to ideological and pedagogical resistance to approaches to multicultural education and diversity as identified by Alberto Rodriquez (1998). Further, tracking and testing are inherent to special education, the function under which Multicultural/Diversity Training (MDT) is situated.

Tracking

Tracking refers to the placement of students into groups that are perceived to be of similar ability (homogeneous groups), within classes (e.g. reading groups in self-contained classes, or by subject areas (e.g., a low-level reading group in seventh grade), or by specific programs of study at the high school level (e.g. academic or vocational) (Nieto, 2000). This practice is directly connected to the present study because tracking is a structural issue that is intertwined with teacher philosophy/ideology, which in return affects teacher expectations and pedagogical practice.

Several assumptions underlie the practice of tracking. Oakes (1985) identified four premises that support the practice. First, there is the notion that students learn better when they are grouped with other students who are considered to be academically similar – "with students who know about the same things, who learn at the same rate, and who are expected to have the same futures" (p. 6). Second, slower students develop more positive attitudes about themselves and school when they are not confronted with much abler students in their daily classroom experience. Third, the placement processes used to separate students into groups both accurately and fairly reflect past achievements and native ability. Fourth, is it easier for teachers to accommodate individual differences in homogeneous groups or that, in general, groups of similar students are easier to teach and manage (Oakes, 1985). One of the positive effects of Oakes' work is that she does not simply put forth descriptive accounts; she goes on to critically examine how such implicit thinking may lead to practices which are contrary to intended ends. Her counter arguments are grounded in empirical evidence and reflective analysis within an historical perspective sensitive to the social and political context of school practice.

Oakes looks to over sixty years of studies on homogeneous grouping and states, "The results differ in certain specifics, but one conclusion clearly emerges: *no group of students has been found to benefit consistently from being in a homogeneous group*" (Oakes, 1985, p. 7). The italics are in the original work. She summarizes the net results of studies of the relationship between tracking and academic outcomes as contrary to widely held assumptions:

> We can be fairly confident that bright students are not held back when they are in mixed classrooms. And we can be quite certain that the deficiencies of slower students are not more easily remedied when they are grouped together. And, given the evidence, we are unable to support the general belief that students learn best when they are grouped together with others like themselves (pp. 7-8)

In critiquing the second assumption, Oakes summarizes investigations of the relationship between tracking and student attitudes and behaviors over a twenty-year period. Again, she shows that the research findings differ from taken for granted assumptions. Research indicates that tracking seems to foster lowered self-esteem and that negative self perceptions are exacerbated by attitudes of teachers and other students toward students in lower tracks.

> Once placed in low classes, students are usually seen by others in the school as dumb…Students in low-track classes have been found to have lower aspirations and more often have their plans for the future frustrated…Moreover, student behaviors have been found to be influenced by track placement. Low track students have been found to participate less in extracurricular activities at school, to exhibit more school and classroom misconduct, and to be involved more often in delinquent behavior outside of school. Lower-track students are more alienated from school and have higher dropout rates. (p. 8)

Educators attempting to detrack their schools and move from homogeneous to heterogeneous instructional groupings, however, confront, not only logistical problems of restructuring but also deeply held beliefs of colleagues, parents, and students about intelligence and privilege that legitimate tracking, especially in racially and socioeconomically mixed schools (Oakes et al., 2001, p. 320). Thus, they are faced with normative and political struggles in which:

> …their critique of current power relations and distribution of opportunity clashes with traditional (and often racist) views of educational opportunity. The different worldviews, or standpoints, of educator who see the need for detracking and those who do not believe in such reform are culturally dissonant and politically conflictual because detracking butts up against fundamental issues of power and control played out in ideological battles over the meaning of intelligence, ability and merit. (p.320)

Standardized Testing

Testing is particularly important to our discussion because Texas leads the nation in the accountability movement that is epitomized in high stakes testing, a highly contentious issue. It, like tracking, is a structural issue which is also inextricably interrelated to a prevailing worldview which exerts a great deal of influence on the curriculum and pedagogical practice. Both testing and tracking are critical factors for student academic achievement, especially CLEED students who are overrepresented in lower tracks and special education and who score lower on standardized tests than their White, middle class counterparts.

Nieto discusses the subversion in purpose of norm referenced tests, which were originally designed to identify mentally retarded children, but were expanded because of the influx of immigrants after the beginning of the twentieth century and used to “rationalize theories of inferiority.” She maintains that tests, particularly intelligence tests, are frequently used to segregate and sort students. She also asserts, “Tracking and testing have often been symbiotically linked” (p. 92). Although the purposes today do not seem as insidious, the ubiquity of testing is astounding. Nieto reports that FairTest, an organization that monitors the use of standardized testing, conservatively estimated that about 100 million tests are administered to 40 million students in schools annually (p. 93). More interesting, the organization found that most states require a total overhaul of their testing system in order to achieve what they purport to do (Nieto, 2000). Although most states profess to use tests to improve curriculum and pedagogy; “the vast majority of states use predominantly multiple choice tests that may not achieve these aims” (p. 93).

Goals 2000, the federal strategy to raise national standards is based on the “dubious”’ assumption that more tests will somehow lead to more learning and higher standards (Nieto, 2000, p. 93; Apple 1993). Nieto calls to our attention the proposal by the National Education Goals Panel to require students to be tested in fourth, eighth and twelfth grades in the five core subjects, and recounts, “The panel focused little attention…on curriculum or instructional practices or in improvements in teacher education” (p. 93).

Nieto has cautioned that although concern for equity is often cited as a rationale for “high stakes” testing (linking test scores to school, teacher and student success) there is evidence, which she summarized, that standardized testing has not appreciably improved learning.

> In fact, tests may have had largely damaging effects. A review of testing legislation in terms of equity and diversity concluded that instead of improving learning outcomes, such legislation is likely to have a detrimental impact on students of color because gross inequities in instructional quality, resources, and other support services are ignored. Moreover standardized scores correlate very highly with family income. Even the president of the College Board, [at that time] Donald Stewart, admitted that SAT scores 'reflect the socioeconomic split between the well-educated of all races and the rest of society. Also because more states are requiring that students pass a standardized test before they graduate from high school, tests may actually result in increasing the urban drop out rate. Nieto, 2000, p. 93).

Testing influences other practices, such as curriculum and pedagogy, which may impede equity. In the area of curriculum, testing may limit teacher creativity because in schools where students have low test scores, teachers may be inclined to "teach to the test" (Alford, 2001; Kincheloe, 2001; Nieto, 2000;) rather than creating authentic curriculum which responds to student needs. The result may be "dummying down" or restricting the curriculum to the content and approach of the test …teacher motivation was [also] reduced (Nieto, 2000, p. 95).

Likewise, pedagogy may be affected. According to Linda Darling-Hammond (1991) when tests are required, there is a decline in student-centered discussions, essay writing, research projects and laboratory work. This, in turn affects teacher autonomy; curriculum that is distanced from the teacher and the school is less likely to reflect the culture of the students in that school (Darling-Hammond, 1991; Nieto, 2000). Nieto concludes that although standardized testing is ostensibly used to inform schools and teachers about the needs of students, they are too often used as sorting mechanisms. She alludes to Dewey (1916) who stated:

> One person's abilities compared to another is none of the teacher's business. It is irrelevant to his work. Alternatively, "What is required is that every individual

> shall have opportunities to employ his own powers in activities that have meaning," (p. 172).

The Curriculum

Nieto asserts that in many instances, the curriculum is alien to the needs of the student, and that the mismatch is reflected in the irrelevance to the lives of students, their families and the communities from which they come. She describes schools as "fortresses separated in more than physical ways from their communities" (p. 95). When this separation exists it becomes impossible for teachers to build on rather than neglect the experiences that students bring to the classroom and subsequently broaden their perspectives.

Defined as "the organized environment for learning what is thought to be important knowledge…Curriculum lets students know whether the knowledge they and their communities value has prestige within the educational establishment" (p. 96). Where only the dominant culture is valued, students who are not members of the dominate culture are often alienated or disengaged. At least four other aspects and/or consequences arise as students of the nondominant cultures encounter a male, middle class Eurocentric curriculum.

First, curriculum is often "watered down" by teachers who believe that such accommodations will better serve the needs of diverse learners—a function of teachers' low expectations for particular students. Second, teachers are often resistant to discuss difficult, contentious, or conflicting issues, even when they are central to the lives of students. Michael Fine (1991) referred to this behavior as "silencing" or "determining who will speak, what can and cannot be spoken, and whose discourse must be controlled" (p. 33). This leads to the next issue, democratic principles may be thwarted by lack of access to knowledge due to tracking, which differentiates curriculum to reflect societal inequity (Oakes, 1990). Finally, "textbooks, a considerable part of the curriculum, may be at odds with democratic and pluralistic values," (Nieto, 2000, p. 99).

Pedagogy

Nieto (2000) takes pedagogy to mean more than the strategies and techniques that teachers use to make learning more active or engaging, but also how teachers perceive the nature of knowledge and what they do to create conditions that motivate students to learn and become critical thinkers (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 2000; Pang, 2001; Larke, Wiseman, & Bradley, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1995; King, 1981). Unfortunately, according to Nieto, "most classrooms…reflect the belief that learning can best take place in a competitive highly charged atmosphere. Techniques that stress individual achievement an extrinsic motivation are most visible. Ability groupings, testing of all kinds and rote learning are the result" (p. 101).

> Teacher pedagogy is also influenced by their lack of knowledge of the diversity of their students and how cultural and language differences affect learning. Many teacher education programs still function within a monocultural framework, and because of this few teachers are prepared for the numerous culture, languages, lifestyles and values they will face in their classrooms. The result is that many teachers attempt to treat all students the same way, reflecting the unchallenged assumption that 'equal means the same.'

Students from subordinated cultures are most negatively affected by such a perspective. Martin Haberman (1991) uses the concept "pedagogy of poverty" to describe a practice in urban schools which limits teaching strategies to asking questions, giving directions, giving assignments, and monitoring seatwork, strategies, which Nieto maintains is based on the “dubious assumption that children of disempowered backgrounds cannot learn in creative, active, and challenging environments” (Nieto, 2000, p. 101). Alternatively, Haberman posits a pedagogy that actively involves students in authentic situations which allows them to reflect on their own experiences, (Haberman, 1991).

Other Structural Issues

The five remaining structural issues identified by Nieto are: physical structure, disciplinary policies, limited role of students, limited role of teachers, and limited family and community involvement. The fact that they are not detailed is not a reflection of perceived importance, but rather, a function of the purposes of this study and the research questions that they generated. Nieto asserts that the physical structure of schools can impede educational equity, especially in schools serving students of color and the poor. Many of these schools bear an uncanny resemblance to factories and prisons (i.e. police on duty, students subjected to frisks, metal detectors). In such schools teachers often exhibit fear of the students in their charge. The overall climate is one of foreboding; there is often a lack of relevant and culturally appropriate materials and displays, and institutional colors prevail. The destructiveness and violence that administrators seek to eliminate, by the use of strict codes of conduct in a paramilitary atmosphere, are often reflections of the students’ perception that “some school structures are incompatible with students’ emotional and physical needs” (Nieto, 2000, p. 102). Further, the physical environment of the school may reflect teacher expectations of student capacity, “If students are perceived to be ‘deficient,” then the environment will reflect a no nonsense, back-to-basics, drill orientation,” (p. 102).

> The physical environment in many schools provides a stark contrast to the stated purpose of teaching and learning. When schools are not cared for, when they become fortresses rather than an integral; part of the community they serve, and when they are holding [laces instead of learning environments, the contradiction between goals and reality is a vivid one. This chasm between ideal and real is not lost on the students. (p. 102-103)

Another issue is disciplinary policies, which Nieto deems critical, especially during the middle and secondary school years. She points out that policies may not be developmentally appropriate and that certain conditions in the school may also exacerbate student drop out rate—such as “policies that are perceived by students to be unfair and ineffective, especially those that are imposed rather than negotiated,” (p. 104). Limitations on the role students play in their education is expressed in alienation, noninvolvement, and discouragement; the most extreme manifestation of disengagement is for students to drop out of school. Nieto characterizes most schools as “benign dictatorships’ and adds that when people in schools are disempowered, “frustration and alienation and are the results,” (p. 105). This type on teacher-student interaction reflects Freire’s (1998a) banking model described earlier in the chapter.

Limitations on the role of teachers are external as well as internal. “As a group teachers are shown little respect by our society and they are usually poorly paid and infrequently rewarded” (Nieto, 2000, p. 106); they are also constrained by the pressure for student success on standardized tests, prescribed curriculum, which is textbook driven, and extra role requirements, all dictated for above. In schools they often fall prey to physical and verbal threats as well as lack of parental support. The result is that they, like students, often feel alienated and discouraged and these feelings have negative consequences for students. Michael Fine (1991) reported that teacher disempowerment correlates highly with reproachful attitudes toward students; in other words, the more powerless teachers are, the more negatively they behave toward students. By way of contrast, teachers who experience more autonomy, and who are efficacious, hold higher expectations for students, (Nieto, 2000). As an alternative to the restrictive environment in which many teachers do their work, she offers this prescription.

> Structural changes to broaden the roles, responsibility, and status of teachers need to be accompanied by changes in (a) the general public's attitude about teachers' professionalism, (b) teachers' beliefs about their own capacity, and (c) the dynamic possibilities for learning that student diversity creates. (Nieto, 2000, p. 107)

Limitations on family and community involvement portend negative consequences for students. Research reports that programs with strong family involvement have higher student achievement than identical programs with less parental support; however, how parent and family involvement is defined differently in different contexts, and defining participation in traditional ways is often problematic (Nieto, 2000). For example, culture and economic differences impact family involvement.

> Unless teachers and schools understand the cultural meanings underlying different families and the goals that parents have for their children, typical involvement strategies may further estrange families who already feel disconnected from school. (Nieto, 2000, p. 108).

Multicultural education means different things to different people. Sleeter and Grant, unlike Gay (1994) who identified common themes in a definition of multicultural education, described the only common meaning as "changes in education that are supposed to benefit people of color." If multicultural education aims at respecting diversity, then it follows that it should be conducted under the premise of respecting the diverse philosophies of the participants, which "would make the workshops more attractive to educators and, consequently, might be more successful" (Baltes, 1998). However, Maria Morris (2001) challenges, "no matter what approach one might take, teaching multiculturalism presents problem, as many students exhibit fierce resistance – especially around issues of racism"(p. 1).

Resistance to Multicultural Education

Psychologists assert that resistance "serves the need of stability…serves as a regulatory, pacing mechanism to keep change form becoming overwhelming" (Keeley, Shemberg, Cowell, & Zinnbauer, 1995, p. 143). Higginbotham (1996) suggests that student resistance to multicultural discourse results, in part, from the way educators approach the issue, and argues that educators' choice of materials may communicate unintended messages about 'who is to blame' for the onset of society's inequalities. Chizhik & Chizhik (2005) relate that as instructors gather readings and create activities to facilitate students' understanding of social justice and in some cases, to encourage transformative action (Banks, 2001; Bell, 1997; Grant & Sleeter, 1987), this call to action, according to Chizhik & Chizhik, stands as an indicator that students can play a role to counteract social inequality; however, they note that students enter the classroom with preconceived notions of social inequity which may interfere with their understanding of what the instructor is actually try to teach. "In short, students preconceived notions about social inequity may contribute to resistance to curriculum presented in the course," (p. 116). This is in line with Leon Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance, which McFalls & Cobb-Roberts (2001) utilized as a resistance reducing strategy in their multicultural education classes. The authors describe typical students as White women from working- or middle-class backgrounds, age 19-21, native to the state where the university is located. They come from racially and ethnically encapsulated areas. “Cultural isolation often leads to stereotypical, racist, and/or prejudicial attitudes…especially when knowledge about others is derived from misleading and stereotyped media representations” (p. 165; Jordan, 1995). Further, these students are fairly “apolitical, individualistic, and non-confrontational, and most often they view situations and people from a personal point of view” (Ahlquist, 1991).

When these types of students are confronted with materials that challenge or threaten their personal and social identities, their reactions may range from “cognitive dissonance to emotional shock” (Noel, 1995). McFalls and Cobb-Roberts (2001) suggest that “the challenge teacher educators face when there is resistance to diversity issues is to create alternative methods for introducing ideas that are threatening to students,” (p. 165). Their prescription is to teach cognitive dissonance; they assert, “because the dissonance between opposing ideas is unpleasant, people are motivated to reduce the dissonance in a way similar to how they would be motivated to reduce a drive such as hunger” (p. 165). The authors provide a concrete example of the reaction of a teacher, who uses a direct instruction approach to teaching science, after reading “an elaborate report disconfirming the effectiveness of this instructional technique,” (p. 165).

> To reduce the psychological discomfort, the teacher may (a) change the new cognition to make them consistent with the preexisting cognition (i.e., deny or devalue the research altogether) (b) add new cognitions to bridge the gap between the opposing cognition (i.e., find additional information that supports

> the idea that using a direct instruction approach is better than no instruction or other instructional forms of instruction), or (c) change his or her behavior (i.e., stop using a direct instruction approach altogether). (p. 165)

McFalls and Cobb-Roberts (2001) hypothesize that because students in multicultural education courses are often exposed to information inconsistent to their prior beliefs and experiences, a point well documented throughout this study, “They are likely to experience dissonance that may be expressed outwardly in the form of resistance,” (p. 165).I have described this article in some detail because the majority of the articles dealing with resistance, as demonstrated below, are presented in similar format. They provide: 1) a definition for the perspective of multicultural education or the alternative conceptual framework used in the study; 2) a justification or problem statement couched in such issues as the demographic divide, cultural incongruity between students and teachers, anti-racist education, education for social justice, et cetera; 3) a description of the why, what or how students resist; and 4) a strategy for resistance reduction. For example, critical teacher educators tend to believe that the importance of understanding students’ preconceived notions can be understood from a social constructive theoretical perspective. Wertsch and Potman (2001) recommend that learning is improved when the teacher and learner share intersubjectivity (i.e. common understanding) of some of the material, which implies that “teachers understand students’ preconceptions about a topic to maintain dialogic conversation and facilitate learning” (Chizhik & Chizhik, 2005, p. 117; Freire, 1998a; Giroux, 1983); if not, social interaction can be disrupted and lead to resistance (Rodriquez, 1998).

The literature on student resistance to social justice education, which engages in a discourse that critiques actions that privileges the dominant group while oppressing others, includes various perspectives and contexts (Chan & Treachy, 1996; Cochran-Smith, 1995; Farber, 1995; Higginbotham, 1996; Ladson-Billings, 1996; Sleeter, 1995). For example, Atwood (1994) and Davis (1992) described student resistance to feminism. Bennett (1999), Ladson-Billings (1996), Cochran-Smith (1995) and Sleeter (1995) examined student resistance to multicultural education. Tatum (1994) discussed her experiences with resisting students in a Psychology of Racism class. Rodriquez (1998) identified two forms of resistance to sociotransformative constructivism, ideological and pedagogical, which are utilized in this study. "Regardless of the approach to social justice, reactions from resisting students follow similar emotional and behavioral responses," (Chizhik & Chizhik, 2005, p. 118). In Tatum (1994) students exhibited feelings of shame, despair and anger. Sleeter (1995) reported her students as expressing feelings of guilt over discussions of race, gender, class and ethnicity. The literature also describes students engaging in active or passive resistance (Chan & Treachy, 1996; Hardiman & Jackson, 1992). Along with active and passive resistance, Higginbotham (1996) included absence as a form of resistance, and it is her conceptualization, along with Rodriquez (1998), Sleeter (1992a, 1995), and Sleeter and Grant (1987, 1994) that is used in the present study. In her study of in service teacher professional development, Sleeter (1992b) examined the perspectives with which they entered the training situation; features of the framework are included because the stories told in Chapter IV demonstrate the impact of perspective on how the teachers responded to multicultural staff development. Sleeter categorized the perspectives as conservatism, liberalism, radical structuralism and multicultural.

Characteristics of conservatism include: 1) Few government restrictions on individuals allowing them to strive for whatever they want; 2) Equal opportunity to compete; 3) Government restricts competition minimally; 4) Private institutions, church and family, instill a sense of personal discipline, courage, motivation into people and curb and control immoral temptations – “the mistakes people make;” 5) Societies, institutions should strive to preserve the best historic traditions, breeding and wealth; 6) Inequality is viewed as natural, resulting from individual deficiencies in natural endowment and effort; 7) Inferiority of racial and low status groups; and 8) Culturalist hold that African American culture (as does the culture of other people of color) inhibits Black people from competing.

Liberalism is characterized as: 1) Sharing conservative view toward competition among individuals for upward mobility; 2) Rejecting the sociobiological explanation for inequality and the idea of a natural aristocracy; 3) Having some sympathy for claims by disadvantaged groups that institutions restrict their opportunities; 4) Reform liberals support state intervention that ensure that people will be treated as individuals regardless of group membership, (i.e. Head start and other compensatory programs) that will one day no longer be necessary; and 5); Ultimately, cultural, attitudinal, and institutional dysfunctions that block the strivings of individuals can be corrected.

Radical structuralism: 1) Rejects the individual as the main unit of analysis and focuses on competition among groups; 2) Views society as involved in continuous struggle among competing groups; 3) Asserts there is no ultimately good society, only continual struggles to overcome specific obstacles to human fulfillment as these become apparent; 4) Inequality across groups is more significant than inequality among individuals, and result from group conflict more than natural endowment or individualistic factors; and 5) Most social organizations, including the state, are structured primarily, by groups with the most power. Therefore, inequality cannot be addressed effectively through solutions that alter changes for individuals. In addition, the state cannot be relied on to serve the interest of oppressed groups.

Multicultural Education rejects conservatism, particularly biological and cultural deprivation explanations of inequality, but is neither clearly, liberal or radical structural as illustrated in the extensive foregoing discussion.

Sleeter (1992a) used these perspectives as the conceptual framework to analyze the perspectives of the teachers following nine days of intensive multicultural professional development. The curriculum materials were presented over a protracted period which allowed sufficient time for reading, reflection, and interactions with the text, other participants, presenters, and program developers. Teachers' explanations of their goals for teaching and multicultural education were situated among four perspectives: conservative, liberal, radical structuralist, and multicultural.

Sleeter reported that of the 26 teachers who discussed the relationship between their goals for teaching and multicultural education, seven saw it as irrelevant, their argument was based on a conservative understanding of society—all Americans have fairly equal opportunity to achieve upward mobility, and those who do not progress are hindered by their own lack of effort or deficient home background. The two remaining teachers who "rejected a sociobiological explanation and were concerned with the struggle of 'out-groups', nevertheless, espoused a conservative view" (p. 29). These nine respondents were European American.

The remaining 17 teachers 'interpreted multicultural education broadly within a liberal understanding of society, (p. 29). Four of eight teachers who were focused on the struggles of out-groups were interested in "nourishing students' self-esteem and interpersonal relations;" the other four "brought some degree of criticism to their understanding of multicultural education" (p. 29.). The teachers of color were aware of institutionalized racism, two special education teachers were aware of how schools institutionalize failure, and the other European American teachers began to connect life experiences with political criticism. Sleeter concluded:

> …for the most part, the teachers' perspective took as given the social context of the individual, and asked how to prepare the individual to live within the context. Most further assumed that, with some variation, society's rules apply to everyone; the rules may not always be fair but they are acceptable, and processes for setting them are fair. (p. 29-30)

Professional Development – A Vehicle for Change

Before delving into the world of professional development, it is essential to at least briefly address two issues. First, the audience for professional development, primarily teachers, is adult learners. Second, when developed in the light of research in "best practices", professional development has the potential of fostering renewal and change. Closely related to these issues as the cultural divide between teachers and their students widens is teacher expectations. It is important because it has been shown to effect student placement and teacher pedagogical style as well as student self-concept and student achievement and is, therefore, a further rationale for effective MDT.

Audience for Professional Development

There is a great deal of literature that characterizes the adult learner (i.e. Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 1998; Mackeracher, 1996; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Knowles (1984) introduced the concept of androgyny, which has had a significant impact on the practice of adult education. He argues that six factors characterize adult learning: 1) As adults mature they become more self directed; 2) Adults bring tremendous amounts of experience that can and should be tapped in the learning situation; 3) Adult readiness to learn is influenced by the development tasks associated with their social role; 4) Adults become more problem centered in their learning as they mature; 5) Motivation for learning in adulthood is more internal than external; and 6) Adults need a practical reason for their leaning. I take the liberty of extending this list to include an observation supported by course lecture notes, "learning can be affected by past negative experiences in education, feelings about authority, and the preoccupation with events outside the classroom. People work differently under different kinds of pressure" (Dr. Norvella Carter, Texas A&M University, Lecture Notes, Summer, 2001).

It is important to consider the audience when initiating staff development, but unfortunately, this most important factor is often ignored. In describing typical staff development initiatives, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) (1995) issued a policy statement which included its assessment of current local professional development initiatives.

> There is a growing body of opinion among "experts" that the conventional forms of professional development are virtually a waste of time. In this view, lectures, workshops and other conventional forms of information delivery and training are too top-down and too isolated from classroom realities to have an impact on teachers' practice.

If this statement is true of typical staff development initiatives in Texas, particularly MDT, the first five characteristics of adult learners will have been violated. The statement is evaluative; therefore, is seems appropriate to examine “best practices” in the field since there is substantial evidence that effective professional/staff development can produce desired outcomes.

Best Practices for Professional Development

There have been numerous articles in the area of professional development in general; however, few studies, until the last decade, dealt specifically with teacher professional development. Since the late 1980s a body of literature has emerged on in-service professional development, teacher learning (Richardson & Placier, 2001) and teacher change (Cohen & Hill, 2000), Sykes (1996), and Elmore and Burney (1999). Much of the literature has focused on math (i.e. Ball, Lubienski, & Mewborn, 2001) and science (i.e. White, 2001), and technology (i.e. Means & Olson, 1994). The Eisenhower Program sparked renewed interest and funding for evaluation of teacher professional development efforts. The goal of the program was to support professional development experiences for teachers that “enhance classroom teaching and, ultimately improve student learning,” (Desimone, Porter, et al., 2002, p. 108).

Although Eisenhower Program funds mainly support professional development in math and science, other content areas are included. The funds are authorized under

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1994; 2000) and are disbursed through State Education Agencies (SEAs) to school districts and through state agencies for higher education and nonprofit organizations (SAHE grantees), (Desimone, et al, 2002). Because we are looking at perceptions of multicultural/diversity trainers who are engaged in professional development efforts in the state of Texas, this body of literature is germane.

Effective Staff Development

> Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) examined five models of staff development for teachers and reported successful practices emerging from 1970s and 1980s staff development activities: 1) Programs were conducted in schools settings and linked to school-wide efforts; 2) Teachers participated as helpers to each other and as planners with administrators of inservice activities; 3) Emphasis was on self instruction, with differentiated training opportunities; 4) Teachers were in active roles, choosing goals and activities for themselves; 5) Emphasis was on demonstration, supervised trials and feedback; training was concrete and ongoing over time; and 6) Ongoing assistance and support was available upon request. (p.40)

Upon further review of research on staff development and a consensus of “expert opinion” that school improvement is a systematic process, the researchers extended the list to include the following elements: 1) Schools should have norms that support collegiality and experimentation; 2) District and building administrators should work with staff to clarify goals and expectations, and actively commit to and support trainers’ efforts to change their practice; 3) Efforts should be strongly focused on changes in curriculum, instructional, and classroom management practices with improved student learning as a goal; and 4) There should be follow-up assistance that continues long enough for new behaviors to be incorporated into ongoing practice. (p. 54).

The Consortium on Policy Research in Education (1995) codified the suggestions of a number of experts and organizations on the most promising professional development programs or policies. The analysis and policy recommendations, like the one above synthesize existing literature, and though five years apart, they converge on characteristics of effective professional development. Five years later, the CPRE evaluated teacher response to a four-year partnership between the Merck Institute of Science Education (MISE) and four school districts in New Jersey and Philadelphia.

Teacher Responses to Professional Development

Jonathan Supovitz and Susan Goerlich Zief (2000), citing National Staff Development Council statistics from 1998, couch their findings in the fact that when professional development is voluntary, it is often difficult to get more than 50% of teachers to participate. Their study was conducted in the third of the four-year partnership between the Merck Institute for Science Education (MISE) and the four school districts mentioned above—an ongoing, on-site, administration supported professional development collaboration. The authors put forth the proposition that understanding the motivations and interests of the other half—those who choose not to participate—will help providers better serve teacher needs. Recognizing that teachers are often given a choice even within required offerings, the authors sought to also understand invisible barriers to teacher participation.

> Often, only a small cadre of teachers, the ‘usual suspects, continue participating after an initial burst of teacher interest. Those who continue to return are frequently the subject of research, but little is known about the silent group that chooses not to participate. We initiated our study convinced that labels such as “stay-at-homes’ and ‘saboteurs’ [and resisters] (Schlecty, 1993; Johnston, 1997) fail to portray the motivation of non-volunteers. (p. 1)

The authors believed that “answering the questions of who these teachers are and how to reach them may affect how deeply a reform is rooted, how long it is sustained, and what is its eventual impact” (p. 1). Four “invisible barriers” were identified: structure, content, school factors, and district factors.

Structural barriers revolved around issues of time, intensity and duration, purpose, and the “culture of teaching,” and teacher preferences proved to be at odds with research on effective professional development in the area of structure as well as the area of content. Teachers were unwilling to commit time beyond the regular work day, including professional release days, to staff development, and although research on effective professional development suggests that experiences that are both intensive and sustained are more likely to change teachers’ practices (Hawley & Valli, 1999; Smylie, Bilcer, Greenberg & Harris, 1998), and the Partnership offerings were both, teachers overwhelmingly preferred one-day workshops.

> The clash between traditional and contemporary concepts of professional development went deeper still. When asked to describe the most impressive professional development opportunities they had experienced, teachers described workshops where they received materials or ideas and which were led by an interesting instructor. (p.2)

Another aspect of the workshops which deterred participation was the nature of the culture of teaching which Supovitz and Zief describe as insulated, “one’s struggles and shortcomings are often kept behind the closed classroom door” (Lortie, 1975).

Regarding content, a second barrier, research indicates teachers are attracted to professional development that helps their student (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Guskey. 1986). Teachers in the Supovitz and Zief study were not uniformed in this interest.

> Half the teachers we interviewed were motivated by their personal interest rather than their professional needs…several wanted to wanted to know how to use a Windows operating system for their own record keeping and word processing, but not for instructional purposes, (p.2).

Additionally, "Those who attended professional development in order to help students learn where looking for a quick fix to a specific problem rather than in-depth learning," (p. 2). Whether participation was personal or professional, the teachers preferred a more superficial treatment of the subject matter at hand.

The remaining two "invisible barriers" identified in the study are school culture, which plays and important role in teachers' professional development choices (Corcoran & Goertz, 1995; Fullan, 1991) and district factors because teachers often perceive district reforms as fragmented and uncoordinated, which likely impedes participation in professional development in any one content area.

Regarding school factors or environment, the schools in the study exhibited a wide range of commitment to new ways of teaching and learning, but schools where leadership (administrators and teachers) demonstrated high levels of commitment to the reform process had higher participation rates. "On the other hand, a critical mass of teachers or administrators may resist a change in the pendulum swing," (p. 3). The authors also note that "older teachers especially recognize the cyclical nature of reform. **Why** jump on the bang wagon if there is the potential for it to roll out of town with the next reform cycle?" [Emphasis in the original] (p. 3)

A final factor was accountability. Supovitz and Zief report, “The teachers interviewed mentioned attending state- or district-sponsored workshops about state assessment because they feel they need to understand all that their students will be expected to know and do” (p. 3). In effect, they found time to attend workshops on assessment. One of the interesting aspects of this research is that it utilized data from CPRE, whose concepts of professional development the teachers in the survey contradict. Often, descriptive studies and prescriptions recommendations abound in the absence of evaluation. The final research study is vital because it is an impact study.

The research of Desimone, Porter, et al (2002) is an example of the professional development research funded by the U. S. Department of Education. According to these authors, “professional development is considered an essential mechanism for deepening teachers’ content knowledge and developing their teacher practices,” (p. 81). They report on a 3-year longitudinal study on the effects of professional development on the development of teacher instruction. The researchers used a purposefully selected sample of about 207 teachers in 30 schools, in districts in five states. The report opens with the question, “What are the characteristics of professional development that affect teacher practice?” (p. 108).

The authors drew on research and best practices (Cohen, 1990; Louchs-Harsley et al, 1998; Garet, et al 1999, and Garet, et al, 2001), and hypothesized six features of professional development as effective in improving teaching practice. Three of the features are structural, which refers to the characteristics of the structure of the professional development activity. The remaining three features are conceptualized as core features, which refer to the characteristics of the substance of the activity. The core features worked through the structural features, (Desimone, Porter et al, 2002).

Structural features included the form or organization of the activity, duration and collective participation. The form or organization of the activity conceptualized as:

> Whether the activity is organized as a reform type, such as a study group, teacher network, mentoring relationship, committee or task force, internship, individual research project, or teacher research center, in contrast to a traditional workshop, course or conference (p. 83).

Duration refers to the total contact hours spent in the activity and the span of time over which the activity takes place while collective participation focuses on the degree to which the activity includes teachers from the same school, department of grade level, as opposed to individual teachers from many schools.

Core features were active learning, coherence, and content focus. Active learning is defined as the opportunities to become actively engaged in the meaning analysis of teaching and learning. Coherence refers to the degree to which the experience is consistent with teachers' goals, aligned with state standards and assessments, and encourages continuing professional communication among teachers. Content focus is the degree to which the activity is focused on improving and deepening teachers' content knowledge in mathematics and science (Desimone, Porter, et al, 2002).

After reviewing the articles cited above on "best practices" or characteristics of effective staff/professional development and reports from the Eisenhower Project and the Consortium for Policy Research and Evaluation (CPRE), findings became convergent and, therefore, redundant so that the foregoing seems to represents a consensus in the field about what makes for effective teacher staff/professional development.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

> Educational treatments are situated and dynamically interactive…They are locally constructed social ways of life involving continual monitoring and mutual adjustment among persons, not replicable entities like chemical compounds or surgical procedures or hybrid seed corn or airplane wings.
>
> —Federick Erikson and Kris Gutierrez

Introduction

The purpose of this study was threefold. One purpose was to understand the experiences of Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers with teacher resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training (MDT). Another object was to comprehend structural barriers that inhibit effective delivery of MDT. A final purpose was to gain insight into how trainers make sense of their task in light of their social locations and the incongruence surrounding the training process. To accomplish these tasks, the guiding research question was, "What factors affect resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training in the State of Texas?" More focused questions were drawn from this central concern.

Specifically, the questions were:

1. How is resistance to multicultural/diversity training manifested by educators who participated in the training sessions and by those who the trainers encounter in the school setting?
2. What were the structural and personal barriers that impeded or prevented the trainers from effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training?

The chapter is divided into eleven sections. First, I provide a rationale for the decision to a qualitative research method. Second, I describe the specific qualitative method used in the study. Then, I discuss how my pilot study (2001) influenced the present study regarding its design and introduce the general design of the study. A description of the population from which I drew the sample and a description of the expert panel used to select the sample follows. Under the section headed Sample, I discuss purposive sampling and introduce the participants. The final sections of the chapter explain the data collection and analysis process, address the issue of trustworthiness, and ends with a chapter summary.

Design of the Study

Until the early 1970s quantitative research dominated the field of education research (Bogan & Biklen, 1998). Grounded in the positivist paradigm, the research focused on measurement, operational definitions, variables, hypothesis testing, and statistics for the purposes of prediction and control. The interpretive paradigm represented a reaction against and critique of the positivist paradigm. In *Naturalistic Inquiry* (1985), Lincoln and Guba assert:

> Positivism severely constrains the possible uses of science to prediction and control. Indeed it is often called the “pragmatic criterion” of success in science that it should lead increasingly to prediction and control. Such delimitation forces out of contention other legitimate purposes, as, for example, verstehen or understanding, description, problem responses, status determination, and so on. It focuses on what might be called kennenschaft to the virtual exclusion of wissenchaft (Lincoln & Guba, p. 26).

This chapter’s opening quote, Erikson and Gutierrez (2002), was written in response to an article in *Educational Researcher* by Feuer, Towne and Shavelson

"Scientific Research in Education" (2002) and the larger National Research Council (NRC) report on which it is based. Feuer, Towne and Shavelson's effort was an attempt to interpret the report of the NRC for members of the American Education Research Association. Erikson and Gutierrez as well as Pellegrino and Goldman, Berliner, and Adams-St. Pierre, in the same issue of the journal, critiqued the article and the Council's report as purporting to embrace an inclusive philosophy concerning various methodologies employed by educational researchers while actually endorsing a "limited orthodox view of science" (Berliner, 2002). Berliner contends:

> If we accept that we have unique complexities to deal with, then the orthodox view of science being put forth by the government is a limited and faulty one. Our science forces us to deal with the particular problems, where local knowledge is needed. Therefore, ethnographic research is crucial, as are case studies, survey research, time series, design experiments, action research, and other means to collect reliable evidence for engaging in unfettered argument about educational issues (p. 20).

Concurring with researchers such as those cited above, who present an argument for heterogeneity in educational scholarship, I cite the debate because in the present climate of high stakes testing and accountability, as the government increasingly defines then calls for "solid scientific evidence," it seems important that we acknowledge teachers and students in classrooms as "conscious, sentient, and purposeful human beings, so no scientific explanation of human behavior could ever be complete" (Berliner, p. 20). Because there is such a wide range of methodological tools to choose from, I allowed the purpose of the research, and the research questions to guide my methodological choices which were also influenced by my personal philosophical, epistemological, political, and social locations, all of which are interrelated.

Embracing the critical and interpretive paradigms and viewing the data through multicultural lens, I chose for the most part to make use of qualitative research methods because this form of research is designed to help us understand the meaning of social phenomena with minimal disruption of the natural setting (Merriam, 1998; Lincoln, 1985; Bogdan and Bilken, 1998).

Merriam (1998) identified five types of qualitative research that are commonly found in education -- the basic or generic qualitative study, ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory, and case study. The purpose of most qualitative studies in education is “to discover and understand a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved. She affirms that while the various types can be distinguished from each other, they all share the essential characteristics of qualitative research – the goal of eliciting understanding and meaning, the researcher as primary instrument of data collection and analysis, the use of fieldwork, an inductive orientation to analysis, and findings that are richly descriptive,” (p. 11). In this study, I used the case study form.

A case study is a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject… a single depository of documents, or one particular event (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989; Starke, 1994). In education, they are often “framed with the concepts, models, and theories from anthropology, history, sociology, psychology, and educational psychology” (Merriam, p. 19). “Unlike experimental, survey, or historical research, case study does not claim any particular methods for data collection or data analysis… Any and all methods of gathering data, from testing to interviewing, can be used in a case study," (Merriam, p. 28). This multi-site, multi-subject study is a more complex version of the case study (Scott, 1965), and I have selected two methods of data collection and analysis.

I used descriptive statistics to design a profile of education service center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers. The body of my study made use the Constant Comparative Method or part to whole analysis, which is described below. I also made use of the unsolicited stories that the trainers shared in the interview context as they facilitated my ability to situate the trainers and their approaches to multicultural education and, hopefully, to aide the reader in understanding the degrees of difference in trainer responses to research questions in view of their unique perspectives.

The Constant Comparative Method

Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967) addressed the question of "how the discovery of theory from data – systematically obtained and analyzed in social research – can be furthered" (p. 1). They developed the constant comparative method of data analysis as a means of developing what they called grounded theory. "Grounded theory consists of categories, properties, and hypotheses which are the conceptual links between and among the categories and properties," (Merriam, 1998, p. 159). While Glaser and Strauss focused the elaboration of the method to their disciplinary interest, researchers in various disciplines utilize the method. Sharon Merriam (1998) explains:

> Because the basic strategy of the constant comparative method is compatible with the inductive, concept-building orientation of all qualitative research, many researchers who are not seeking to build substantive theory have adopted the constant comparative method of data analysis (p. 159).

Merriam (1998) identifies five important benefits of the constant comparative method that render its use as ideal for the purposes of this study. First, it is a means of examining complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. Second, it results in rich holistic accounts of a phenomenon. Third, it offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand the readers' experiences. Fourth, insights can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research. Finally, the method can be useful to education innovation, evaluating programs, and implementing policy (Merriam, 1998).

While Glaser and Strauss' perspectives are those of sociologists involved in the enterprise of generating theory in their field, what they developed is a general theory of comparative analysis that is transferable across disciplines and perspectives and which has multiple uses. While the Constant Comparison Method is an extremely flexible and utilitarian tool for the conduct of qualitative research, it, as are all methodologies, is more suited to particular purposes and questions than others, and it has certain limitations.

As I conducted my pilot study, *Perceptions of Educational Service Center (ESC) Multicultural/Diversity Trainers to Teacher Resistance to Multicultural Education* (2001-02), a major methodological limitation became painfully clear. I was fortunate to interview very knowledgeable and articulate individuals so that the collected data was rich beyond my expectations. I used the constant comparative method to approach my research questions. Although the method proved useful as it provided a way to collect and synthesize multi-subject, multi-site data into a form that allowed formal analysis, I had a nagging uneasiness as I wrote up my findings. Something seemed to be missing.

Approximately six months after the first experience, I reentered the data. The uneasiness returned; however, this time I could explain the feeling. By breaking the sequential data into bits and pieces, I had lost valuable information (Merriam, 1998). For example, one of my participants was very talkative, very articulate, and very informed. She provided the most in-depth information about each category that finally emerged from the data. She also provided information that the other participants did not mention, but, in hindsight, proved most important to the research. I would have lost this valuable data; so I decided to use selected narratives to situate the multicultural/diversity trainers.

Use of Participant Narratives

As in the constant comparative method, in narrative studies there are usually no a priori hypotheses. The specific directions of the study usually emerge from reading the collected material and hypotheses may then be generated from it (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiarch & Zilber (1998) (hereafter cited as LTMZ) describe the narrative approach as one advocating "pluralism, relativism, and subjectivity." In this study, I did not conduct narrative analysis; however, in Chapter IV, I did use the stories that the trainers told because they provided "unique and rich data that cannot be obtained from experiments, questionnaires, observations, or other qualitative methods," including the constant comparative method (LTMZ, p. 9). The narrative materials were used to discuss motives; attitudes, and beliefs of the narrator, how she situates herself in regard to her role and a M/DT, and her approach to multicultural education (LTMZ p. 9)

Narratives give prominence to human agency and imagination and is well suited to studies of subjectivity and identity," (Riessman, 1993, p. 5). Although I am not a trained sociologist, this point was of major interest because participants, during the pilot study, offered unsolicited personal stories to situate themselves and to make their arguments, and in their stories, structural and cultural elements were highlighted, which affected my decision to pursued in this study and to include structural barriers as a major component of the research. In fact, structural issues eventually overshadowed individual teacher resistance; a happening that would not have occurred using more traditional research methodology.

I did not treat the narratives of the respondents as "records of facts, or how things actually were, but as a meaning-making system—making sense out of the chaotic mass of perceptions and experiences of life. In the pilot study the M/DTs all advocated for multicultural education; yet, most were able to accommodate themselves, more and more over time to structures, concepts and practices, which were antithetical to the principles of multicultural education.

The experience of conducting my pilot study, coursework, independent reading, and data collection and analysis for this study affirmed that different approaches yield different kinds of information. The constant comparative method was compatible with the purposes of the study, and the participants' narratives complimented the method by providing additional contextual material and helping to make sense of the categories and themes that emerged from the data, and which are also a product of the perspectives that the participants brought to the interview process.

The Pilot Study

Before returning to graduate school as a nontraditional student, I had embraced multicultural education as a concept involving, among other things, inclusion in the classroom -- inclusion of ethnic, language and religious minority students, students with different sexual orientations, and students with disabilities. For me, it was about creating a classroom environment that was welcoming to all students – a classroom where diversity is celebrated. To that end, I added Special Education to my certification in English, Reading and Speech Communication. My intent was to become better prepared to serve the various needs of students in my highly diverse English classroom. When I applied for an English position in my district, I was told by the principal, at the school where I preferred working, that there was a shortage of reading teachers; I was asked and agreed to teach reading instead of English. This new assignment provided a new experience for me which allowed me to vicariously experience life as a "low performer".

My low achieving students (mostly ethnic and language minority) and I were, subsequently, physically separated (tracked) within the school community, a pattern not uncommon in the current structure of schooling. I was expected to provide a very prescriptive curriculum designed to raise the TAAS scores of these children – a curriculum that was boring, irrelevant, condescending, and alienating.

My return to graduate school and the qualitative pilot study that I subsequently conducted, grew, in large part, out of the my concern for what I perceived as alienation among many marginalized groups of students toward standard curriculum in the schools and a perceived lack of interest, on the part of teachers, for making the curriculum in their classrooms more responsive and relevant to the diverse students in the teaching-learning environment**.**

The purpose of the pilot study (2001) was to investigate teacher resistance to multicultural education as part of a long range effort to examine the effects of that resistance for marginalized students and to develop ways of overcoming such resistance. Thirteen questions guided the semi structured interviews conducted for the study (see Appendix A).

Two major findings emerged from the study: 1) multicultural/diversity trainers understand that their efforts in multicultural education confront complex structural forces (in society and in schools) that support the dominant culture, and 2) while recognizing institutional racism (in the form of hegemony), most trainers use an approach to training which focuses on the individual rather than on structural and societal factors. The exception is one trainer who developed her own program (a trainer of trainer model) that allows her more access to the campus environment in which teachers do their work.

These findings**,** which emerged from the patterns and themes identified by using the constant comparative method to analyze participant interviews, generated questions that affected the design of the present study. First, structural issues or barriers were not a focus of the study; however, in unsolicited responses and stories, they continued to impose upon the discourse, so that they could not be ignored. Therefore, the scope of the study was broadened to include an examination of structural issues as obstacles to MDT. Likewise, the geographical area was broadened to make it more representative of small and medium size districts traditionally served by ESCs as well as to elicit responses more representative of the pool of ESC trainers (the respondents in the pilot study were skewed toward larger cities).

Third, the methodology was expanded to include the use of participant narratives to supplement the constant comparative method in an effort to retain and include material that would be lost if stories were cut into bits and pieces to form discrete categories. It seems appropriate to mention here that many of the passages included throughout the text, whether narrative or explanatory, are long, and in almost as many cases verbatim. I defend my decision to use the respondent's words as much as possible, because of who they are: 1) two of the participants hold doctorate degrees, the remaining six hold masters degrees; 2) all are veteran trainers, familiar with the workings of the Texas Education Agency and its ESCs; and 3) they are all professional trainers whose jobs depend on their ability to make themselves understood. My job becomes one of synthesizing and contextualizing as much as interpretation, since the respondents facilitated my task with their own articulation. At the same time, they, unwittingly, justified my rationale for developing criteria for participant inclusion in the in-depth interview portion of the study.

Fourth, during the pilot study, I found that the quality of responses to interview questions increased with level of experience and involvement with the Multicultural/Diversity Network, and that individuals with whom I spoke, such as center directors and other trainers, consistently asked if I had spoken to the same individuals, who they considered "experts." The selection criteria were based on such feedback.

General Design of the Study

In this study the data collection and data analysis were conducted in two parts. Part A describes the purpose and process for developing a profile of the typical M/D trainer using survey data and descriptive statistics. The survey was administered to the entire population from which the sample was drawn. Telephone follow-up and archival data was also utilized to provide a profile of ESC Multicultural/Diversity Trainers in the State of Texas. Return rate on the survey was 89.47 percent. In Part B discusses the expert panel used to identify potential participants, the sampling process, the participants who were intimately chosen and agreed to participate in in-depth interviews, and the context of the interview process. Part C describes the data collection and data analysis processes, the whole to part analysis to address emergent themes regarding structural barrier and teacher resistance to MDT. A discussion of the use of narrative accounts of participants to gain a more in-depth understanding of the experiences, motivations, stances, and obstacles faced by participants in their "lived experiences' as multicultural/diversity trainers (Josselson, 1995) follows. Part D describes efforts at establishing the trustworthiness of the findings of the research study. Each of the first three parts combine the use of archival data, interview data, and observational data to identify prominent patterns as well as exceptions to them (Malen, Croninger, Muncey & Redmond-Jones, 2001 p. 113) as themes and interpretations emerge.

The Population

The first portion of the study involved the development of a "Profile of Education Service Center (ESC) Multicultural/Diversity Trainers". The purpose of the profile was to provide a picture of what the “average” multicultural/diversity trainer in Texas looks like in term of education, training, experience, gender, race/ethnicity, and multicultural competency. To accomplish this task, I used archival data and conducted an informal survey of all ESC Multicultural/Diversity Trainers in the State of Texas. Initially, the population consisted of twenty (20) individuals. One of the participants, who was also nominated and agreed to participate in the interview portion of the study, died in February 2003. I contacted her supervisor and learned that that were no plans to fill her position prior to the expected date of completion of this study; therefore the population for the survey consisted of nineteen (19) eligible participants.

I designed an 18-item questionnaire (see Appendix B) that consisted of both closed- and open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions were used to obtain demographic data such as sex, age, years of service and so on. Open-ended questions addressed descriptive, judgment, and opinion related issues, which served, along with expert nominations, 1) to identify participants who met the criteria for participation in the interview portion of the study, 2) to attain an initial “feel” for the attitudes and dispositions of the trainers, and 3) to gain knowledge of the amount and quality of training these trainers received in the areas of multicultural education and/or diversity. I obtained the most current Multicultural Network Representative Listing from Region I and mailed it to each member of the population. Ninety-five (95) percent of the population responded to the survey, and I used the data to develop the “Profile of Education Service Center (ESC) Multicultural/Diversity Trainers” using descriptive statistics.

The Panel, the Sampling, the Participants, and the Interview Context

The Panel

I used the above mentioned list of Multicultural/Diversity Network Representatives to assemble an expert panel in nominating participants for participation in the in-depth interview portion of the study. The list was mailed to each panelist. The expert panel consisted of five individuals who had been identified in a pilot study (2001) and through conversations with ESC directors, peers, and former workshop participants as having expertise in the area of Multicultural/Diversity training. Although, other individuals were mentioned as potential members of the panel, every individual with whom I spoke insisted that these five individuals must be considered.

Each of the women far exceeded the criteria set for inclusion in the interview portion of the study. Each had been a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer since decentralization in 1996 and had served in that capacity for at least six years. Two of the panelists are no longer in the position – one is retired and the other has moved to a new position within the regional office. Two other of the panelist came to their present positions after having worked at the State level prior to decentralization. One of the panelists (who agreed to be identified for this purpose) is the Region I trainer who was, and remains intimately involved with each of the Multicultural/Diversity Network Representatives (MNR). She was instrumental in implementing and nurturing the network since her region was designated lead agency for the multicultural/diversity function in 1996. There were two Ph.D.'s among the panelists and the other three held Masters degrees.

Along with the listing of MNR's, the panelists received a letter (see Appendix C) which included very simple instructions: Based on professional and personal interaction with multicultural/diversity trainers, identify those individuals on the list who meet the criteria for inclusion in the study; the inclusion criteria for the in-depth interview were: 1) length of time as a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer (3-5 years); 2) knowledge of the history and development of State-directed multicultural efforts since decentralization and the ability to clearly articulate the issues; and 3) high level of commitment to Multicultural/Diversity Training.

The Sample

The sampling was purposive, which is appropriate to an emergent design intended to achieve maximum variation of critical cases. I followed guidelines put forth in Merriam's (1998) discussion of the characteristics of purposive sampling.

From the time of my pilot study (2001-02), I was able to achieve maximum variation by selecting each unit of the sample only after the previous unit had been taped and analyzed. Each successive unit was then chosen to extend information already obtained, to obtained other information that contrast with it, or to fill in gaps in the information obtained so far," (Merriam, p. 201). As I gained insight and information accumulated, I began to develop a working hypothesis about the situation, and the sample was refined to focus more particularly on those units that seemed most relevant--continuous adjustment or "focusing" of the sample" (Merriam, 1998, p. 202). Unlike traditional sampling, where the sample size is typically designated beforehand, this sample was based on informational considerations. I developed criteria based on those needs, and decided to stop sampling when those meeting the criteria were selected (Merriam, 1998, p. 202).

The Participants

The panel recommended nine individuals as meeting the criteria for inclusion in the study. All panel members initially nominated seven of the individuals. The two panelists who did not nominate the eighth and/or ninth individual later acknowledged that it had been an oversight. Finally, the panel agreed that the nine individuals were all committed trainers who could articulate the issues well. I contacted, first by phone, the nine potential participants. Each of the individuals agreed to participate in the study. Unfortunately, one of the nominees died in February 2002. The remaining eight individuals each signed and returned their consent forms when they participated in the survey portion of the study.

The final sample was 100% female -- three (3) or 37.5 % White, three (3) or 37.5 % African American, and two (2) or 25 % Hispanic. These proportions do not reflect those of the population of ESC trainers, but neither do the percentages of minority trainers in Special Education (the function under which Multicultural/Diversity Training falls), reflect the total population of ESC trainers. In both instances, students of color are over represented. This may reflect the boarder (teacher, school, and societal) view of special education and multicultural/diversity issues are “their” problem. Regardless, these are the individuals who met the preset criteria for inclusion in the in-depth interviews, and those criteria are consistent with literature in areas including organizational communication, development, and change and professional development. A brief profile of the participants follows.

Angelica is a 46-year-old African American female (self-identified as African American). She has been and ESC trainer for ten (10) years, has had a multicultural/diversity focus for five (5) years, and has conducted ten (10) multicultural/diversity workshops. Angelica is a team player and an optimist who believes that people want to do the right thing. She has been trained in several programs, including: REACH, Culture of Poverty (COP), Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA); been influenced by outside consultants, including: Dr. Gwen-Webb-Johnson, University of Texas, Austin; Brenda Gilliam; and Dr. Charlotte Risinger, ESC Region XI; uses multiple resources, including the Billy Hawkins video tape; and is current on issues involving interventions and language. Her areas of specialization are social studies and special education. She does not advocate nor center her workshops on a particular training program, but says she uses "a hodgepodge of methods to suit the context and audience" for her presentation.

Brenda is a 48-year-old African American female (self identified as Black). She is philosophically committed to multicultural concepts; but she is also realistically aware of the socio-political context in which she operates. She, like Crystal, came to her present position after working with Texas Education Agency (TEA) at the state level in Austin, TX. She has been an ESC trainer for 7 years, focused of issues of multicultural education and diversity for 12 years, and has conducted over 15 multicultural/diversity workshops. Brenda is a certified trainer in The Culture of Poverty and has some training in the Culture of Tolerance and REACH programs. She uses COP in most of her training; however, she uses the program after establishing need, which is based on State (TEA) data. Her areas of specialization include parental involvement, special education process, paraeducator training, and charter schools. Brenda is less optimistic than Angelica and believes that people are more likely to respond to mandate than from altruism. In her training, she is in the process of moving from a workshop to a staff development model.

Crystal is a 44-year-old Caucasian female (self identified as White). Crystal is the “optimist’s optimist”. She describes herself as a “random-abstract’ personality type. It is hard to be “down” when you are around her. She is a team player. As a matter of fact, she conducts most of her workshop with a partner. During my observation, I watched the interplay between the opposite personalities of Crystal and her associate with delight. Before coming to the regional education service center after decentralization, Crystal worked for the Texas Education Agency (TEA) at the State level in Austin, TX. She has been an ESC trainer for five (5) years, focused on issue of multicultural education and diversity for 8 years, and has conducted 25-30 multicultural/diversity workshops. Certified as a trainer for REACH and the Culture of Poverty (COP), she uses COP in most of her training efforts. Trained in elementary and special education, she also has a minor in psychology, which account for much of her work in the areas of behavior, crises prevention and District Evaluation Committee (DEC) monitoring. The strength of her leadership comes from her personal charisma, the fact that she is a team player and her ability to network with significant individuals in the broader community. She is an activist in the local education community.

Adrianne is a 52-year-old African American female (self-identified as African-American). Each of the other participants acknowledges her as an inspirational leader among them. She served as an ESC trainer focused on multicultural and diversity issues for ten years and has conducted over 30 multicultural diversity workshops. She is a certified REACH trainer and advocate who has had formal coursework at the university level as well as the training provided by the regional office; this expertise allowed her to develop supplemental material to enhance her workshops. Because of her interest in the overrepresentation of African-American males in special education, she requested permission to examine more closely state data in the area. Her work anticipated a trend that is being utilized more vigorously throughout the State of Texas – using data as the launch point for intervention. Adrianne’s leadership is based on a combination of expertise, personality, and realistic assessment of the context in which she operates. She is flexible in her approach and creative enough to operate effectively as a trainer despite structural impediments.

Juanita is a 47-year-old Hispanic (self identified as Hispanic and Latina). This is a trainer of trainers. Her peers agree that when the going gets rough, call Sharon. She has been an ESC trainer for seventeen (17) years, has focused on issues of multicultural education, bilingual education and diversity for eight (8) years, and has conducted 16-20 multicultural/diversity workshops. Sharon is a soft- spoken, polished, expert facilitator. With a Masters degree in special education, she was initially hired “to provide direct services to families of children with disabilities.” During the course of her service she says, “I became aware of a mismatch between what service providers viewed as important and what families viewed as important. We ignored the impact of cultural perceptions and I did not want to be an ineffective service provider.” This attitude and commitment led her to accept a leadership role in the area of multicultural education and diversity. Sharon is a certified REACH and Culture of Poverty trainer and has also been trained in the State’s pre-referral model, which is designed to prevent inappropriate referrals to special education. Her preferred program for multicultural diversity workshops is REACH. As a bilingual individual, she provides technical assistance to special education (K-12) and preschool (PK3-K) in the area of speech—diagnosis and referral.

Connie is a 60-year-old Caucasian female (self identified as White). She can probably best be described as a critical multiculturalist. She has been an ESC trainer for ten (10) years, focused on issues of multicultural/diversity training for eight years, and has conducted over 30 multicultural workshops. An acknowledged “expert” leader by her peers, Connie designed her own training program. She relies on data and a foundation for effectiveness. She is an innovator and a compelling storyteller. She is knowledgeable, emotional, and deeply committed to the principles of multicultural education. According to some, she “ruffles feathers”. Her area of specialization is education administration, which may account for her ability to understand and effectively articulate structural issues in the area of multicultural/diversity training.

Carolyn is a 52-year-old Caucasian (self identified as Anglo). She has been an ESC trainer for 7 years, focused on multicultural and diversity issues of for five (5) years, and has conducted 5 multicultural diversity workshops. Although she is not a certified trainer, she participated in the REACH and the Culture of Poverty trainer of trainer programs in 1998. Initially, Faith has used concepts from both of these programs in her workshops. At the time of her interview, she was not using either; instead, outside consultants were being used for multicultural/diversity training (This was an agency rather than a personal decision.) A unique aspect of her training activity is that she chose to focus the training on paraprofessionals. Her rationale is, "these are the people closest to the students we need to reach, and maybe we can generate a 'trickle up' effect". Faith is one who I would describe as a knowledge seeker and a facilitator. She has a high level of commitment and is always seeking ways to improve herself and the workshops. One strategy has been to move from a workshop to a staff development model.

Socks is a 44-year-old Hispanic (self-identified as Mexican American). She has been an ESC trainer for almost six (6) years, focused on issues of multicultural education and diversity for four (4) years and has conducted 8 multicultural/diversity workshops. Socks is a very energetic person. Her Bachelors degree is in elementary education and sociology; the Masters is in special education. She is a special education diagnostician and is mid-management certified. Socks has had formal course work in multicultural education and training in REACH, Culture of Poverty, Teaching Standards with Maria Montano-Harmon, English as a Second Dialect (a program developed at California State

University), and Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in American Schools, a program developed by Dr. Howard Smith, University of Texas at Austin. She prefers the REACH program for use in her workshops. Before coming to the ESC, Socks was both a regular and bilingual education teacher in the public school system and has taught kindergarten through 6th grades. Her areas of specialization include bilingual ESL, parental involvement, TEKS English/Spanish, and TAKS assessment of English language learners. She has worked through the State with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Her major current responsibility is in the area of alternative teacher certification, a program that requires candidates to be trained (usually a half day) in issues related to multiculturalism and diversity. Socks is responsible for that training.

The Interview Context

The sample and interview context are the same for Part B and Part C of the study. Data collection and data analysis are discussed separately. All of the participants were interviewed initially and formally in their workplaces, ESC offices. Two of the individuals, who participated in the pilot study, had second follow-up interviews which occurred in their homes. Two other of the participants had both the initial and follow-up interviews in their office. The remaining two participants, not included in the pilot study, were interviewed once in their office and agreed to and participated in intensive follow-up telephone interviews. All face-to-face formal interviews were tape-recorded. In addition, I spent a total of a working day (8 hours) with one participant, two days (16 hours) with another, and three to four days (30- 40 hours) with two participants. The amount of time spent with the remaining three participants ranged from three to five (3-

5) hours. Where circumstances permitted I engaged in a total of seven days (56 hours) of observation at three sites.

The education service centers are multipurpose self contained buildings situated on well kept and well lit grounds and located, whenever possible, in areas central for district stakeholders.

Building sizes range from one story to multi-level multi-building facilities. The physical structures reflect the numbers of stakeholders the facility is expected to serve. Common features of the facilities include: a reception area; a general work area; several meeting rooms accommodating 25-30 participants, most of which can be converted to accommodate more or less participants; an auditorium or large room, which can accommodate general sessions of groups of 70 or more; audio/video equipment storage; refreshment centers; and adequate rest rooms and parking spaces for visitors. Most trainers operate out of cubicles containing desk and chair(s), computer, and bookcases while others have private offices. This seems to be more a function of space availability or limitation and seniority (first in, best space), except were the trainer also happen to be at the administrative level (Senior or Lead Trainer).

Data Collection and Analysis

The inductive character of case study designs, required that data analysis involve examining sources to: a) identify prominent patterns as well as exceptions to them, b) lay out the chain of evidence that supported, contradicted or qualified emergent themes and interpretations (Yin, 1994), and c) develop narrative accounts of the participant’s expectations of and experiences with the conduct of the study. Glaser and Strauss (1967) describe the constant comparative method in four stages: 1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, 2) integrating categories and their properties, 3) delimiting the theory, and 4) writing the theory.

The process of data collection and analysis was simultaneous; while coding an incident for a category, I compared it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category. I found, as Glaser and Strauss reported, that as categories and their properties emerged, I found the "language of the research situation" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 107). As I immersed myself in the process, I found it helpful to use what the authors called their second rule.

I stopped coding and recorded a memo on my ideas. "This rule was designed to tap the initial freshness of the analyst's theoretical notions and to relieve the conflict in his thoughts" and it did (p. 107). I continued this process until "the constant comparative units changed from comparison of incidents with incident to comparison of incident with properties of the category that resulted from initial comparisons of the incidents" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 108). This, as Glaser and Strauss predicted, forced me "make some related theoretical sense of each comparison" (p. 109).

Finally, I began to delimit or reduce the categories as I found underlying uniformities in the original set of categories or their properties, and began to "formulate the theory with a smaller set of higher level concepts" (p. 110). This process was replicated with each successive transcript and/or relevant observational data.

Following this process, I possessed coded data, a series of memos, and a theory. When I became convinced that the "analytical framework formed a substantive theory, that is a reasonably accurately statement of the matters studied, and it is couched in a form that others going into the same field could use – I began writing (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, p. 99).

In more specific procedural terms, I tape recorded and transcribed the interviews of each of the eight participants verbatim. Following each interview, I read my field notes and listened to the tape recorded interview at least three times while transcribing the interview. By the time the transcription was completed, I was familiar with the style, tone, syntactical idiosyncrasies, dialect, and plot of each respondent. Upon completion of the transcription, I began to code the transcripts.

Two peer reviewers received copies of the transcriptions via U. S. mail, coded each independently, and returned them to me—one reviewer returned the transcript by U. S. mail, the other returned the transcript by e-mail. We used individual as well as conference calls and e-mail to discuss differing interpretations, which were few. In fact, the level of agreement was very high, and can, perhaps, be explained as a function of the clarity of participant responses and our comparable training in qualitative research methods. In a second round, I designated a color for each trainer: Juanita, sky blue; Connie, purple; Adrianne, yellow; and so on. Two coded transcripts were copied onto the paper of appropriate color. One copy was cut and sorted by categories into labeled folders representing structural barriers and teacher resistance to MDT. The first rendering yielded 49 categories, which were eventually sorted and resorted into 12 categories. These 12 categories were subsequently subsumed under the seven themes presented as findings in Chapter V.

The second copy was handled in similar fashion, except that narratives and explanatory passages were selected from the text and used to situate the trainers in their approach to MDT and to understand their goals, roles and expectations for the training. What seemed unique to me was that the trainers never gave simplistic answers. The nature of their work accustomed them to elaboration so that their responses were longer than would be expected in a typical interview response, and it became difficult decide what to include where. Consequently, narrative passages are included as frequently when using the constant comparative method—probably more appropriately conceived as the part to whole or content approach—as with the holistic-content approach (LTMZ, 1998) of Chapter IV. As indicated in Chapter IV, the narratives provided insight into the trainers' philosophical, social, racial and gender locations as it relates to multicultural/diversity issues, their approaches to training, their perceptions of structural barriers and teacher resistance to multicultural/diversity training, and the tensions that arise as a result of incongruencies among the training they conduct, the stated purpose(s) of the training, and their ideological and pedagogical stances.

I was granted permission to conduct observations by all of the trainers; however, only three participants conducted training during the period when I was collecting data. On each occasion, I was prepared to sit in on the session(s), make notes, debrief with the trainer after the training and take my leave. Unexpectedly, I was invited, by each trainer, to attend the training session(s) as a participant observer. Needless to say, I was delighted. In so doing, I was able to experience the workshop along with the other participants. My only hesitation was that I might miss some of the interaction and nonverbal cues given by the participants, however, that did not present a problem for two reasons: 1) the activities requiring interaction were isolated incidents, and, 2) following the activity, I was able to reposition myself for maximum reconnaissance. I used a global scan technique, which places a great deal of burden on the observer; the trainer-centered nature of the sessions, however, allowed maximal retrieval of response information through appropriate positioning.

My first observation took place as Brenda conducted a two-day workshop. I was prepared to take copious notes, but found that I could follow the presentation easily by following the texts that were presented to each participant. Additional material consisted of raw data easily accessible by way of the TEA website, so the only field notes of the training taken concerned observation of participant reaction and interaction and the debriefing with the trainer.

The second observation was of a one-day workshop with Angelica which was designed as an organizational and awareness workshop. Again, the trainers provided the information that was easy to follow. The format of the workshop was that of a presentation by an expert panel, so that the focus of the observation was the paralinguistic, and linguistic responses of participants followed by the debriefing.

The third set of observations occurred with Crystal. After one day of a proposed three-day session, a snow storm interrupted our session. A month later, I resumed my observation with the same participants in our second day of the workshop. I did not receive notification of the final day of the training, and therefore, did not attend. Crystal and Brenda used the same base material for their workshops, and procedurally, the observation process followed the same process.

The methods overlapped, and, in my opinion were compatible and complimentary. However, the credibility of narrative analysis depends heavily upon the readers.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) frame the issue of trustworthiness in the form of two questions: "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audience (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of? What arguments can be mounted, what criteria invoked, what questions asked, that would be persuasive on this issue?" (p. 290). Their response is that trustworthiness is comprised of truth value, applicability, consistency and neutrality.

Truth value speaks to the credibility of the study which involves two dimensions: 1) to conduct the study in such a manner that credibility is enhanced, and 2) to have "the constructors or the multiple" approve the findings (p. 296). Applicability refers to the idea that findings may be replicated in other contexts. Lincoln and Guba suggest that the burden of proof lies with those seeking to replicate the study more than the study's originator; it is the originators task to provide "sufficient descriptive data to allow the applier to make a decision concerning transferability based on such factors which influence similarities in context. Consistency refers to whether the findings are consistent with the data collected. Neutrality addresses the issues of researcher bias and objectivity. Since I reject the idea of "objectivity", I accept the qualitative definition, which removes the "emphasis from the investigator" and places it on the characteristics of the data" and adopt their concepts and criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p, 300).

Credibility of Findings

I used several methods to increase the credibility of findings. The major activities were triangulation, member checks and peer debriefing. I also attempted, to a lesser extent (a function of time and money), to engage in prolonged engagement and persistent observation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Referential adequacy, an activity that makes possible checking preliminary findings and interpretations against archived "raw data" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was used extensively during the pilot study, and whenever appropriate where archived raw data was accessible, during this study.

Triangulation is an activity to increase the probability that credible findings will be produced (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mathison, 19--; **+).** I made use of several data sources including, archival data, interview data, and observation.

I reviewed development plans required by the state, minutes of meeting of the Multicultural/Diversity Network, training curriculum and content material (where copyright provisions allowed), and information available on State Board of Education (SBEC) and Texas Education Agency (TEA) websites. The documents were used to gain an initial understanding of the context, clarify policy and legislative issues, and trace how Multicultural/Diversity Training was being implemented in the State of Texas. Interviews were also used to crosscheck information. For examine, I compared the interview of four respondents (two had worked at the state level before coming to their present positions and one had served as state contact during the establishment of the Multicultural/Diversity Network). The other two trainers had the most longevity as trainers and had both been working members and guiding forces during the incubation period of the network. I found no inconsistency or contradictions among their recollections of the formation, purposes and goals, growth and development, and current status of the Multicultural/Diversity Training initiative. In fact, when they were unsure of any aspect of my questioning, each referred me to one of the other participants for clarification and/or verification

As articulated by Lincoln and Guba (1985), peer debriefing provided an external check on the inquiry process. Throughout the process of data collection and analysis two of my peers took the role of "devil's advocate very seriously. They read all of my interview transcripts, provided feedback and asked questions concerning category construction, and looked critically at my interpretations. I hoped for and we did achieve consensus in both category construction and interpretation. In the two incidents where differences occurred, I relied upon my own judgments and will trust the report to affirm or reject my interpretation.

Member checking is an activity providing for the direct test of findings and interpretations with the human source from which they come – the constructors of the multiple realities being studied (Lincoln & Guba; 1985**).** Throughout the process of data collection and analysis, participants were asked to clarify, correct, and verify my interpretation of their responses; each individual was also offered a copy of their individual transcript for review and commentary; all refused the responsibility of reading and responding to the entire transcript, although each responded to particular portions, and as reported above, responded to questions, points for clarification and verification of facts and quotes, and translation of undecipherable tape-recorded material.

Transferability

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), “Transferability inferences cannot be made by an investigator who knows only the sending context,” (p, 297). Through thick description, I have endeavored to provide sufficient information to allow the “applier” (whoever proposes to use the results) to make the decision for transferability. He or she must determine, in view of factors such as time and context, whether transferability might be achieved.

Dependability

Concepts undergirding dependability in conventional research models are stability, consistency, and predictability; hence, repetitions must be applied to the same units (Ford, 1975; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The “real” world of human beings is neither static nor consistent nor predictable nor independent of factors outside of the human subject. If, however, the study were repeated with similar participants in similar contexts, the findings should be similar. Raw data, including interview protocols, interview audio tape recordings, transcripts of interviews, field notes, and journal entries were investigated and are available for external checks (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Confirmability

Again, as a qualitative concept, the emphasis is removed from the investigator and placed, according to Lincoln and Guba, where it should be, “on the data themselves”

(p. 300). However, I used three methods in order to establish confirmability: a retrospective audit trail, admittedly a methodological weakness, triangulation (discussed in more detail under credibility), and a reflexive journal which is available for inspection.

Summary

In examining structural barriers and teacher resistance to MDT, this qualitative study seeks to unravel a web of complex issues, involves multiple perspectives of individuals at different levels of an equally complex institution, an open system, which influences and is influenced by multiple actors. Simple explanations are inadequate. The research questions are ones that demand sense making of the time bound particularities of interactions in an educational system where the illogical often becomes the logical, accepted, and perpetuated practice. There is substantial evidence that educators sometime ignore the research in their own and other field as it relates to teaching and learning. They also ignore the impact of the demographics and the demographic divide: the increasingly diverse student population, the majority female, European, monolingual/monocultural teacher pool, the academic underachievement of students of color, and the impact of culture on this phenomenon. Qualitative methods offer a valuable tool for critical understanding of the dynamics at work.

Adrianne, Juanita and Socks' stories meet Linde's (1993) criteria for life story: they make an evaluative point about the speaker as opposed to a point about how the world is, and the stories and associated discourses have extended reportability, that is, they are reliable and are retold over the course of a long period of time (p.21).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The finding reported in this chapter result from three methods of analysis: a survey of Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity trainers, using descriptive statistics, narrative and graphic representations as a tool for analysis; the Constant Comparative Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967); and narrative analysis. The survey, descriptive statistics, and graphic representations were used to develop a profile of Texas Regional Education Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers. The purpose was to provide an overall picture of who these individuals are and how the sample for the in-depth interviews compared with the population from which it was drawn. Narrative analysis, unlike the constant comparative method, does not break down temporally sequenced material into bits and pieces since the events are meaningful because of their location within the text (Riessman, 1993). The Constant Comparative Method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) was used to capture recurring themes indicated across data (Merriam, 1998). The two methods are compatible because narrative analysis captures information that could be lost if the constant comparison method were the only methodology used to analyze the data (Riessman, 1993).

In Chapter I, the Texas Education Agency, the Regional Education Service Centers, and their functions were discussed in some detail. This section begins with a description of the results of the survey that was used, in part, to construct a profile of

Texas Regional Educational Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers. These discussions provide contextual information to illustrate working conditions, and job expectations for multicultural/diversity trainers. It is followed by a discussion of the formation of the statewide multicultural diversity network and its training program and curriculum. A third section offers a composite of the typical multicultural diversity trainer. Further analysis describes and summarizes the perceptions of the eight individuals who participated in the in-depth interviews. The purpose of this analysis is to gain a picture of who these trainers are; the results also substantiate that the sample is representative of the population from which it was drawn.

Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Network Trainer Profile

Trainer Demographics

Among the education service center multicultural/diversity trainers, there are eighteen (18) females and one (1) male, 94.7 and 5.3 % respectively. One respondent refused to disclose her age; however, I was able to talk with the individual personally and do not believe that her score would skew the results. I have therefore calculated the mean on the seventeen remaining numbers. The average trainer is forty-eight (48) years of age. According to race/ethnicity, three respondents (16.66 %) self-identified as African American. Of the three Hispanic respondents, two (2) self-identified as Latina and one (1) self identified as Mexican American, representing (16.66 per cent), There are twelve White respondents who self-identified as Anglo (3), Caucasian (3), and White (6), representing (66.66%). Trainers have various designations: Consultant with specialization (i.e. Education, Title I Migrant or Assessment), Senior Consultant, Education Specialist, Senior Education Specialist, Lead Education Specialist and Project Manager (with specialization). Title differentiation has no bearing on their functions as multicultural/diversity trainer. These responses are graphically represented in tables one through four (see Tables 1.1-1.4, pp. 131-134). The remaining questions one through eighteen (1-18) are numbered and responses are presented individually or in clusters.

Background, Training and Experience of the Multicultural/Diversity Trainers

The average multicultural/diversity trainer has been with the ESC for 6.2 years; the mode is 10 years and the median is 5.5 years. She has been a multicultural trainer for 4.3 years; the mode is 8 years and the median is 3.4 years. The number of workshops conducted by each trainer varies greatly because of two factors: lack of participants willing to attend the workshop and number of years the trainer has been conducting workshops. For example, two of the trainers have been in their positions less than a year while at least seven have conducted training for over five years; the mode is significant in that six individuals or 33.33% have never conducted a workshop; the mean is 3 and the mean is 8. Of the six who reported not having conducted workshops: one said she touched upon multicultural/diversity issues, two said multicultural issues were embedded in their specialty presentations, one anticipated conducting workshops at some point, and two reported that multicultural/diversity workshops were contracted to outside consultants. All of the trainers reported that Multicultural/Diversity workshops occur infrequently; the mode is two times per year.

Each Multicultural/Diversity trainer has a Masters degree in some area of Special Education – three are PhDs. Trainer areas of the specializations include special education diagnostician, speech therapy, bilingual education and exceptionalities); however, few have had formal training in the field of multicultural education. As a result, the trainers are not familiar with the theory, research, or best practices in the field. Region 1 (the designated lead region for multicultural/diversity training) has offered training in specific programs that were authorized by the State. Among the programs are Respecting Ethnic and Cultural Heritage (REACH), *A Framework for Working Adults and Children in Poverty* (COP) and Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA). Ninety per cent of the trainers earned their advanced degrees at colleges and universities in Texas. Eight trainers (44.44%) received training through Region I only, three (16.66%) had multicultural education courses at the college or university level, and seven (38.88 %) reported having a combination of the regional and college level training. Age and area of specialization were mediating factors in level of trainer exposure to multicultural education at the college level. A matrix of the background, training, and experience of the multicultural/diversity trainers follows in Table 4.

Table 4.1 Profile of Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers

Sex	**Age**	**Race/Ethnicity**	**Years w/ ESC**	**Years M/D Trainer**	**Number of Workshops Yearly**
M F 1 18	Mean: 48.8 Mode: 52 Median: 47.5	White: 12 African Am: 3 Hispanic: 3	Mean: 6.2 Mode: 10 Median: 5.5	Mean: 4.3 Mode: 8 Median: 3.4	Variable (1-2)

Table 4.1 Continued

Education	**Specialization**	**Number of M/D Courses**	**Regional Training**	**Training Program**	**M/D Training**
Masters: 15 PhD: 3	Special Education: 18	Mean: 1 Mode: 1 Median: 1.5	Mean: 5 Mode: 10 Median: 4	REACH COP TESA EEC	Region only: 6 Region/Univ: 9 Region/Teacher Cert.: 2 Univ. only: 1

Items nine through eleven consider, albeit at a surface level, amount and type of training, trainer voice in curriculum decisions, and time and commitment to MDT.

Multicultural/Diversity Training

Item nine asked, “What type of curriculum do you use in your workshops? Please be specific (i.e. REACH, The Culture of Poverty, Self-developed).” The trainers used the programs in which they were trained, so I have framed the responses in term of the training received.

As indicated earlier, the most common source of training was provided through Region I followed by offerings of the respective regional offices. Few trainers sought additional training on their own. Five trainers reported developing their own training program; one was directed at multicultural/diversity issues while the other dealt with area specific concentration and were variations on other programs (i.e. struggling readers, evaluation of multicultural/diverse learners).

The number of trainers by specific training programs is reported: Culture of Poverty (COP), eleven; REACH, five; Educating Everybody’s Children, two; ESL Academy, one; Bilingual Education (Struggling Readers Institute), one; Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA), one; Outside Consultants, four; and Self-developed, five. Archival data reveals that more trainers than indicated on the self-report had been trained in TESA but had not perceived the training as being multicultural/diversity training.

Self-developed programs really referred to pulling information from different sources, and were used primarily in the trainers' area of expertise such as bilingual education or the elements of the special education referral process. Only one trainer actually designed a full-blown program. Because several of the trainers were trained in more than one program, no arithmetic calculations were made on this item; however, a summary follows. First, over one-third of the trainers received Culture of Poverty training. Second, twenty-five percent of respondents received training in more than one regional program. Third, all of those trained in REACH also received training in other programs offered by the regions. Fourth, of the trainers who received COP training, four had no other training. Finally, TESA training is underrepresented in the self-report because trainers did not perceive it as Multicultural/Diversity Training because it is more generalized (See table 4.2 below for tabular summary).

Table 4.2 Multicultural/Diversity Trainer Educational Preparation

REACH	**COP**	**TESA**	**Education Everybody's Children**	**Bilingual Ed Struggling Readers Institute**	**Outside Consultants**	**Self-Developed**
5	11	1	2	2	4	5

Responses to the question, "Why did you choose the curriculum that you use?' generated responses that ranged from "They were using it when I came" to an extended critique of the programs in use and a rational of why one trainer was led to develop her own program. Table 4.3 looks at three categories: local preferences, in use (availability), and thoughtful evaluation.

Table 4.3 Training Program Use by Multicultural/Diversity Trainers

Local Preference	**In Use (Availability**	**Thoughtful Consideration**
3	4	10

Item eleven was a very straightforward question, “How did you arrive at your present position?” It was asked in order to find out whether the trainers actually sought out their positions as multicultural/diversity trainers or not. Categories are: asked or assigned (indicating that their role as a trainer may have resulted from an external and arbitrary decision, volunteered (which might be an indication of prior commitment to multicultural/diversity issues), and specialization (which could indicate a limited focus as it relates to multicultural/diversity issues. (See Table 4.4)

Table 4.4 Becoming a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer

Assigned	**Volunteered**	**Specialization**
6	8	3

Item 12 simply asked whether trainers would be willing, if asked, to participate in the in-depth interview portion of the study. Sixteen trainers answered in the affirmative; one declined citing “limited time and experience in the position.” Two educational service centers did not participate in the survey.

Commitment to Multicultural/Diversity Training

Items thirteen through fifteen address the issue of commitment to multicultural/diversity training in terms of resource allocation, specifically, focus, time, and trainer perception of role(s). Item thirteen asked, “Does your training focus on issues other than multicultural education or diversity? If the answer is yes, please specify area of specialization.” Question fourteen asked what percentage of time was spent of preparing and conducting multicultural/diversity training. All of the trainers viewed multicultural/diversity training as an addition to their major function, question fifteen, at the education service center. Fifteen trainers answered this question and indicated that on average they spent approximately 19.93 rounded to 20% of their time in preparation or conducting multicultural/diversity workshops; the bimodal percentages were 10 and 25 percents (three responses each) and the median was 15 percent. These figures were inconsistent considering the few number of workshops that were held unless trainers interpreted the question to means what percentage of time was spent when they were specifically preparing for a workshop rather than percentage of total time. Table 4.5 indicates responses to the three questions.

Table 4.5 Area of Specialization, Major Function at ESC, Percentage of Time on Multicultural/Diversity Training.

Area of Specialization	**Major Function at ESC**	**Multicultural/Diversity (% Of Time)**
Special Education	Literacy	No Response
Special Education	DEC Preparation, Multicultural	15%
Special Education	Special Education – Diagnostician, Business Admin, Elementary Education, School Improvement	Less than 10%
Special Education	Transition, Child Find, Resource Library, DEC Preparation, Assessment, Evaluation & Compliance	10%
Special Education	Special Education	5%
Special Education	Special Education, Assessment, Evaluation & Compliance	As Needed
Special Education	Bilingual Education, Assessment, Compliance, Evaluation	30%
Special Education	Math, Science, Reading (Literacy)	25%
Special Education	Elementary Ed, Language, Poverty	50%
Special Education	Crisis Intervention, Behavior, Assessment, Compliance & Evaluation	30%

Table 4.5 Continued

Area of Specialization	Major Function at ESC	Multicultural/Diversity (% Of Time)
Special Education	Bilingual Assessment Psychology, Speech Therapy	1%
Special Education	No Response	33%
Special Education	Special Education – Gifted and Talented	10%
Special Education	Evaluation Title I, Migrant Assessment, Compliance & Evaluation	Less than 5%
Special Education	No Response	25%
Special Education	Secondary Business Parental Involvement Teacher Certification	25%
Special Education	Special Education – Process Para Educators, Charter Schools	20%

Question Sixteen asked, “What changes would you make in the present multicultural/diversity training program?” The responses are represented in four categories with summary.

Question Seventeen was, “If you could affect change, why would you do so?” This question sought to understand the philosophical underpinnings of the trainers work in the area of multicultural/diversity issues and is closely aligned to both the preceding and succeeding questions. Tables 4.6 - 4.8, beginning on the following page, reflect the connection among the three questions addressing the what, the why and the how regarding change to multicultural/diversity training as it was structured at the time.

Table 4.6 Desired Changes to Multicultural/Diversity Training Program

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	What
1			X	X	Better Diversity, Respect for Low SES
2			X		No Narrative Response
3			X		More Emphasis on Diversity
4	X				No Narrative Response
5	X				No Narrative Response

Table 4.6 Continued

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	What
6		X			More info to Local Education Agency (LEA)
7		X			More Diversity, Less COP
8		X			More Inclusive – Not Just Hispanic, Black and Asian
9				X	Add Components one at a Time
10				X	Make Mandatory
11	X			X	No Real ME Training
12		X		X	Start at Preservice Level
13	X	X		X	Embed ME in all Curriculum
14				X	Make markedly GT, ESL, etc
15				X	Align Training to Evaluation
16			X		Some Training Leads to Stereotyping
17	NR	NR	NR	NR	No Narrative Response

Table 4.7 Why Make Changes to the Multicultural/Diversity Training Program

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	Why
1			X	X	Can't change anyone; Can facilitate change in attitude
2			X		Quality reading and instruction to all students
3			X		Teachers consider pedagogy in light of culture
4	X				Low SES % scores will not improve if schools don't address the issue
5	X				Changing demographics – must meet needs of all students
6		X			All children deserve good education; district personnel overloaded – policies, procedures, TEKS, assessment (see ME one more thing to do)
7		X			Trainer presentation skills
8		X			Help kids succeed
9				X	Empower students to relate better to parents and family dynamics
10				X	As change agent

Table 4.7 Continued

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	Why
11	X			X	People can do because they are unhappy with things as they are in interactions
12		X		X	Awareness as yourself and them as cultural beings
13	X	X		X	Essential to future of nation, would diverse need of people are met
14				X	Problem among educators; if Hispanics don't get training they are sometimes the biggest offender
15				X	Awareness at Regional and center level Same definition of ME Real Emphasis is on Special Education placement "We do not need to talk about diversity – teachers need strategies to avoid misdiagnosis and how to reach students. There is too much theory at the regional training"
16			X		Awareness of dangers of stereotyping
17	NR	NR	NR	NR	Make cultural sensitivity and learning styles training a requirement for all higher education schools

Table 4.8 How to Affect Change to the Multicultural/Diversity Training Program

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	How (Trainer Role)
1			X	X	Students should be validated for what their culture can contribute
2			X		Network Representative because of limited services
3			X		Educate White females
4	X				Connect Whites with culture
5	X				Strategies to interest people in coming
6		X			Involve administrators
7		X			Help people develop cultural reciprocity; respect for individual difference, create positive environment so children can learn
8		X			Increase participation; make trainers more sensitive to audience; train entire districts
9				X	Increase regular teachers involvement
10				X	Create a sense of commitment in all stakeholders
11	X			X	Empowerment of teachers, voice
12		X		X	Embed ME in all training
13	X	X		X	Implement REACH
14				X	Stress the importance of culture

Table 4.8 Continued

NO.	More Training	Change in Focus	Collaboration with Regular Teachers	Structural Changes	How (Trainer Role)
15				X	Child-centered classroom; Reflection of the role of the teacher; Use of data as foundation for instruction
16			X		Impact of teacher bias; understand other cultures
17	NR	NR	NR	NR	Treat people and students as individuals not as a group

The high rate of return on the survey instrument made it possible to provide a composite of the typical multicultural/diversity trainer in the state of Texas, which is presented below. The portrait can also be used to assess the degree to which the trainers who participated in in-depth interviews represent the population.

Meet Monica

I introduce you to the typical Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainer. We will call her Monica. She is twice as likely to be White, then, equally likely to be African American or Hispanic. She is 48 years old, has been employed with an ESC for 6 years, and has been a multicultural/diversity trainer for 3 years. Monica is a special education professional with a masters degree. Her major responsibilities have to do with her area of specialization although she devotes about 10% of her time to MDT when she has a sufficient number of participants to conduct a multicultural/diversity workshop.

Monica has taken one formal course in multicultural education at a college or university in the state of Texas. Most of her multicultural/diversity training, however, was obtained through the statewide Multicultural/Diversity Network (Region 1) and training offered through her region. She has been trained in REACH, the COP, and/or TESA, and she has conducted 10 to 15 workshops.

Although Monica was not formally schooled in the theory, research or best practices in multicultural education, her background in special education contributes to openness to difference. Because of her openness and interest in helping all students learn, she was asked by her supervisor to become a Multicultural/Diversity Network Representative. Her commitment to multicultural/diversity issues has grown with her tenure, training experiences, and contact with seasoned trainers; however, she is fully aware of the uniqueness of her region and, for the most part, conducts training that is acceptable to the local community.

Participants in the in-depth interview, discussed below, are representative of the population. Before we entertain the individual cases, a context, in the form of the Multicultural/Diversity Network and the curricula of the training will be provided.

Formation of the State-wide Multicultural/Diversity Network and its Training, Program and Curriculum

The interviews with Juanita Esteban, Adrianne Black, Crystal Johnson and Brenda Lamar, confirmed by archival data including state and district directives, planning documents and minutes of pre- and post- formation Multicultural/Diversity Network meetings, form the basis for the information related to the ESC Multicultural/Diversity Network and the training curriculum; the information was also verified by the other respondents. When the Multicultural Network began its work 1997-98 a major problem facing the group was reaching a common definition on the concept of multicultural education. The initial program authorized by the state of Texas was the Respecting Ethnic and Cultural Heritage (REACH) program. The program is built on five principles: 1) multiple perspectives, 2) culture is something that everyone has, 3) multicultural/global bridge, 4) head, heart, hands, and healing, and 5) co-responsibility.

A primary goal of REACH is to help teachers understand that they, like the students they encounter in their classrooms, have a culture that is to be valued, respected and used to build upon in fostering student achievement. Another program that was authorized shortly thereafter was *A Framework for Working with Children and Adults in Poverty*, hereafter referred to as Culture of Poverty (COP), which is based on the recognition of socioeconomic class as a factor in student achievement. The program advocates that teachers develop an understanding of the characteristics of their students related to socio-economic status and then utilize strategies to bridge the gap between where the students are and where they need to be (according to mainstream culture).

As I talked to additional consultants, they began to mention programs that I had not heard of before, and during my second interview with Juanita Esteban, I received a brief overview of two of these programs. “Educating Everybody’s Children,” she explained is a “turnkey” program developed by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). I did not know what turnkey meant, so she explained that a turnkey program is scripted, “It is scripted and the materials are made available to the trainer and what handouts you need to have for participants and stuff like that” (JE.I2.p.1.ll.15-17). Another program, Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA), is also a turnkey program designed for the trainers, but which requires certification of completion of training. This program deals with how teachers' expectations influence students' achievement regardless of socioeconomic status or cultural heritage. According to the principles of the program, the interaction between the adult and the student in large part determines how a student will perform and react in the classroom, and it is based on the research of Brophy and Good (1974).

I asked Juanita how much of the material that the trainers use is copyrighted. She responded that all of the material except for the pre-referral [to Special Education] model, developed by the University of Texas at Austin for the purpose of dissemination to teachers and policy makers, is copyrighted. She said that one has to have permission to photocopy a lot of it [ASCD material] and that several of the TESA materials are copyrighted.

We have discusses the Multicultural/Diversity Network and the training curricula used by Multicultural/Diversity trainers; it is appropriate now to form a deeper acquaintance with the individuals who actually provide the training. As stated earlier, these individuals are the most seasoned trainers in the State of Texas having been selected for their longevity in the position, their knowledge of how the "system" works their commitment to multicultural/diversity training, and their ability to articulate responses to the questions put to them in the interview schedule.

The Participants -- A Composite

The respondents to the in-depth interview had at least a Masters degree with a specialization in some aspect of special education. They all received their advanced degrees from colleges or universities in the state of Texas. All of the respondents are female, and six of the eight interviewees are native Texans. Two of the African Americans grew up, attended public schools and were reared or are rearing children who attended public schools in, or near, the region where they are now employed. This is also true of the two Hispanic and one of the White trainers. The remaining White trainer grew up in a different region of Texas from where she is now employed but has raised children who attended public schools in her current district. The remaining non-Texas natives, one White and one African American, have lived in Texas most of their adult lives and have children attending public schools in the state. Their backgrounds suggest that they have intimate knowledge of prevalent local worldviews.

As noted in the criteria for selection to participate in the in-depth interview, these trainers possess: 1) at least five years experience as a multicultural/diversity trainer, 2) extensive knowledge of the history of State-directed multicultural/diversity efforts since decentralization (1996-97); and 3) a commitment to multicultural/diversity training. The respondents, for the most part, came to their positions because of executive fiat. This does not imply that they had no interest in multicultural education and diversity. However, unlike preparation for their major responsibilities at the education service center, specialized training in multicultural education or diversity was not a prerequisite for employment. On average, these trainers dedicate about 15% of their time to formal MDT although they affirm multicultural/diversity concepts, use multicultural/diversity strategies in their school-based fieldwork and embed them in the other functions for which they have responsibility.

Each trainer received REACH training; two are certified trainers. All of the participants also received COP training, and two utilize it as their major training tool. One trainer uses what she calls a “hodge-podge” approach, pulling information from various programs as appropriate. Another consultant makes use of external consultants. One of the trainers developed her own program while the remaining consultant indicated that her service center does not have a “real” multicultural/diversity program.

Characteristics and Major Concerns of Individual Participants

Although the participants share many perspectives on issues related to multiculturalism and diversity, they are variously situated in their approaches to MDT, the issues that are of most concern to each trainer, their perceptions of the teachers they train, and the circumstances surrounding MD. In this section, I will describe what each participant shared with me in response to the interview questions. I chose this format because I wanted to present a detailed image of each participant before moving into the parallel themes that emerged by using the constant comparative method of analysis in Chapter V. Variations in the length of the descriptions do not reflect degrees of importance, but result from the fact that much of the shared information would be redundant to the reader if shared repeatedly.

Multicultural Trainers—Up Close and Personal

Although, for the most part, trainers were appointed to their positions, at least six of them described personal experiences which situated them as an “Other.” Unsolicited, during the course of our interviews, they shared experiences that may have contributed to their desire to change the metanarratives about what knowledge is important, what values are important, and how the education system really works for students who are not members of the dominant culture and those who are poor.

Of the three White trainers, two, Crystal and Connie, had experienced poverty. Crystal used her accomplishment, despite the experience, to disarm and to draw her mostly White, female trainees into the training process because, according to Crystal, they can relate to the economic issue. Connie, on the other hand, is a confrontational advocate for the underdog. She uses data and analogy to deconstruct beliefs about the nature of CLEED students and their parents and believes as does Rodriquez (1998) that issues of race, ethnicity and power should be explicitly addressed if any change is to occur. Carolyn is less expressive in her stance. She is a knowledge seeker who had been thwarted in much of her efforts to increase her knowledge base so that she can share more information with individuals who attend her training. Her region is prescriptive about the nature of the training and how it is to be conducted. She has limited voice in the matter, although she has been innovative enough to try a different approach.

Carolyn

The Region

Carolyn is a trainer in a Major Metropolitan Area of north central Texas. The student population is between 640,000 and 650,000 with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 60% of the student population. European Americans comprise 40% of the student population, a majority minority region. Less than fifty percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 11% are enrolled in Special Education and 16% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 15%, Hispanic 8% European American 75% and Other 2%. In 2004, TAKS were administered in all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 54%, Hispanic American 58%, European American 83% and Other 86%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 57% passed the TAKS.

Carolyn's Story: "Just a Little Civility"

Carolyn spoke less of a personal nature except for the intimidation she initially felt in her role as a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer; she experienced criticism and resistance personally and emotionally until, with the help of more seasoned trainers, she learned to take a more objective position and understand that much of the resistance resulted from defensiveness on the part of those who were being critical. Carolyn did, however, raise a point that was mentioned by only one other trainer, the gender issue. Connie, who also approached the issue, did so in the more traditional context of gender roles in the workplace, pointing to the fact that men at the centers are more likely to be administrators while women conduct the training – paralleling the dynamics of the entire educational system. She also used a scenario concerning lack of female superintendents to illustrate institutional inequalities and how we come to accept them. On the other hand, Carolyn admitted to her acceptance of her "female" role as a reason for her devastation when people did not respond to her in a positive manner because she was "cute and wonderful" (CW.I1.p.ll.485). Carolyn recalled:

> When I first started diversity training, I let any kind of dissension really affect me. And I would think it's, 'Oh, my gosh. I didn't present that correctly. Or,

> Oh, my gosh. I've offended this person.' After doing, we do…I was part of a REACH team. Are you familiar with REACH? (CW.I1.p4.ll.146-150)

When I answered that I was familiar with Gary Howard and REACH, Carolyn continued by explaining that her team decided to present to para professionals first, and then to work on teacher and administrator presentations. She said she found it interesting to see the differences and how upset people became in the training; she offered this example.

> There was one particular instance where there is a part in the training where you are to align from zero to 100 and where you think how far we've come in relationship building. And I would always preface that part with, 'You know, you're going to get offended. Say ouch! ....and just understand that your toes are going to get stepped on.' And we actually had two ladies go at each other to the point where they made each other cry and so the activity was stopped. But I thought, 'How cool.' They actually felt comfortable enough to voice their opinions. (CW.I1.p.4.ll.158-166)

When I asked Carolyn about the nature of the incident, she told me that it involved a Hispanic and an African-American woman. The African-American woman commented that she was tired of seeing cars parked in the yards of Hispanic people. Carolyn intervened.

> 'Oh, dear, it's time to stop this one!' And, to make a long story short, after the activity we went to a break, and I went to both of them and, you know, I said, 'Are you okay? Can I do anything?' And both of the ladies got up and they met halfway. And the black lady said, 'I am so sorry for offending you like that.' And the Hispanic lady said, 'Not all of us park our cars in our yards. A lot of us have much more respect for what we have…,' yada, yada, yada. And they said it so brilliantly, the African-American lady said, 'I was really stereotyping you.' And I was going, yes! Yes! And they hugged and everything. I mean it was beautiful to see. (CW.I1.p.4.ll.170-181)

Carolyn's earlier perspective had been, in part, rooted in a colorblind perspective. For her, difference was the norm, but she did not problematize the underside of the phenomena of difference. When I mentioned that many of my own undergraduate students came from smaller towns or the insulated communities in Texas, she said, “I really hadn’t thought of coming from insulated communities and the rural communities because, I guess, when you are in a [metropolitan area]…You know, we’ve got one school district or one campus that has over 80 different ethnic groups (CW.I1.p.6.ll.263-266). The sequence of her brief scenarios demonstrate her personal growth through exposure to and membership in the REACH team in her area and her observation of intergroup differences uncovered in the process of interaction during the training. She also saw firsthand how confronting issues can lead to resolution. At this point in her development as a trainer she said, “My goal for the diversity is for people to respect the differences among people rather than trying to bring everybody into, you know, into a certain comfortable fit that’s comfortable for interactions between one person and the other” (CW.I1.32803.p.1.ll.10-13).

As with each of the other trainers, I reserved an opportunity for self expression in terms of goals, hopes, philosophy, motivation, concerns or conclusions about the MDT and their role in the process. Carolyn is emotional as she shares her feelings. First, she said it makes her angry to watch how people treat each other (CW.I1.p.11.ll.472).

> I mean, and I know this sounds very Pollyannaish, okay. But it really irritates me to see the lack of civility that is present here. It makes me angry for teachers to brow beat kids because they don’t – I mean the kids – don’t understand what the directions are. And after going through the REACH training and watching the changes that are made in the participants who go through that whole process, it is just like I want to go, “Yeah! You get it! You get it like I’ve got it!” (CW.I1.p11.ll.473-479)

I asked Carolyn whether she saw herself as a change agent; she was ambiguous as she responded:

> Prob– well, yes and no. Uh, yeah. Because I keep coming back to doing the diversity training and how it used to, it hurt my feelings that people didn't think I was just cute and wonderful and that I had wonderful things to say! And now I have gotten to the point, I don't care. Uh, I mean, I care. It doesn't hurt my feelings anymore. Uh, and I have backed off of being so 'in your face'. (CW.I1.p11.ll.483-488)

Carolyn believes in REACH and its principles and believes MDT using the REACH program can effect change. However, her region uses consultants in its staff development efforts. It may be that the use of consultants is more cost effective because of the large numbers being trained at any given period during school- or district-wide professional development, but, as indicated by the literature, this form of staff development is least effective because, by it nature, it is fragmented, tends to deal with isolated topics and is often unrelated to perceived needs of those participating in the staff development effort. Carolyn did not make this issue problematic; in her MDT she accommodated the model but attempted to provide continuity and to invite presenters who would address issues relevant to multicultural education and diversity (i.e. bilingual education, parental involvement, cooperative learning). When she provides technical assistance to a group, usually teachers, she uses reciprocity training, which deals with respecting others and their cultures.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Her emphasis on lack of civility and respecting differences indicates a liberal human relations perspective – she wants people to get along, be respectful and/or tolerant, and for teachers to develop strategies to help all students succeed. Her focus is on changing individual attitudes. She is likewise a trainer and an advocate for REACH, and says she uses it whenever possible because it is built of principles of multicultural education.

Crystal

The Region

Crystal trains at a central Texas ESC that is located in what would be considered a Central City. The student population is between 125,000 and 150,000, with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 48% of the student population. European Americans comprise 52% of the student population. Fifty percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 15% are enrolled in Special Education and 5% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 7%, Hispanic 4% European American 87% and Other 1%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 51%, Hispanic American 59%, European American 767% and Other 76%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 58% passed the TAKS.

Crystal's Story: "Practice What You Preach"

Crystal's narrative was a remembrance of how she confronted racism in her own family. The story was related to me in response to a question about how she came to do the work she does. Crystal became very reflective and eventually came to conclude that she had been doing this work since she was young because of some "weird stuff" that happened in her life. She shared one of those things -- “I came from a family that was racist,” (CJ.I1.p.22.ll.971-972), and she characterized them as “rednecks” from Mobile, Alabama…not all of them, but plenty of them, and probably still are today,” (p.22.ll.972-973). On the other hand, she her father and grandmother “taught me that people were people, and they were good and you treated everybody with respect,” (p.22.ll.973-976). Crystal said she heard the words but observed contradictions between words and actions; at times, there were even differences between the words spoken to her and the words she heard spoken that were not meant for her to hear; she recalled, “They talked bad about people,” (p.22.ll.978).

While in the Navy an incident brought the contradictions to the forefront. She dated a Black man and “had the audacity to think that it was okay,” (p.22.ll.979-980). She remembered that her father “had a fit! Told me I was disgracing the family, but I am thinking my family can’t possibly mean that,” (p.22.ll.981, 984-985). Crystal stood up to her family and remained friends with the young man as well as others friends who were different from herself -- friends from all over the country, who she had met during boot camp. She used this incident to relate to her present physical location, which she describes again as the “most narrow-minded place I have ever experienced,” (CJ.I1.p.23.ll.1033-1034). Crystal’s personal comments about MDT, how she came to be a trainer and her perceived role were succinct enough to include verbatim, which I have done below.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Crystal said she began doing MDT at the service center because she had been the contact person at the agency and had gone the establishment and development of the Multicultural/Diversity Network.

> I was on the team there at the agency. And so, since I had been on the team, it was a natural thing for me once I got started here to do that. One of the ladies that was there….I don't remember exactly how that all worked out. But I was hired to do decentralized activities and many of them. One was the multicultural diversity. One was to work with the DEC monitoring, because that had been part of what I did while I was at the agency. (CJ.I1.p.9. ll.401-406)

Given her estimation of the attitudes and perspectives on the region and its residents, I asked why she continued to do this work. Her response was thoughtful.

> _Because I see progress. One of the things that I have seen since I have been here…..I wanted to give it up the second year I was here, especially with all the stuff I had to deal with in people at work. I thought, 'Why am I even trying to get on this bandwagon? What do I keep pushing for?' But I can't not do it. I believe all kids deserve to have the best prepared teachers possible. And I think we've got to know the academic stuff. I think that is critical. But, if we don't know how to convey that information and we don't know how to talk to people from all the different walks of life that come into our rooms… We don't get to choose who we teach. I don't get to choose who walks into my workshops. It is not an option for me. I don't even say, 'Oh, I don't want to teach him.' And teachers in our public schools don't have that option. So, if I am not willing to walk the walk, how am I going to think that they're going to do it? So for me it is part of the….I don't know how not to do it. (CJ.I1.p.10.ll.416-430)

My final question to Crystal was, "How do you define your role as a Multicultural/Diversity Trainer?

> Uh, how do I define it…. You know, I think it is a combination of being a teacher, an educator, it's carrying the sword, standing in there and staying with the fight. I don't know. I am not sure. It is a passion that I feel like I have to continue and I don't know how not to do it. I think I have probably been doing this particular work since I was young. I was in the military and I came from Mobile, Alabama. Of course, I had weird stuff happen in my life and everything

> but one of the things is I came from a family that was racist. (CJ.I1.p.22.ll.972-981)

With Crystal, we have come full circle, because this is the point at which she told the story recounted above. Crystal is a REACH advocate and believes in its principles. She, like Carolyn, believes MDT using the REACH program can effect change. However, people in her region, from superintendents to teachers rejected the REACH program. She chooses to use the COP program in her training, and she advocates for that program with as much fervor as she does for the REACH program; she does not experience tension between the two programs, one based of multicultural principles and the other based of economic indicators of behavior which comprises a deficit model of certain students, an assimilationist philosophy, and is viewed by some of her peers and particularly Black participants as stereotypical. Crystal's rationale is that it is a beginning, and that she will eventually reintroduce REACH training.

Rhetorically, Crystal's approach is the Multicultural Education Approach. She is aware of some structural issues related to racial and ethnic minorities, and she is an advocate for cultural knowledge, sensitivity and competency among teachers and administrators. Her training, which is oriented toward the teaching the culturally different approach does not reflect her personal views, and she is liberal in her perspective as she opts for gradual change over time. One of her strategies is to embed multicultural/diversity issues into other, more acceptable functions such as parental involvement, bilingual education and assessment – what other trainers as well call "the back door approach". This is not a new strategy (Sleeter, 1996), but it can be dangerous. In using language that is more acceptable, trainers avoid issues of wealth and power relationships and other structural issues such as tracking and labeling, avoid taboo issues such as race and racism and White privilege, and often reinforce negative aspects of the dominant school culture.

Connie

The Region

Connie's region in central Texas could be described as a Central City. The student population is over 450,000 with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 43% of the student population. European Americans comprise 57% of the student population. Less than forty percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 11% are enrolled in Special Education and 11% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 6%, Hispanic 6% European American 87% and Other 3%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 55%, Hispanic American 58%, European American 80% and Other 82%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 58% passed the TAKS.

Connie Stories: "It's that Noise, Always in the Background"

The most unique aspect of Connie's personal stories is that, except for a brief mention of the poverty in her past and the fact that her grandmother was Native American, most are all told from the third person point of view. They are also contemporary accounts; they tell us more of where she stands currently than how or why she arrived at this point. I found the stories relevant, however, because of the emotionality and commitment displayed during the telling of each, and because they clearly position Connie as on the side of the underdog. On her survey questionnaire her response to the question, “How did you arrive at your present position” was, “A lifetime of living in the South, US with bigotry which infects every part of life?” I chose two of her stories. The first deals with the stereotypes that members of the dominant class develop and how they can influence people of color through discrimination and cultural, institutional and individual racism. The second shows how a school rendered a group of students invisible, devaluing the students and their culture.

Rosie the Doctor -- Cultural Bias and How We See Others

Connie’s story is of a friend who immigrated to the United States three years ago from Mexico where she was a dentist. Described as an intermediate speaker of English, she went to the office of the secretary at an elementary school that her daughter attended. The secretary is White, female, middle class, native speaker of English, and speaks only English. Connie says that Rosie did her best to speak English and tell the other woman that she needed an application for a job. Without asking about Rosie’s qualifications, the woman gave her a janitor’s job application. Here Connie’s story begins.

> Fortunately, Rosie has a sense of humor. She filled it out. She took it back…that’s when she found out that she had filled out the janitor job application. They said, ‘This is the wrong one for teacher assistant. We’ll give you another one for teacher assistant.’ And she filled the second one out. Now she has gone through all kinds of travail in getting official transcripts from Mexico, having them translated into English, to prove that this school district has hired someone with a doctor’s degree to be a teacher’s assistant in their preschool. So, it is this kind of – seeing people of color through eyeglasses that see them as ignorant, illiterate, incompetent, thieving, worthless – lots of bad attributes are seen through these glasses.

Connie insists that this attitude permeates the system as she describes typical responses to her suggestion that, given the proper resources, many Spanish speaking parents could help their children academically. “And so, when I go to districts I say:

“Look. Spanish speakers from Mexico could help their children in school”

“Oh, no they can’t, Connie.”

“Why not?”

“Well, they don’t read and write.”

And I say, “Well, you know, everybody in Mexico is not illiterate”

“Oh, but all of ours are. All of our parents are illiterate.”

I said, “Well, how do you know?”

> Because I know that these people I am speaking with are like me. They don’t read and write Spanish. Uh, they are also like me – they’re not bilingual English. How would they know that the person that they’re speaking with is illiterate? And they’re very resistant in buying any kind of Spanish materials. I know a district that has lots of Spanish speaking students where the Spanish speaking parents with college degrees have told them, ‘We will read to our children. We will help our children if you would get the Spanish books.’ (CB.I2.p.3-4.ll.115-146)

While the preceding story addresses stereotypical attitudes about certain people of color, specifically Mexican Americans, the one that follows points to how a Eurocentric perspective can render a group of students invisible in the school setting.

It is Black History Month, So What?

Connie was invited to a school to conduct a workshop on diversity that was to last 30-40 minutes. She learned, before going out to the campus, that the district had recently undergone a demographic shift, thirty per cent of the student body, which had been predominantly European American, was now African American. Connie describes the incident.

> Well, this was right before uh Black History Month. And you would think that that's been around for so long and you can buy so many so much materials; you just have to lift it out of the box and stick it on the wall. I mean, it takes no imagination. It takes very little effort -- And very little money. I mean you can do a Black History Month in a public school here without just overworking yourself. Well I get there and there's nothing. Nothing! Thirty percent of the students are African American, nothing. No poster, no banner -- No nothing! You wouldn't know that they had… they did not want it to appear that they had African Americans there.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Connie rejects REACH, which she called nonresearch based, and COP, which she labels stereotypical. Her approach is the Multicultural Education Approach, and she supports some elements of Education that is Social Reconstructionist. She is viewed by some of her peer as too confrontational because she refuses to ignore the issue of inequitable treatment based on race, ethnicity, gender and /or disability, and she discusses class and power relationships from a critical perspective. She talks about the influence of politics and economics on the process of schooling and the importance of culture and developing cultural competence among teachers for student achievement. Connie places emphasis on a general lack of support for multicultural education fostered by the dominant culture which permeates the community, including the educational system, xenophobia and cultural bias, schools as sorting and selection institutions designed to support the status quo, and she advocates for total school change. What is ironical is that she does not focus on the school-parent-community-broader social linkages as necessary to affect such change. She holds out federal and state interventions as a means for addressing structural inequity, which is anathema to a radical structuralist perspective. Her stories, for the most part, revolve around the mistreatment of students as groups; however, she does not problematize the use of strategies to change individuals in light of structural inhibitors.

Adrianne and Juanita

Adrianne and Juanita are Senior Education Specialists and the senior most members of the trainer group, and because of their commitment and knowledge base, are greatly respected by their peers and willing to assume leadership roles. Recall that Adrianne came to her role as a result of her personal commitment as she was one of the first in the state to initiate a formal investigation of overrepresentation of certain groups, particularly African American males, in special education. A trainer of trainers, Adrianne remains a REACH advocate and user. She found creative ways of continuing to use the program as others found reasons to discontinue its use. The student is at the center of her conversation as she challenges educators, in an environment of high stakes testing, to consider the affective domain and understand that a child learns with the heart as well as the mind. She is very aware of herself as a cultural being. As an African American woman, she has had experience with racism and discrimination. Her personal story rejects the stereotypes that some people hold about Black families as she recalls that she was a grown woman in conversation with her sister when she realized that her family was considered poor by some standards. Adrianne views wealth as relative and recounts the very rich experiences provided by her supportive, hardworking parents; her experiences growing up may also account for her rejection of COP as stereotypical.

Adrianne

The Regional

Adrianne is a trainer in a major metropolitan area of south central Texas. The student population is between 940,000 and 950,000, with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 67% of the student population. European Americans comprise 33% of the student population, a majority minority region. Over fifty percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 10% are enrolled in Special Education and 17% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 19%, Hispanic 12% European American 67% and Other 2%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 54%, Hispanic American 60%, European American 83% and Other 86%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 57% passed the TAKS.

Adrianne's Story: "I didn't Know We Were Poor"

One of Adrianne's most consistent struggles is against stereotyping and labeling. She is as much a critic of COP as she is an advocate of REACH. She resents what she views as a monolithic portrayal of certain groups, who, according to Ruby Payne, exhibit certain characteristics. She asked, "You know. And, so, who are you and who are we to say – you know it's an attitude about whatever" (AB I2.p.4ll.226-227). Elaborating on her meaning, she provided a personal example.

> You know, I grew up in a situation and I didn't realize, and I still don't to this day, you will never tell me that we were poor but I was talking to my sister one

> day and we were talking about this family that, when we were growing up, they just never did like us. We were talking about that. And I said to her, "Well, why is it that they didn't like us? I don't understand why they didn't like us." She said, "Because we were poor.' I said, 'No, we weren't.' She said, 'Well, yes we was.' And, I said, 'No, we weren't'" You know, so that was my first time ever hearing that because poverty or being poor never came out of my parents mouth, and everything I needed I got it. And every lesson that I wanted to take, I took. If I wanted to take ballet lessons, I took it. If I wanted to take piano lessons, I did. If I wanted to take violin lessons or accordion lessons, whatever I wanted to do I was able to do. And whatever I wanted, you know, clothes I wanted to wear, I wore them. Now, if we were poor then that was never presented to me. I never missed a meal and we ate well, you know. And my parents used their money well, you know, the money that they had. And so but we were just never told that we were poor. (AB.I2.p.4-5.ll.227-244)

Adrianne's story demonstrates the relativity or poverty, or wealth for that matter. Because of the care, opportunities, and aspirations that she experienced from her parents in her home environment, she did not know that by standards of the dominant community, including African Americans at certain socioeconomic statuses, she and her family were considered poor. This is a familiar scenario in the African American community, at least among certain age cohorts; I personally had similar experienced and shared that with Adrianne. We shared the view that we were rich indeed, and that the expectations for personal and academic success that our parents, teachers and community held for us affected the trajectory of our lives. In schools, teacher expectations are important for student success and a welcoming environment is as important. We knew that we were valued and parent and teacher expectations for us were high. We, therefore, "rose to the occasion." For Adrianne, the personal infuses with the professional in her concern for the overrepresentation of certain students, particularly 'Black males', in special education which what brought her to her position of advocacy;

the passage below highlights how the personal and the professional combined to ferment a passion and commitment to MDT.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

I asked Adrianne what were her overall goals for this type of program – her overall wish or goal for diversity programs? Her response was lengthy.

> My . . . if I was a principal in a school, every person in my building would be culturally aware and would have to take multicultural training. It is my. . . ideal that every person in education, regardless of whether they are the bus driver, the custodian, or whoever, that they should be culturally competent. Which is an ongoing . . . just like we offer training, ongoing, all the time for instructional strategy on TAAS. You don't just do TAAS training one time. We continually refine it—updating and offering more and more strategies, more and more strategies. I think we should be doing the same thing with cultural diversity. We should be continually fine tuning, offering more strategies for teachers and teachers should be held accountable as to how many hours or how much training they're getting in multi-culture. I don't see how we are not going to be able to do that, or we will continue to push children away from our schools. That's what's going to happen. Because children know, they know whether a teacher likes them or not. They know too whether it has to do because of the color of their skin or because they may dress differently or because they may have a disability of some kind or because they may look differently. They know. So until our teachers become culturally competent and not only that, culturally sensitive and create the environment where all children -- an all inclusive environment, where all children are accepted, then we will continue to have high drop out rates. We will continue to have students that will not do well on the TAAS. We will continue to have high referral rates to special education, alternative schools. Our behavior classes will continue to grow. We try to make this a medical problem and say these kids on this and on that. A lot of this has nothing to do with that, it has to do with how we . . . It's just like you have someone to come as a guest in your home, if you don't treat them well, then they don't want to come back to your home. School for us as educators, that's our home. Students that come there, we're inviting them into our home. We either say you're welcome or you're not welcome. And we say that to our parents as well. You're welcome or you're not welcome. (AB.I1.p.10-11.ll.429-558)

Adrianne supports the Multicultural Education Approach. She is concerned with securing equity in education for all students by educating teachers, and through them, students about cultural pluralism and diversity as a means of changing society. She has experienced racism and discrimination herself and understands the negative effects of tracking and labeling on students of color. Adrianne is focused on the importance of the affective domain in student achievement and has a major goal helping teachers to become culturally competent in interacting with their students. Adrianne does not couch her descriptions in political terms, most likely a conscious strategy, but she, like Connie, is more theoretically grounded than most Multicultural/Diversity Trainers. There is also a hint of the Single Group approach in Adrianne's perspective in her professional focus on African American males in Special Education and her personal commitment to empowerment in her community. The commitment to community also incorporates elements of the Education that is Social Reconstructionist approach.

Juanita

The Region

Juanita's region is located in a Central City in south Texas. The student population is over 300,000. African Americans and Others do not comprise a percentage figure. Hispanic Americans comprise 96% of the student population and European Americans comprise 37% of the student population, a majority minority region. Eighty-five percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 10% are enrolled in Special Education and 37% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of Hispanic 81% European American 17% and Other 2%; there are no African Americans in the teacher pool. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 68%, Hispanic American 58%, European American 80% and Other 88%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 56% passed the TAKS.

Juanita's Stories: Degrees of Assimilation and Acculturation Matter

Juanita is, likewise, a trainer of trainers. In many incidents she has been called in to "troubleshoot" when issues become too heated for the locals to handle. She describes herself as a Latina woman and decries efforts by too many of her teachers at acculturation and the devaluation of her culture as a Puerto Rican American. Juanita does not want to see that happen to other CLEED students. She too is very child centered. Juanita used at least three illustrations to show how people can unwittingly come to devalue their own culture. In one story, Juanita talked about being punished for speaking her native language. In the same scenario, she recalls how eventually parent would succumb to pressure and stop speaking Spanish in the home. She says that for the longest time she didn't speak Spanish and that when she found herself as a service provider among people who didn't speak English, she had to "pull it out of the closet," (JE.I2.p.23.ll.1009). A second incident took place when a Professor from Texas A&M University came to her region to discuss an exclusionary clause that rules out such things as socioeconomics, cultural and language differences and lack of educational opportunities as indicators for disability. She recalled:

> …the most resistance came from a group of first or second generation Americans…I am saying that if you want a true picture of what this child can do test him in his native language like the law says you have to…They don't believe it…we met resistance from a group who, you could tell from their mannerism and their speech, were new to this country. (JE.I2.p.23.ll.1034-1035, 1037, 1039-1041, 1045-1046)

The third story had a very ironic twist. Juanita spoke of a cousin in her husband's family who was darker than her husband, who is "very fair, hazel eyes, very Spanish looking, but people mistook him for European American," (JE.I2.p.24.ll.1061-1062). She says that the cousin told his father that he was not going to marry a Mexican girl. The father asked him why. He said he didn't know, but Juanita responded to her husband in this manner:

> I know why. Where was he raised? He was raised in a town in the valley where it was hard to be Hispanic and they worked very hard at assimilating Hispanic kids, you know, making them "White" so Jimmy got this perception that if he has a White wife then he has the trophy wife. (JE.I2.p.24.ll.1068-1072)

What made the story so tragically ironic is that he, indeed, married a woman who Juanita describes as beautiful; she is a European American from the Mid-west. She is also a multiculturalist who worked in South America most her adult life. Juanita says, "She fell in love with the Mexican culture, and it hurts her that she can't share it with her kids because he is so adamant that his kids not be," (JE.I2.p.24.ll1075-1077).

A final story had to do with Juanita's school experiences and that of her peers in a system whose student population was predominately Mexican American being taught by traditional Anglo teachers who were assimilationist in their orientation. Juanita said that she and her friends were punished for speaking their native language, some were ridiculed or had their names changed because teachers could not or would not pronounce their names the way their parents had named them (JE.I2.p.22.ll.982-984). Juanita recalled a story that she had read along with an article, "Mi Que Teramino", "They Took Away My Name" about a girl named Rebecca. In the story, the girl's mother spelled her name differently from the spelling the teacher was accustomed to using. The teacher tells the girl, “You know, your mom can’t even spell. That is not the way you spell Rebecca. And this is the way we’re going to spell Rebecca and by the way, your name is going to be Becky now… Just took that from her and this is a five-year-old kid” (JE.I2.p.22.ll.987-990). Juanita continued reflectively, “And she remembers that about school. They took her name, something that her parents gave her, you know?” (JE.I2.p.22.l.991-992). She then relates the story to her own life.

> l remember, we talk about it, my husband and I and friends of ours, how our parents would get letters from school saying you are no longer to speak Spanish to your child. You are to speak English to them so they can learn English because if you speak English to them they’ll learn English. Well, they were sending these letters to parents who didn’t speak English. So then we had kids who didn’t know how to speak to their grandparents. And had poor models of English because the parents were trying to speak with them in the best English they had. Because we had parents that were trying. They wanted to become Americans so they were going to try, you know, to help their kids become American, but, in working so hard to become American, they allowed certain things to happen, you know. And, then when the kids got older they were saying well, the kids don’t have the same value systems we have. Well, no, because….they don’t have the same sense of story. Well, no, because you, not knowing any better, allowed someone to take that from them. (JE.I2.p.22.ll.992-1007).

Juanita relates a conversation, which follows, with one of her classmates about the effect of losing her language, which she connects to her experience then and now.

I remember going to school with a young lady who said, ‘My grandmother is coming over.’

And I went, ‘Oh, man. That’s great. I wish mine would come over more often but she can’t afford the trip.’

She goes, ‘But I don’t like her to come over because I don’t know how to talk to her. We don’t talk.’

I said, '"What do you mean, you don't talk?' She goes, 'Well, all she speaks is Spanish.' (JE.I2.p.22-23.ll.1007-1012).

> And I was real surprised that she didn't know….. I quit speaking Spanish for the longest time and did not start again until I was an adult, when I found myself in the community as a service provider working with parents who didn't speak English and I was like, okay. Pull it out of the closet. And it was rusty at the beginning. But for many of us we were so assimilated and acculturated that we've got teachers now who don't value the linguistic and cultural diversity of the students with whom they work even though they are the same Hispanic ethnic group. In fact, sometimes they are harder on kids than your European American. Because they remember the pain of being so different. They don't want the kids to go through that pain but in so doing they're bringing about new pain. (JE.I2.p.23.ll.1013-1023)

Goals, Roles, and Locations

I asked Juanita if she was a multiculturalist. Here, I paraphrase parts of her response, which was given in our second interview. Juanita said that on a continuum, she is challenged each day, and as soon as she thinks she has it all together, something unexpected rises to the surface. This emphasizes the growth process in becoming a multicultural person, but Juanita said that these moments "make me stand back and say, 'you know, I didn't know I felt so strongly about that.' She provides an example of such as instance.

> It's like one day a person said something about all kids are the same to me, I don't see color. And I found that very offensive because to sit there and you tell me that you don't see me as brown really hurt me. ..They're denying your individual diversity -- Your individual difference. Who are you as an individual? And I didn't realize I had really bought into that statement until she said it and I was like, 'I find that offensive!' I want her to acknowledge me as brown. I want her to acknowledge me as a Latina. I wanted her to acknowledge me as an educated one too. You know what I am saying? So, yeah, I am still growing. Some days I'm Donna Reed, and some days I am Roseanne Barr. I'm not the best person to be around. It is just being who I am as an individual. Some days I am much better at being multiculturalists than others. And I am still learning so much that is out there. (JE.I2. p.13-14.ll.584-599)

In the same interview, I asked Juanita a second question, “What is your personal role with the network and as a trainer?”

> Okay. Help our network look at our data objectively. My personal role is to make sure that all our decisions are data based and that personal agendas don’t come into play here. Because I’ve got some personal agendas that I have to keep at bay. We are an agency that is being funded by State and Federal funds, and we must look at our data to help us make decisions, and then we must utilize research based scientific effort or approaches to see changes in either the systems or changes to student behavior. And my role is to stay as objective as possible and help in leading us towards those goals that we set, as a network, that are important for the state. (JE.I2.p.14-15.ll.636-645)

Finally, I asked Juanita what her overall hopes were for MDT. Her response, like Adrianne’s reflected a fusion of the personal and the professional.

> Oh, my overall hopes would be that we would get to the point in this state that when schools have banners that said, “All students…” they the would mean, “All students.” And when they said, “We welcome diversity,” that they would acknowledge and accept diversity in its true fashion. (JE.I2.p.8.ll.348-352)
> Okay. Our goal for the multicultural network is to help set up a system in the state of Texas that would validate the existence of learning problems of CLD students, so that we can have the appropriate students being served by Special Education (JE.I2.p3.ll.109-112).

Juanita embraces the Multicultural Education Approach. She strives to change society by educating teachers, and through them, students about cultural pluralism and diversity as a means of changing society, as well as making sure that all students achieve. She understands, through personal experience, the power of the dominate groups to repress and oppress subordinated groups and the mechanism used to do so. One such mechanism is the devaluation of cultures that are different from the mainstream. Much of her focus is on the affective domain; she does not want language minority students to relive the experiences what she and her peers endured. She, like

Adrianne, does not couch her descriptions in political terms; I attribute this to her tact, but I suspect that she has the critical terminology to express herself in different terms. I believe she consciously uses a more ameliorative language in order to accomplish the goals of a critical multicultural agenda.

Angelica

The Region

Angelica trains in an east Texas region classified as Central Suburban. The student population is over 50,000 with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 36% of the student population. European Americans comprise 647% of the student population, a majority minority region. Fifty-two percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 16% are enrolled in Special Education and 6% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 6%, Hispanic 1% European American 92% and Other 0%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 50%, Hispanic American 58%, European American 77% and Other 76%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 60% passed the TAKS.

Angelica's Story: "Let's Sleeping Dogs Lie"

As indicated earlier, Angelica, at the request of her executive director, developed a program of her own which, like Connie's, is data driven but in the early stages of development. As I sat through her workshop, the approach was expert, technological, and less directly focused on multicultural/diversity issues. That might change, but my impression is that the orientation is toward that of the Human Relations Approach to multicultural education – let's just get along and try to close the gaps represented in the data without acknowledging underlying institutional issues.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Angelica enjoys the support of her director and her colleagues; she did not relate personal stories, and did not bring up issues of race or ethnicity during the formal interview, although she described the privilege of White males in her region as manifest in their view of intellect racial minorities as exceptions while they view themselves, their perspectives and their culture as normative. I know, from casual conversation, that Angelica is aware of racism and discrimination in her area, but as she said in her interview, her approach is "let sleeping dogs lie." She, like Brenda, takes racism as a given in the region where she was reared and where she reared her children.

When I asked what her goals for were for MDT, she began by explaining a change in focus, recommended by the state, which led to the development of a localized program of her design.

> The training that was provided from the state level was focused on the state. What we know is the state is huge, so we have to focus on the people that are within our region, and so the issues that are within my region, these are going to be the things I concentrate on. (AJ.I1.p.9.ll. 446-449)

Angelica's program to addresses the overrepresentation of students of color, particularly African American males, in special education. Her philosophy is to start at the top, so superintendents in her area, as well as principals and special education directors are required to sign off on and commit teams to the training she has developed. It is directed at regular education teachers' and their response to individualized education plans (IEPs) and special education assessment and referral; the program has technical assistance, feedback and evaluation built into its design. Ultimately her goal is to develop mutual respect between the students and the adults in the learning environment.

> I believe that we have to appreciate and respect all children because I believe that educators make all of the difference in a child's life. I believe that we may not know where that child is going, but we know we have to get them there some way, and that if you are caring and respectful and you do the best you can with them that they will be successful, and so that is what I try to do. (AJ.I1.p.4.ll.148-153)

In her present capacity Angelica defines her role in terms of specific programmatic objectives:

> What I see myself doing is providing this training, facilitating the training, making sure that there is follow-up, making sure that new people who come on board will be trained and have that foundation built in and that by me being dedicated to this project and making sure that the documentation is there, I am just hoping to see that change. But that is what I am going to do is provide the information to them, make sure that I do follow-ups and make sure that there is documentation. (AL.I1.p.9.ll.425-432)

Brenda

The Region

Brenda's region in east Texas could be described as Central Suburban or Independent Town. The student population is between 75,000 and 100,000.with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 43% of the student population. European Americans comprise 57% of the student population, a majority minority region. Less than fifty percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 13% are enrolled in Special Education and 3% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of

African American 17%, Hispanic 2% European American 81% and Other 1%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 48%, Hispanic American 62%, European American 73% and Other 79%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 54% passed the TAKS.

Brenda's Story: Racism, a Fact of Life in her Region

Brenda is perhaps the most pessimistic in her view of what can be achieved through the Multicultural/Diversity Training in her region, but she keeps on trying, hoping to reach as many people as possible. She was born and reared in the area where she now works, so she understands the culture of the region. I must interject here that when we completed our first interview, we decided to go to a local restaurant. We were treated well; however, it was obvious from the stares that not many African Americans patronized the establishment. The place was full, but we were the only people of color dining. I think Brenda wanted me to get a feel for the area myself.

Brenda understands the effects of cultural devaluation and racism well. She, like Carolyn and Crystal, are sensitive to possible negative effects of limited exposure and experience on an individual's perceptions of difference. She said that as a Black woman in this area she had experienced racism first hand and I knows that students in schools have some of the same experiences. She has a son who was graduating from a local high school at the time of our first interview.

Although she views racism as a major issue in her region, she believes that change can be accomplished and that education is the key to affecting that change. She said that another reason that people in her area hold on to older paradigms in terms of race and race relations is lack of exposure to those who are different from themselves. Disclosure also presents a problem in her area because people are afraid to be “wrong.”

> I tell them it’s not necessarily that your perception is right or wrong, that’s exactly where you are because of your experiences and that’s what a lot of people are afraid of. That people are going to take them for being wrong. Rather than, my experiences will not allow me to see the world as you, because your experiences are different than my experiences. You know, if nothing else, from the part of the world that we were raised in… I was born and raised in southeast Texas…about 15 miles from here, but I had the opportunity to leave and go to college and come back. Leave and go work again and come back. I’ve been in and out of my community about three times, and I’m 46 years old. And a lot of people don’t have that opportunity to experience that. So therefore, they have a different outlook on life than what some other people would have and that’s what individual. (BL.I1.p.6.ll.226-238)

Brenda presented few personal stories in her interview; however, when asked about her overall goals for MDT, she had a great deal to say.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Brenda’s response to the question of her aspirations for MDT was lengthy so I pulled major points from her discussion. First, Brenda said she wanted districts in her region to recognize that MDT could positively affect several other areas of concern, including addressing perceived behavioral problems, raising TAAS [now TAKS] scores and reducing AEP [Alternative Education Plans] referrals. “I wish they could see the value in the Multicultural/Diversity Training.” She also felt that as teachers begin to understand the student, they could be more successful at making accommodations to match the student’s predominant learning style. Brenda believes that, pedagogically, teachers must move from the more traditional models, which she conceptualizes as lectures, individual seatwork, and regurgitation, and that MDT will open a door to better teacher-student understanding and schools would produce better citizens. In her own words, Brenda continued:

> I believe that if they would let multicultural diversity training in, they would see where we can no longer tease a child anymore, and that child is not a bad child, he's a different child, but he's still a child. And maybe we could embrace that…one of the lawyers came through Region Y and did training. He said, 'If it looks different and acts different, it is different, and we need to act upon it.' You know, so therefore, I think if you learned more about different cultures…we would actually know what we need to be 'pulling the whistle on' Now that's just something I want to happen. . (BL.I1.p. 8-9.ll.352-374)

Turning to the issue of data driven decision-making, Brenda said she would like to see districts actually analyze the data and develop appropriate training in conjunction with the Regional ESC; her desire is to work with the districts as a partners. Additionally, Brenda wants to see a broadened perception of multicultural/diversity issues develop within the region.

> …I want to get beyond a black-white issue. I would like to see [them] look at people's differences--and look at it in an honest way and accept it. And work from a person's strengths, be able to identify a person's strengths and be able to build on that for our future, because if we don't change, we're going to be by the wayside. And I don't think a lot of people realize that. (BL.I1.p8-9.ll.379-385)

Brenda is, essentially, suggesting a change in paradigm. She continues:

> We're not even teaching on the same model that we did when I was in school, and that's been what 30 years ago. We have got to learn to be more flexible, like for instance, we've got to learn how to teach our children today in a different mold and in a different manner. And in order to do that, we've got to have open-minded teachers…I believe that one of the steps in becoming open-minded is to develop yourself in an area where you can accept everyone. And I think the Multicultural/Diversity Training is one of the first levels to doing that, because we can no longer ignore the children that are not in the accelerated classes. I mean, you know, if a child is in accelerated classes, they get everything 100%; they're not problems or anything. But it's the children who are your atypical learners that get thrown to the wayside, and I believe firmly that this would be a mechanism for teachers to start accepting those children and teaching them in that manner. (BL.I1.p.9.ll.389-402)

Brenda uses COP in her training, and the focus is on the Teaching the Culturally Different approach. She does not have the theoretical background of Adrianne, Connie, Juanita, or Socks, but her experience with racism and discrimination locates her in a complex situation. Lack of theoretical grounding could account for her unproblematic acceptance of COP; yet, she is painfully aware of the effects of tracking and labeling on students of color, particularly African American students. She accepts the principles of REACH and includes many of the activities used by REACH trainers in her training; she also draws from other programs. When I observed her workshop, she was using state data to show disproportionate representation of low-income students in special education as well as lower percentages of passing on the TAKS tests among the same students. As she conducted this portion of the training, several points became clear. Teachers were not accustomed to dealing actual data: they did not know how to read it, what it meant or how it could be useful to them.

As Brenda clearly understands, she has to make a start. She joins Crystal, Carolyn and Angelica in "sneaking in through the back door." This is a synopsis of her strategy. If she can show participants how they can use the data to more efficiently locate problem areas and plan appropriate interventions, she might hook them. If she hooks them and they begin to disaggregate the data, patterns of interaction such as low income is likely related to race and ethnicity which is, in turn, related to test scores will emerge. The realization may change teacher perception of the need for MDT, and that is Brenda's long range plan.

Socks

The Region

The west Texas region where Socks trains is classified as an Independent town or Independent Suburban Area. The student population is just over 75,000 with a combined racial/ethnic distribution of African American and Hispanic American and Other that comprises 62% of the student population. European Americans comprise 38% of the student population, a majority minority region. Fifty-five percent of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 12% are enrolled in Special Education and 10% are served by Bilingual ESL programs. The teacher pool consist of African American 3%, Hispanic 18% European American 78% and Other 1%. In 2004, TAKS were administered on all core subjects (Reading/ELA, Writing, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies). The passage rate by race/ethnicity was: African American 48%, Hispanic American 56%, European American 77% and Other 80%. Of the economically disadvantaged, 55% passed the TAKS.

Socks' Story: Miss Esther Pritchett

For Socks disclosure was not an issue; in fact, I believe that she was waiting for an opportunity to tell her story in full, and I provided that venue. She, like Connie, is very critically oriented. Her story is one of physical, mental and emotional abuse which centered on a teacher we will call Esther Pritchett. This experience was to influence her entire life, and it is both tragic and empowering as she recounts the pain she experienced as well as her resiliency and resolve to become everything that Ms. Pritchett was not. Teachers have a profound, and sometimes lasting, affect on the students they teach, and that influence can be either diminishing or empowering as they value or devalue the culture of the child, and therefore, the child and her family and community.

Socks, like Juanita, is critical of the hegemonic consequences that the push toward assimilation has had on the Mexican Americans in the area, especially children. When initially asked if she had personally been affected, Socks told me that she had experienced “mental, physical and verbal abuse as a second grader” in a county in her service area. (SR.I2.p.6.ll.249-250). I asked if she could talk about it, and she exclaimed “Yeah, you know what? I have found now that it is better to talk about it…You need to share it …because that is this area!” (SR.I2.p.6.ll.254-256). Socks’ story is about the cultural and personal devaluation she experienced because a teacher was stereotypical in her attitudes about Mexican Americans and did not perceive anything on value in the child’s culture. The story is dated, and the teacher eventually apologized; however, more subtle remnants of the attitudes and actions of Esther Pritchett still persist.

Before entering public school, Socks had experienced a nurturing home and school and described herself this way, “My self esteem was boosted and I was a confident little girl,” (p.6.ll259-260). She had attended a Catholic school, then a predominantly Black school where she experienced what she referred to as “good teachers.” “I just remember it was very positive. I was like her [the Black teachers’] pet. I felt good. You know, she was proud of me. I was reading,” (p.6.ll.264-265, 266-268).

Before entering second grade, her parents bought a house in a new development and registered her in a new school with a new teacher, “Mrs. Esther Pritchett. That was her name. I will never forget her name,” (p.7.ll.274). Socks said the experience with

Mrs. Pritchett transformed her from a “confident little 7-year-old. Happy, energetic, full of life, spirited” into “an 80-year-old woman during that year” (p.7.ll.275-278).

In the next twenty-two pages of transcript, Socks detailed her experiences with Esther Pritchett, her mother’s reaction to those experiences, and efforts to escape the abuses of this teacher. She talked about school experiences with other teachers (some good and some bad) and how she became empowered and, in turn, helped her mother to understand what was really happening to her and to eventually stand up for her. Interwoven into her story are subplots -- incidents from other facets of her life and her family’s as Mexican Americans in the areas. She also talks about college and graduation, and becoming a wife and mother and a teacher; however, she ends the story where it began, with Mrs. Esther Pritchett.

I am going to attempt to retell selected portions of Socks’ narrative. Of course, my telling could never match the intensity of Socks tale; the most I can hope to do is not to distort what she related to me, to afford a glimpse into the dynamics that work in many racial and ethnic families with issues of acculturation and assimilation, and to capture through Socks’ story the impact that teachers can have of the lives of the students they teach.

Socks recalled that her mother, who was a seamstress, used to keep her nails well groomed and polished and dressed her in the latest fashions of the sixties, including go-go boots. As the only girl in the family on her dad’s side, her aunts “showered her with all these little dresses and shoes”…I dressed like a little model. She hated the way I dressed.” Socks said that the verbal abuse started from that. Pritchett would make statements such as she didn't look like a lady – "You look like a tramp." Socks said she had never heard the word in that context. "So, I didn't know she was calling me a prostitute." Then, she began calling Socks to her desk and "hitting me, hitting me on my shoulders". Socks detailed Pritchett's harassments, but the crux of the story was that Socks became her target and the teacher enlisted the other children as accomplices.

At the behest of some of her classmates, Socks eventually told her mom what was happening and how much she disliked public school. Her mom's response was that it was just a transition period and if she just continued to be the best student, she would do well. At school, the abuse continued; Mrs. Pritchett continued hitting Socks, and she deployed a new weapon form her arsenal, refusing to allow Socks to go to the bathroom. She would accuse her of lying and just wanting to get up and move. The results, for Socks, was a humiliating experience made worse because her classmates were prompted to join in ridiculing her.

I asked Socks how that experience affected her attitude toward school and toward teachers. She answered the specific question and then told me how she, as a second grader, reverted to truancy to avoid Mrs. Pritchett's brutality.

> I was afraid. I didn't want to go to school. I got to the point where I didn't want to go to school, and I started staying at home and mom didn't know. I stayed off of school for a month until they found out what I was doing. What I started doing is that the front door to our house -- right across from the front door we had a little coat closet and so I'd let my brother go ahead to school. You know, I started not wanting to go to school again. And then my mother would say, "Where are you going?" and I'd say, "I'm going to walk to school with my friend." And she would say okay. Then my brother would leave. I would make sure he was gone and then after that I open it real slow and then I'd say, "Okay, mom. I'm leaving." And she would say okay. She was in the kitchen cleaning up, right? And I'd walk out the front door and I'd open that screen door and let it shut like I went outside, right? Then I'd have that closet door open and ready

> and I would just sneak in there and close it really tight. And then, after that I would hear mother cleaning up, finishing up and then she would take off and go to work. (SR.I2.p.9.ll.381-396)

I asked hopefully, whether the situation changed when she left Mrs. Pritchett's class. Relieved, she told me that third grade was so much better; however, the experience with Mrs. Pritchett made her very apprehensive. She said that before the year began she was afraid. "Oh, here we go again." When she saw her new teacher, her first question was, "Is she mean?" She said, "It is funny but after you start making all these assumptions…and I understand now in multicultural education…I know how it is to make assumptions. I was making assumptions when I was eight years old about people." (SR.p.10.ll.408-411) Socks immediately returned to Mrs. Pritchett as she talked about stereotyping and teacher expectations. Mrs. Pritchett preferred that Socks dress in a style consonant with her perception of a Mexican immigrant. "Luckily" Socks' mom was a seamstress.

> She would make me….and my dresses were long and ugly like peasant dresses because that is how she wanted me to dress. And I was trying to do everything to make her happy. Uh, she also, one time asked me when had I come from Mexico. 'When did you get here from Mexico?' And I said, 'I don't know.' And she said, Well, you need to know. Did you get here last year?' I said, 'No…. because I was for sure that I hadn't. She said, 'I want to know when you got here from Mexico. You go home today, you're going to find out when you got here from Mexico.' I went home and I asked my mom, and my mom said, 'You tell her that we've been here for years and years. I was born in Big Springs, Texas. Your dad was born here. He's been here in Carton his whole life. Your grandma is Indian. She was born in New Mexico.' And I said, 'I can't tell her that! I have to tell her we're from Mexico.' 'But, we're not, honey. We're not.' Mother is explaining this to me. So I found out about our history tree a long time ago because I had to!

I said, "I see." Socks continued. "I learned about genealogy because after that experience it made me learn more about who I was," (p.10.ll.442-443).

Socks' early, bad experiences alienated her from school, a seven year old truant, and eroded her self-worth and self-esteem. I asked Socks how long she encountered these negative experiences in school. She smiled and retorted, "You know what, if it hadn't been for Mrs. Richardson in third grade…they didn't laugh." I found that third grade was good, and fourth grade was excellent. These positive experiences allowed Socks to understand that Mrs. Pritchett was an exception, and that most teachers have their students' best interest at heart.

Socks had another bad experience with a teacher during her eleventh grade year, but by that time she able to stand up for herself. She was also able to place Mrs. Pritchett's behavior in a larger context as she realized how proud her family was of her and how much they loved her. Socks survived her school experiences and became empowered to stand up for herself. Her experiences also empowered her mother. The mother had gone through this same educational system and dropped out of school in the second grade. How ironic!

During a high point in her life, a gathering to celebrate her achievement as the first college graduate in her family, she interrupted the party to call Mrs. Pritchett. She made sure she had contacted the correct person, and then identified herself. Pritchett asked, 'Socks, is this you?' Socks said she became frightened but continued. She asked Pritchett, "'Why did you treat me like that? Why were you mean to me?'" "I started crying and I started asking her those things, you know. And she started crying.'" 'I'm so sorry. I'm sorry for the way I treated you,' (SR.p.17.ll.759-763). Socks would not forgive Mrs. Pritchett; however, she vowed that she would be a different kind of teacher.

> And in all my teaching every day I would say, Ms. Pritchett did that and you're not doing that. And so I made sure that I was not a traditionalist. I made sure that I didn't have those stupid reading groups. I made sure that I didn't sit my children in rows. Everything that she accused me of, I am unearthing right now. I didn't do it in '83. My principal loved me. They thought I was so innovative…I made sure that I taught everybody. (SR.I2.p.18.ll.795-796, 804)

Socks experienced the system from several perspectives—as a student, a teacher, a parent, and now, at the ESC level. She talked about the racism and the cultural bias she saw and experienced and which exist now in more subtle form; she describes her region as in a state of denial.

Goals, Roles, and Locations

Socks clearly supports education that is multicultural and social reconconstructionist. She believes that the entire educational system in her area needs restructuring. She is the only trainer who goes so far as to say that her region "really does not have a MDT program", though I am convinced that there are others who know this about their own regions. Socks is very outspoken and is, therefore, not viewed by many of her peers and supervisors as a team player. She provides an example of how a great many people respond to those who read the world critically; she has the reprimands to prove it. This more radical position is a precarious one. She like Connie is admired by her peers for taking a stand, but when the "going gets rough", she stands as the "lone wolf." She and Connie have been relieved of responsibility for MDT on more than one occasion, and, at the time of her interview, Socks was not optimistic concerning her longevity at the Center.

Summary

Sleeter and Grant (1987) identified five approaches to multicultural education: the teaching the culturally different approach, the Single group approach, the human relations approach, the multicultural approach, and the education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach. Gay (1994) described these approaches as “developmental, cumulative, and somewhat historical” (p. 15).

In their personal perspectives, three of the trainers (Adrianne, Juanita and Carolyn) present themselves as advocates of the multicultural education approach. Adrianne and Juanita have consistently used the REACH program in their training, and Carolyn is an advocate for REACH and used it regularly until her team broke up. Brenda and Crystal, also count themselves among those advocating the multicultural education approach; however in their training, they use a deficit model which conforms more to the teaching the culturally different approach. Angelica draws from several approaches. As a trainer in developing her three Cs—“Communication, Cooperation, and Collaboration”—she draws heavily on the human relations approach. In her capacity as a social studies consultant, she shifts emphasis. As she helps teachers embed multiple perspectives into their curriculum, her orientation is closer to the multicultural education approach.

As stated above Connie and Socks lean more toward the education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approach. Having such a leaning, it is surprising that Connie looks to federal and state intervention for solutions to the problems encountered in the implementation of MDT. Socks has located many systemic and individual impediments to MDT but offers fewer concrete ideas about how to remedy the situation. Each of the trainers, as do the teachers they train, approaches MDT from their racial, gender, and social class locations (Sleeter, 1992), and each must meet those who attend the training with that dynamic in mind if they are to achieve even a modicum of success at achieving the goal(s) that have been set for the training.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

> Standardization shifts both the control and the official language of educational policy into a technical mode intended to divorce the public from the governance of public schools.
>
> —L. M. McNeil

Introduction

One of the hallmarks of the public school system in Texas is its diversity. Two dimensions of diversity proved of great significance to this study. One significant characteristic of diversity is the size of the state; there are 254 counties and 1,042 school districts, ranging in size from Houston Independent School District with 200,000 students to Divine Independent School District with fewer than 20 students (Snapshot, 1998-1999 Pocket Edition, 1999). The other characteristic is the diversity of the student population in Texas: 14 percent African American, 30 percent Hispanic, 44 percent White and 3 percent Other. Forty-eight percent of the student population is reported as economically disadvantaged (Snapshot, 1999). Because regional ESCs and local school districts in Texas exercise a degree of autonomy, the first issue is tied closely to structural barriers to MDT. According to Greenman, Kimmel, Bannan, and Radford-Curry (1992) institutions are created within the boundaries of socially constructed realities and are woven with the fabric of these realities. What people consider the logical ways to do things, or the most valued or efficient way to solve problems or what is considered common sense, is so within this reality or from the perspective of their cultural world view (p. 90).

The second issue is structural as well, but it is also relational. In light of the predominately White teacher pool, it holds great significance for teacher resistance to MDT because of the diverse student population of which Texas is comprised. Cummins (1986) identifies three structural interactions that influence student achievement: classroom interactions between teachers and students; relationships between schools and minority communities; and intergroup power relations within society as a whole (p. 102). The interactions are all of great concern for multiculturalists as they strive to render the American dream accessible to all students and to build a more democratic nation.

As categories and themes which account for resistance to MDT in the State of Texas began to emerge, so did an unexpected pattern. Findings of my pilot study (2002) disclosed significant structural barriers to MDT; subsequently, this study was expanded to include them as an area of investigation. What I had not expected, however, was that, from the perceptions of Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers, structural barriers would overshadow teacher resistance to MDT. As structural barriers became the central issue, I found it expedient to turn the data upside down, moving from the regional level to the classroom level, in order to better contextualize the findings.

David Azzolina (1993) suggested that geographical region is a useful place to start in thinking about multiculturalism, because multiculturalism encompasses a regional view that acknowledges the value of different vantage points and environments. Hence this chapter begins by examining contextual factors that inhibit all M/DTs in their attempts to implement MDT and moves through the regional perspectives which differentiate responses to MDT, and in several regions constitute structural barriers. The next section discusses how lack of administrative support negatively affects MDT while the third section discusses the effects of the accountability system, particularly the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), on a complex of other issues (i.e. special education, especially referrals of students of color and students who are poor to special education; curriculum; instruction) which ultimately impacts MDT as administrators and teachers decide which professional development activities are worthy of support and participation. The following section elaborates on trainers' perceptions of special education as a dumping ground for two reasons. First, it has great impact on students of color and students who are poor because they are overrepresented, and this overrepresentation was the reason for establishing the Multicultural/Diversity Network and MDT. Second, trainers linked inappropriate referrals to special education to avoidance of accountability demands, namely to raise overall district and campus scores on TAKS by removing students whose scores could lower them. This part of the chapter addresses the second research question: What were the structural and personal barriers that impeded or prevented the trainers from effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training?

The second portion of the chapter answers the first research question: How is resistance to multicultural/diversity training manifested by educators who participated in the training sessions and by those who the trainers encounter in the school setting? This part of the chapter addresses the second research question: What were the structural and personal barriers that impeded or prevented the trainers from effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training?

Structural Barriers to Multicultural/Diversity Training

In several areas of the state, a perceived lack of need for MDT is a major structural inhibitor to such training as well as a philosophical reason to resist it. It is structural in the sense that, according to the trainers, the dominant perspective of the geographical area or region permeates the entire educational system in that region. As mentioned in the opening paragraph of the chapter, Texas is, by virtue of its size alone, very diverse. As I traveled to several regions of the state during this and my pilot study, I sensed appreciable differences in reactions to MDT. Two other contextual factors conjoin with differential regional perspectives to render responses to MDT problematic—ESC autonomy and the voluntary nature of MDT.

Contextual Factors as Inhibitors to MDT

Contextual factors are conceptualized as circumstances which are outside the actual MDT process but which exert pressure and influence on the process. These factors may be a derive from any number of existing conditions, for example: 1) they may be historical and deeply embedded, as in local perspectives, 2) they may result from organizational structure, as in the case of decentralization which led to even more local autonomy among the ESCs, and/or 3) they may be a function of long standing and unquestioned practices, as in the case of the voluntary nature of staff/professional development initiatives.

ESCs – Each One Stands Alone

Each of the twenty ESCs is governed by an 8-member board; seven of the members are locally elected, and the remaining member is appointed by the Commissioner of Education to represent charter schools. The MD/Ts, particularly Adrianne, Brenda, Connie, and Juanita emphasized that as long as a center remains in compliance with rather loosely interpreted State and Federal regulations they operate autonomously. The education service centers, in many ways, conform to the prevailing attitudes of the communities in which they operate. Therefore, MDT, because of its voluntary, nature could be more negatively influenced in ESCs which are located in regions harboring negative perceptions of multicultural/diversity issues. The issue of ESC autonomy is embedded as the trainers describe the differences among their regions. The voluntary nature of MDT is addressed more discretely at this juncture because a more detailed account of its impact can position its relevance for all of the regions; the negative impact of volunteerism was unanimously agreed upon by trainers and confirmed by archival records, and it serves to further contextualize the study.

Voluntary Nature of the Training

MDT, except by TEA or school or district administrator mandate, is voluntary, and the voluntary nature of MDT was one of the characteristics which seemed problematic at the onset of this research project. These workshops/trainings were not unique in this feature; however, several other factors coalesced to problematize the issue. First, archival data and M/DT reports confirm that throughout the state, multicultural/diversity workshops are the lowest attended workshops in the ESC's catalog of offerings. The M/DTs attribute this statistic to MDT location as a special education listing; many regular education teachers perceive the workshops as relevant to “them,” meaning so called minorities and those with special needs. It is ironic that these same individuals will seek out gifted and talented programs, which are also located under the aegis of Special Education.

Adrianne and Juanita point to a second factor which the others trainers agreed upon. Although other workshops, particularly those having to do with raising scores on state assessment tests, (TAKS) may be voluntary, testing is so critical for teachers, campuses and districts that they, in fact, become mandatory for those who wish to increase the scores of their students. The workshops are voluntary from the service center perspective; however, campus administrators can make the training mandatory for their staffs, and it seems appropriate to note that, according to Carolyn and verified by the other M/DTs, administrators are often in attendance, a factor closely related to a third issue of concern. The trainers agree that when administrators do not attend MDT, it sends a tacit message that it is not highly valued. For these and a number of other reasons, teachers seem to ultimately conclude that they do not need MDT.

Although, for the most part MDT is voluntary, when incidents of non-compliance with certain standards, such as overrepresentation of ethnic and language minorities in special education occur, districts or campuses are mandated to submit to MDT. The trainers concur and described the two distinct audiences that derive from either circumstance. The voluntary workshop participants are more likely to be open, less resistant to multicultural education, and proactive in their response to cultural differences; however, voluntary attendance is very low. In contrast, the audience whose attendance is mandated is more likely to be reactive and resistant to the information being offered in the workshops, but, because of the mandate, the attendance is high.

In the voluntary workshops, trainers are more likely to be "singing to the choir," so they are easier. Yet, the entire cadre of trainers agreed that the voluntary nature of the MDT operates to its detriment. Comments from one of the participants in the pilot study (2001) and Brenda's are typical of trainer response. Jane explains:

> We provide the training, but it is not very widely accepted or taken advantage of. As it is now, only people that are interested in that topic are gonna' come to our workshops. Participation is very limited, very limited. In fact, um, out of the trainings I have done over the last year, we've had less than maybe fifteen participants. The last session I did, I had six participants. (J.S. Pilot Study Interview, 2002. p.2.ll.45-49)

Brenda's experiences echo Jane's in the area of participation in workshops and a perceived lack of need for MDT in her region. She comments, "We conduct maybe two trainings a semester, but the request is not large for multicultural/diversity training because a lot of people in the area do not perceive that we need the training" (B.L.I1.p.11.ll.152-154). Brenda's observation speaks to the issue of how the perspective of the geographic region influences MDT.

Texas, Where Difference Is Large

The Multicultural/Diversity Trainers (hereafter referred to as M/DTs) confirmed that the regions respond differentially to multicultural/diversity issues and that the variations reflect the culture of the particular area. Unanimously they agreed that regions in East and West Texas were least likely to embrace or perceive a need for MDT, and, although they spoke affectionately of the I-35 corridor as more receptive, the data revealed that even along that corridor (especially in pockets of Central Texas) there is substantial resistance to multicultural/diversity issues and concerns. In both of our interviews, Juanita cited problems with resistance to MDT in East and West Texas, and in our second interview, she acknowledged an ongoing problem in a Central Texas region. She was hesitant to point fingers and, instead, rationalized that perhaps in more metropolitan areas or in regions in close proximity to universities people were more accepting because of the diversity of their populations. The trainers from the regions in question, however, were not at all reluctant to discuss their perceptions of the regions in which they work.

East Texas—Business as Usual

Brenda, a trainer in East Texas, agreed that where more diversity exists, people are more likely to address multicultural/diversity issues, but she added that in her area (where she was born and reared), it was simply a matter of racism. She explained that the largest populations in her area are White, followed by African Americans, with a small percentage of Hispanic and Asian Americans, that the communities are, essentially, still segregated, that many residents lack exposure to those unlike themselves, and that attitudes on race and ethnicity in the area have changed only superficially since the 1960s.

Area residents do respond to socioeconomic status. Brenda conducts a survey in preparation for training and reports, “since we do have such a high number of low socioeconomic children not doing well in our region, and because of the population make-up, the emphasis tends to fall on poverty more than different cultures or ethnicities

(BL.I1.p.ll.146-148). Brenda believes that the perception is shared by most members of the community, including school administrators and teachers. According to Brenda, "even the ESC has blinders on" (BL.I1.p.ll.156).

Angelica, another East Texas trainer, identified the major issue in her area as one of White privilege, especially among White, middle-class males. She concludes:

> These people feel like it is their right to respond, to act, to do whatever they want to do and that everybody else should be in check or know "their place". When a Black person is articulate and professional it is seen as being out of the ordinary. I see education as the key to stop the stereotyping (AJ.I1.13103.p.6.ll. 39-42).

She, like Brenda, was also born and reared in the region where she now works. For these east-Texas trainers, low rates of attendance and participation, unless mandated by the state, results from the perception that MDT is not needed, which is, in turn, a function of a conservative perspective, which Brenda describes as racist and Angelica conceptualizes as a function of White privilege. The trainers content that many European Americans in these regions assess their success as earned through hard work and ability and attribute any lack of achievement on the part of others to innate deficits in the individual or the group(s) to which the individual belongs. They, particularly White males, do not recognize the "White privilege" that Angelica perceives as evident. In both regions of race, and to a lesser extent ethnicity, is taboo.

West Texas – Assimilationists Deny a Problem Exits

Socks, a third generation native of her region in West Texas, provided a number of examples of how resistance to MDT mirrors the total local culture. She also reminded me that many rural areas were very diverse or, at least, bicultural. Her own region is significantly comprised of a large number of bilingual residents as well as residents for whom Spanish is their primary language. Her accounts can be compared with an inverted pyramid; she began at the broader community level, moved to the service center level and concluded at the level of campuses and classrooms.

Socks avowed that the resistance to MDT in her region reflects attitudes of the community at large, including education service center staff, and school personnel at all levels—a Eurocentric, monocultural, monolinguistic orientation. Another prevalent attitude is that race and ethnic relations have moved forward substantially as expressed in statements which are variations of the "things are not like they used to be" theme. Socks believes that educators in the region refuse to acknowledge that problems exist; she describes them as in denial. Despite such attitudes, Socks offers numerous contradictory examples to affirm her assertions.

One example, which was unproblematic for her coworkers, involved hiring patterns at the ESC, which, according to Socks, demonstrates insensitivity to the diversity of the area, lack of efforts to be proactive about recruiting people of color to the regional service center, and the perception, on the part of staff, that an overwhelmingly Anglo staff has the knowledge and commitment to address the needs of all students—a colorblind perspective based on denial and privilege.

Socks described the make up of the staff at the service center and the negative response of center administrators to criticism. She said that the top administrators were all Anglo, and of the 150 consultants, there are five Hispanics and no Blacks. Socks told me that if staffers complain about these numbers or incidents which take place in the schools, they are reprimanded. At the time of her interview, she was concerned about her status, because she refused to remain silent. She describes being reprimanded on many occasions and being seen as a troublemaker because, “I question everything and because I tell them this is the way things could be” (SR.I2.p.22.ll. 993-994).

Sock is the only trainer who was actually told by an ESC administrator that MDT was unnecessary. Toward the end of our second interview, I asked Socks what she would change about the MDT program in her region, she sighed, “You know we really don’t have one. In reality we don’t have one. They don’t see the need for it. They told me we didn’t have a need for that in our area” (SR.I2.p.23.ll.1022-1029).

Socks became more thoughtful as she recalled a second incident. When she began working at th ESC, she was told that she was to become a member of the Multicultural/Diversity Network (SR.I2.p.24.ll.1075-1076). Socks shared her opinion that her supervisors did not expect her to take the position seriously; however, she did. After attending her first training session with Juanita, who, as described earlier, is a REACH advocate and trainer, she was energized and expectant. However, when she returned to her region and attempted to replicate the training, she was deflated. “They don’t even advertise and market my workshop because ‘we don’t need it, we don’t have a need.’” My administrator is Sonia. She said, ‘Stay away from that. We don’t need that’ (SR. I2, p.24.ll.1086-1087).

According to Socks, her director’s response reflects that of the entire region. Having lived in the region her entire life—experiencing it as a student, teacher and parent, she said that for some reason she expected the regional level would be different.

> Now that I get to work at the regional level, it’s everywhere, and it’s worse in our smaller, rural areas, where we have large, large Hispanic populations like in

> Venice. I mean, just right next door to …Mexico. You should see how they are so against bilingual education. They are so against multicultural education. They are so pro one-language, pro one culture. That's it. That's the way it is going to be. (SR.I1.p.5.ll.214-220)

Socks was not deterred by her negative experience; she defied authority and continued her practice of inviting "unwanted guests" into her training sessions. She may have had the right idea, but those in positions of power did not share her perspective as illustrated by another incident, which took place at a meeting of the Texas Association for Superintendents and which will be described below as an incident of lack of administrative support.

Socks described an almost totally Eurocentric community where Spanish-speaking residents are the numerical majority and the African American population is substantial. Those in power, European Americans, do not see a need for MDT. They, like the dominant residents in the East Texas communities described by Angelica and Brenda are privileged, but do not recognize it. They take a paternalistic attitude toward "others;" even ESC administrators, as indicated in their estimation of MDT and in their hiring practices, feel that they are equipped to effectively address the issues of a majority minority community—in its liberal form, a missionary perspective; they will see to the needs of the "natives" as they deem best.

Central Texas – "My Way or the Highway"

In a long passage, Connie juxtaposes examples ranging from training offerings to local billboard advertisements to generate a feel for what she describes as the overall perspective of people in her region of Central Texas—a perspective which she perceives as xenophobic and assimilationist. She says that any workshop mentioning race or ethnicity “would be the kiss of death,” (CB.I2.p.1.ll.39). Likewise, she says that workshops related to strategies for engaging parents of culturally and linguistically different students have low attendance, and she describes it as structural as well as a function of a Eurocentric perspective—“It is not seen as a high value…people don’t like to discuss it” (CB.I2.p.1.ll.42-42). Connie categorizes the attitude as resistance based on “deeply held beliefs” that “if you are not White, middle-class speakers of Standard English, you are somehow not truly American, an attitude which she perceives as pervasive in the region.

> You can see if you drive around…if you go down the highway and you see a big billboard that says ‘American owned motel.’ …What they really mean, is what you really expect to find is a White person who is speaking Standard American English. That’s the real expectation. I can take you just a few blocks from this service center to a neighborhood that is very culturally diverse, but right there on [parkway] next to a Vietnamese coffee shop is a liquor store that says ‘American Owned, Support Americans,’ right next to the Vietnamese, as though if the person is Vietnamese they are not somehow not a real American. (CB.I2.p.1-2.ll.44-48, 56-62)

A second anecdote suggests the influence exerted by outside pressure. Connie was called in to conduct training for an entire school district because of remarks that were made in the local press, and was convinced that press attention was the only reason she was called in – the district relented to pressure from the local community. The incident, if Connie’s perception is correct, serves to illustrate how districts and campuses, as suggested by Juanita, can use MDT to meet minimal requirements or to respond to a crisis situation as opposed to truly embracing its concepts and principles. Connie described the incident then concluded that, likewise, it will require outside intervention for MDT to be taken seriously in her region.

Connie's final scenario depicted overt racism which exist, and is obviously tolerated, in her region. The school in question is private and therefore has certain latitude in admissions policy; however, it appears that it comes dangerously close to breaking the law since it does, in fact, receive federal, state and municipal funds. Connie described a school established by German immigrants which was housed in a Roman Catholic Church; she and her team were there to prepare the school for a state District Effectiveness Compliance (DEC) visit. Connie reminded me that schools are required to have a plan for accommodating non-English proficient students, then recalled:

> And they assure us that they won't ever come, that their plan is to send them to a nearby town—that they will not be able to enroll in their school. They will have to go to a nearby town! If someone of African descent who works for the service center as a consultant goes to these districts, that person's not allowed to use their restroom. And so we still have these kinds of blatant racism that still are going on. (CB.I2.p.3.ll.95-110)

Crystal, a trainer in a different region of Central Texas, is equally blunt as she describes many people in her area as "backward." As an example she described reactions when Gary Howard [founder of REACH] came to her center. Her goal was to establish REACH as the training program used in MDT. Some of her co-workers had been trained and "seemed to be on board." She reflected, "I don't know what I was thinking" (CJ.I1.p.4.ll.186, 188). She observed people looking around and then concluding, 'We don't want to do this.' "He [Gary] got up here and people said yes, they wanted to do it, but they didn't want to do parts of it," (CJ.I1.p.4.ll.189-191). Crystal recalls that the parts they did not want to do were those having to do with race and ethnicity, in particular.

During the course of our interview, Crystal did soften her opening description when she admitted the error of her own presumptions and the realization that she had to learn to meet people where they were before attempting to move them forward. The most positive aspect of Crystal's comments concerned the level of support that she received from her center director, an important element for Angelica and Juanita as well. Amidst the xenophobic community perspectives described by the trainers, when their executive and special education directors supported them, the ESCs became safe islands in a sometimes-turbulent sea.

Crystal discussed two seemingly important factors that were not mentioned in any context by a majority of the M/DTs. She is the only trainer who stressed the importance of going to the community in an effort to affect change, and she is much the activist. Three trainers, she, Carolyn and Juanita talked about staff turnover, a significant factor for MDT because as trainers begin to develop trust, cultivate a team and increase attendance, many leave the ESC. The most often cited reasons for staff turnover are workload and negative responses to MDT which some M/DTs take personally.

Crystal has been able to make inroads for MDT by cultivating relationships and embedding MDT into her other functions. However, she admits that she continues to face enormous challenges because of the underlying belief systems of typical area residents, who are assimilationist in their perspectives about culture and diversity.

South Texas—English in America

In South Texas, demographics demand attention to multicultural/diversity issues, especially linguistic issues. Several districts in regions of south Texas are comprised of “majority minority” student bodies; in one school district, for example, 94 percent of the student body is Mexican American. An irony, shared by Socks in her region in West Texas, is that much of the resistance to multicultural concepts that Juanita encounters originates in the Spanish speaking community. Juanita provided two examples. The first incident occurred as she and a visiting guest professor addressed Spanish speaking residents about the rights of their students to be tested in Spanish. Juanita recalls incredulously, that the residents did not believe her. The second anecdote demonstrates how people, in this case teachers, participate in the devaluation of their own culture as they accept the values of the dominate culture as superior to their own or do what they feel is expedient or in their self interest.

> But for many of us we were so assimilated and acculturated that we’ve got teachers now who don’t value the linguistic and cultural diversity of the students with whom they work even though they are the same Hispanic ethnic group. In fact, sometimes they are harder on kids than your European American because they remember the pain of being so different. They don’t want the kids to go through that pain, but in so doing, they’re bringing about new pain. (JE.I2.p.23.ll.1018-1024)

A second concern, registered earlier by Crystal, is one that is shared by ESCs in general but has significant impact on MDT, staff turnover. Juanita attributes the turnover to two factors. The first is that people neither understand the whole issue of cultural diversity nor the impact that it has on special education. Mischievously, she adds: “Or maybe they don’t want to understand it. Like I said, this is not a topic that people say, “Oh, give it to me! Give it to me! Give it to me! I want it! I want it!” (JE.I2.p.20.ll.894-896) More seriously, she continued:

> Very few have the intestinal fortitude to be the person to go and share information with people and have stuff just roll off your back. In other words,

> you are…we have gone to places where you, the messenger, have been killed, you know. Sometimes I have been asked to go and do a workshop in a certain service center area because they don't want to face their administrators with the news. It is like, "Yeah, we'll send you to do it. You're a guest and they behave better with a guest." (JE.I2.p.20.ll.897-909)

Juanita shared Crystal's experience with reactions of superintendents to the REACH program, which is relevant both here and in the section on lack of administrative support, which follows. Her recollection of the event supports Crystal's perception. Juanita explained that Gary Howard was brought in from Washington, a "European American, highly educated gentleman, theologian as well as an educator, to deal with European American males" (JE.I2.p.21.ll.916-918). Of Howard's reaction to the group, she reports, "and he says, 'Boy, that radar screen just went up,'" (JE.I2.p.21.ll.918-919). Juanita concluded, "And here is this gentleman from the same gender, same ethnic group, middle class just like many of them, also same socioeconomic group, except he had a different perspective on cultural diversity" (JE.I2.p.21.ll.919-921).

The particular incident occurred in Central Texas, in Crystal's region, but Juanita said she had had similar responses in other locations. As a trouble shooter, leader in the Multicultural/Diversity Network, and knowledgeable senior consultant, Juanita reminds those who resist of their obligations upon receiving federal funds through TEA but noted that some of the ESCs have representatives on the network simply as a matter of compliance.

> …when they signed up for that money, as TEA says, they signed up for the money they MUST do what they said they were going to do. So some of our service centers had a representative just as a matter of compliance, and it was a

> team of one. Well, you can only do so much in a region when you are a team of one. (JE.I2.p.16.ll 713-717).

Juanita was pleased to report that other ESCs “bought into it [MDT]” and developed teams of individuals from a cross section of the education community.

Lest, the reader become impressed with a totally bleak picture of the regions and the ESCs, Juanita and Crystal also share the benefit of supportive center directors, and although Juanita’s experiences, like Crystal’s, are not all supportive, she attributes much of the success that she has enjoyed, and maybe even her longevity as a trainer, to the support of her center and special education directors and her coworkers.

Juanita contrasted centers whose leadership is supportive with those whose leadership is less supportive and demonstrates how support or lack thereof is reflected in the trainer’s attitude, job satisfaction, and approaches to training. Juanita, Crystal, Adrianne, and Angelica are noticeably more optimistic than their counterparts, Brenda, Carolyn, Connie, and Socks who experience less support

It is necessary to offer a caveat at this juncture. Regional education service centers are most often associated with small and medium-sized school districts; however, even metropolitan and large suburban districts, as indicated in Regional and District Level Report to the 78th Texas Legislature (2002), rate the ESCs and their consultants very highly in their efforts in the areas of “professional development, technical assistance, administrative support and an array of other services” (p. 7). As indicated by Juanita, Brenda, and Adrianne, regions in which universities are located and form partnerships with schools and districts in major metropolitan areas having very diverse populations tend to respond more positively to multiculturalism and pluralism and, therefore, MDT. In fact, many of the larger school districts hire specialist, who essentially perform many of the functions that ESC consultants perform for small and medium size districts. The most resistant regions are the smaller, more isolated regions. The lack of support evident for multiculturalism and diversity permeates from the regional and local community level to district and campus level administration and eventually ferments a campus and classroom culture that eschews multicultural/diversity issues as important influences for student success.

Lack of Administrative Support—Districts and Campuses

While discussing the differential regional responses to multicultural/diversity issues Crystal and Juanita shared their experiences with resistance to REACH founder Gary Howard's presentation among superintendents in a Central Texas region. Juanita reported that she had experienced similar negative reactions in other regions. Although trainers agree that the REACH program is more likely to be rejected than others used in MDT and Crystal describes Howard's presentation style as radical, which may be true, the experiences of seven of the eight trainers suggest that lack of administrative support for MDT is pervasive and deeply embedded. Trainers described a wide range of behaviors among central and district administrators which indicate their nonsupport such as: 1) total refusal to engage issues of culture and diversity, 2) rudeness, 3) sarcasm, 4) insensitivity, and 5) defiance.

Trainers also acknowledge that the workloads of district and campus administrators and central office personnel may preclude participation and undermine support for MDT. However they include other contributing factors. One has to do with delegation of responsibility. Crystal framed her comments in terms of effects. She thinks the administrators do “have their hands full with trying to run the district and stay in compliance, and they delegate to those below them—and those below them. ‘I don’t have time to do this. I can’t do this’” (CJ.I1.p.10.ll.456-57).

> So it just keeps delegating down until nobody has time to learn how to be culturally responsive to each other, and so, therefore, they keep doing the same-o, same-o-thing. And they keep asking, ‘tell me how to teach these black kids, tell me how to teach these Hispanic kids.’ I mean that is it. It all boils down to that. (CJ.I1.p.10.ll.455-462)

What it boils down to is a second factor, the use of MDT to attend to crisis situations. Brenda, Carolyn, Crystal, Adrianne and Juanita think that too many of those who do participate in MDT are in search of a “quick fix” which is usually linked to poor performance on TAKS. Lack of knowledge is another factor in both nonparticipation and resistance to MDT and as Adrianne counseled, racial/ethnic groups are not a monoliths, tremendous intragroup variability exists; she thinks that if administrators recognized the link between MDT and academic achievement, support would increase.

Juanita, Carolyn and Connie’s responses were initially unique, but once stated, I asked others if the statements were reasonable. They unanimously agreed. Juanita maintained that for many administrators “a lot of the diversity issues being addressed at the school level are there because of compliance … rather than an issue of what is ethically and morally correct,” (JE.I2.p.8.ll.358-359). Carolyn said it was hard to break through the resistance with campus administrators; she said, “They could be “so tied in with their campuses that they can’t get away to learn something new” (CW.I1.p10.ll.427-429), or, she added sarcastically, “Maybe there is “an unwritten rule in the district that says, you know, that campus administrators cannot attend," (CW.I1.p10.ll.430-432). In contrast, Carolyn observed, "Yet, I look around, and I see other people who are in content areas…in the state assessment stuff…the TEKS and TAAS [TAKS], that pulls in administrators" (CW.I1.p.10.ll.433-435).

Each trainer, except Angelica, provided more detailed examples of or comments about lack of administrative support. Four of these are included because they illustrate that this lack of support exist at both the district and campus levels, and it exist in several areas of the state, which supports the perceptions of the trainers that the problem is pervasive in Texas. As a result of the status of the individuals involved, their lack of support has great impact on MDT because campus administrators and teachers take their leads from the district. Campus administrators set the tone for their teachers and staffs, and their attitudes send tacit messages about what is valued. Decisions about which staff/professional development initiatives are worthy of time and commitment rests in the hands of these administrators.

Socks provided two scenarios, both connected to an impending District Effectiveness Compliance (DEC) visit; one is described below. The incident took place at a Regional Meeting of the Texas Association for Superintendents (alluded to earlier), to which Socks had invited a university professor who talked with the group about dual language programs. One of Socks responsibilities is to assist the group in preparation for TEA evaluation of district effectiveness in the area of Bilingual/ESL compliance. Her evaluation of superintends' response to the issue, precluding her assessment of their personal characteristics, was concrete. When the professor concluded his presentation, Socks was embarrassed over the superintendents' rudeness, "They got up and left. They didn't care. They didn't value it. They'd say, 'We don't need that,'" (SR.I2.p.25.ll.1118-1119).

An interesting point of the experience is that the consultant was not at all surprised. As she began to apologize for the superintendents' actions, Socks described the professor's response. He had come in from South Texas, but this was not his first encounter with administrators in this West Texas region. He assured Socks:

> 'Oh, no. I know this area. Don't worry. I know how they are. It didn't offend me any. I am not staying. I am going back.'…Oh, gosh. Thanks a lot. We have so many Esther Pritchett's in our system and all those attitudes are still filtering down. (SR.I2.p.25.ll.1128-1129, 1131-1133).

The Esther Pritchett allusion refers to individuals who reject and devalue cultures which are different from the dominant mainstream Eurocentric culture of most communities and schools.

Connie describes a glaring example of a district administrator's insensitivity to Spanish speaking students in her Central Texas region, an attitude which, she maintains, impacts English language learner achievement in schools and which also alienated parents who were attempting to partner with teachers to help their students succeed. The district in question had been sanctioned by TEA; yet, in the face of negative consequences for the district, an individual at the highest level of district administration persisted in her efforts to thwart district compliance with state regulation regarding books in the Spanish language. Her actions speak to the "rumblings" and deep-seated nature of belief systems which Connie also refers to as one reason teachers resist MDT. Connie reminded me that the state requires the availability of books in Spanish and emphasized that her meeting was with central office personnel and the superintendent—“The superintendent!” (CB.I2.p.3.ll.100). Despite state mandate and the fact that they had been “written up” for noncompliance, the meeting was over whether the district should purchase the books.

> Finally, the superintendent broke in and said, ‘We are going to buy the books, the Spanish books.’ A White female, native speaker of English, indigenous to this county -- I don’t know if she has ever been out of it—stormed. She is second in authority in this district—the superintendent’s right hand woman, I guess you would want to say. She stormed out of the meeting in anger. It made her so angry that they were going to buy books in the Spanish language. So, I can tell you one little episode after another like this. And that is the undercurrent of why the structural resistance is there. (CB.I2.p3-4.ll.143-150)

Connie raises important questions, though rhetorical, in relation to the woman’s response and to other incidents to which she had alluded:

> Why would this woman who is an assistant superintendent of schools let anybody out to find out about teaching the linguistically diverse people? Why would anyone in these districts let someone out to go find out about African-Americans when they don’t want an African-American to use their restrooms? It is just – you know, are they going to tell the public this out front? No. (CB.I2.p.3-4.ll.151-155)

She, in several instances, spoke of “nativist undercurrents” and “this noise in the background” which permeates the educational system in the region despite outward appearances of compliance. Connie concluded: “But you have to be inside. You have to be like me. You have to be a White, middle class, native speaker of English with a Ph.D., and they think that you agree with them” (CB.I2.p.3-4.ll.163-167).

This is a conversation that should never have taken place. The superintendent and his staff were aware of the State’s mandate prior to being written up, but as Juanita suggested, had chosen to “play at compliance” until the state, in Connie’s words, “put some teeth in the laws” and meted out consequences for noncompliance.

During our second interview, I asked Brenda to identify structural inhibitors to MDT. Lack of administrative support at the district and campus levels was the first issue that she addressed. She made the point that administrators need to know their district and their campuses in order to address weaknesses, and said she did not believe that “administrators are aware of what they are faced with” (BL.I2. p.3.ll.112-113). Brenda’s perception is that most administrators in her East Texas region are preoccupied with TAKS scores and that as long as the schools exceed state standards, they are satisfied.

> Administrators are not inclined to disaggregate data or to look at whether students in special education or those that are economically disadvantaged are succeeding in school…We are still struggling to try to get that principal to come and hear that information. (BL.I2. p.3.ll.114-117, p.5.ll.182-192)

Brenda made the point that there are exceptions, but they are rare; that is why she says she can not make it mandatory that teams attend MDT, or as Connie attempted, require the principal to accompany his/her staff. She compared her situation to that of a drowning person, explaining that she was reaching for straws and would grab whatever she could get.

Carolyn, in North Central Texas, said it was hard to break through the resistance to MDT with campus administrators because that is not their focus.

> Their job depends on their campus passing or meeting these state assessment levels. And, you know, I can’t fault them for it, but I am going, you know, if you would back off and you would look at the big picture of your campus, look at your culture of your campus, I think it might improve if you learned some skills to interact with your parents, with your community, with your teachers and with the kids. And, you know, I know that there are principals out there that are very adept at doing that. (CW.I1.p10.ll.439-443).

The principals are out there, but as Carolyn, Brenda, Adrianne and Juanita attest, they are less typical than those who do not genuinely support MDT.

As indicated by the foregoing responses and mentioned in the introduction to the chapter, it is impossible to maintain discrete categories and/or themes because the issues are interrelated and overlap. Discussions of lack of administrative support included discussions of budgetary and funding issues, priorities and perceptions, constraints and possibility; however the most salient dimensions of lack of administrative support for MDT are philosophical resistance and the impact of the state accountability system, specifically TAKS assessment, on districts and campuses. The trainers, particularly in small and medium-sized districts and in identifiable geographical locations, perceive a philosophical resistance to multicultural education and diversity that permeates their regions from the local community through the total educational hierarchy. This generalized resistance also affects the regional ESCs, and, in some cases, has contaminated them.

Trainers unanimously agree that the state assessment system has the greatest impact on district and campus decision making in every area of operation. It impacts curriculum and instruction, pedagogical practices and patterns of social interaction. Most important to this study, it impacts student placement as well as perceptions and decisions about what is important for teacher/staff professional development.

Accountability and Multicultural/Diversity Training

Texas has been in the forefront of the standards and accountability movement in the United States. By statue, “the accountability system was designed to improve student performance, Texas Education Code (TEC) 35.063 accreditation standards and TEC 35.041 academic excellence indicators" (Alford, 2001, p. 110). Unfortunately, the M/DTs in this study suggest that the accountability system may have had unexpected negative effects for students who are not members of the dominant culture and students who are poor. In examining their perceptions and experiences it is important to keep in mind that they are special educators first and view MDT through those lens.

The Dumping Ground

During my pilot study (2002) and earlier interviews, trainers' perception of special education was that of a dumping ground for students who did not perform well on TAKS. Despite federal and particularly state intervention, which recommended that regional education service center trainers focus more on the pre-referral system in an effort to reduce overrepresentation of culturally, linguistically, economically, and educationally disadvantaged (CLEED} students in special education, that perception has not changed substantially. The trainers hold that in their efforts to raise test scores, administrators, teachers, and professionals continue to misdiagnose and misplace students at an alarming rate, an issue that will be considered in a discussed of lack of knowledge in the school setting. Lack of knowledge as well as cultural bias factor into overrepresentation, but the M/DTs place a great deal of culpability on the accountability system, more specifically, administrator, teacher, and professional staff's reactions to it.

All of the trainers agree that self interest plays a part in inappropriate referrals; however, Adrianne was the most outspoken on the issue. When I shared with her that an individual, who wished to remain anonymous, had described educators as consciously using special education as a “dumping ground”, she was not startled; instead, she shared one of her own experiences:

> Oh, I could tell you some stories. I know a principal that—I will tell you these stories because I worked as a diagnostician for a few years, and I actually had a principal call me on the phone five days before they were to take the TAAS and said to me, ‘I need you to come over to this campus right now because I have a list of kids that I need to be exempting from taking the test.’ (AB.I2.p.11.ll.457-462).

My reaction must have indicated that I was taken aback, because Adrianne affirmed, “Now, that is my personal experience. That is not from hearsay. That is what I experienced (AB.I2.p.8.ll.326-333). This was a very blatant act on the part of the principal, but the other M/DTs assured me that the practice was not an anomaly.

Another tactic described by M/DTs whose regions, or districts and campuses within the region, have substantial African and/or Hispanic American students is to try to eliminate these students’ scores from the accountability system. Connie’s experience is an exemplar. She asserts, in Texas special education placement results in two positive outcomes for the districts, they receive more funds and the students whose scores could negatively affect district rating status are pulled out of the accountability system. She reports, “At one time in Texas as much as a quarter of the kids in Texas were never tested on TAAS for various reasons.

The M/DTs attest that teachers will go to great lengths to make sure their classes score well on the test. They scramble to refer students to special education and also to concentrate on the TAKS because: 1) evaluations and accountability become involved, 2) there are less than significant consequences for inappropriate referrals to special education, and 3) referrals, even if inappropriate, are in the best interest of the teacher.

Connie observed that teachers were not rewarded on the basis of such questions as, "Do your African Americans students in your district score at the same level as the Anglos? If they do, you get money and recognition (CB.I1.p.3.ll.150-152). She maintains that the problem is even more acute for immigrant students who are told to stay home on test day and whose parents often conform because "many do not have any papers" and are therefore are "easy to intimidate, and you just tell them" (CB.I1.p.4.ll.181-182). She also reported incidents of principal contacting employers to spread the word that students were not to attend class on test day, and she said that those who did show up were likely to have their tests taken away. She contrasts this with the treatment of European students, "They never take a White kids test away from him. And the word never goes out to an employer, don't send the White kids to school next week; we're giving a test. Tell your people" (CB.I1.p.5.ll.191-193). Connie challenged me:

> And it's on the web, you can look at high schools…who took the test?...the number of Hispanics, the percentage of Hispanics, the percentage of African Americans, etc…But you can actually see this in data in the absentees…You look in the data, you'll see…on test it's called other (CB.I1.p.5.ll.193-196).

Connie's statements were made prior to the new requirement that all students be tested; Adrianne and Juanita explained that now, even students with profound disabilities must be tested and must show signs of progress—AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress).

Since I conducted my pilot study several changes had taken place in the nature of the multicultural/diversity program: 1) since CLEED student represent a high percentage of no passers, even more emphasis has been placed on passing state tests; 2) other M/DTs, at the behest of the state and federal governments, have, unwittingly, joined Connie in her call for data based training, and there is increased interest in and funding for training that comes under the multicultural/diversity banner. However, the training is focused on socioeconomic disparity as evidenced in the increased use of COP training as opposed to the REACH training program, and there is less attention to the affective domain.

Five of the M/DTs, Adrianne, Brenda, Carolyn, Connie and Juanita, believe that special education referrals have increased, the emphasis of MDT has become more cognitively oriented, and those who attend MDT do so for the wrong reasons, chief among them, to appropriate instructional strategies that will raise the test scores of students of color and students who are poor. The M/DTs had much to say about three issues as it relates to high stake testing as a priority and the affects it has on either MDT or on student outcomes: lack of attention to the affective domain, the impact of TAKS on instruction, and the impact of TAKS on MDT.

Lack of Attention to the Affective Domain

Juanita best expressed the experiences and perceptions of the trainers with diminished concern for the affective domain. In her judgment, “The primary structural barriers, or the systems barriers, that I see is that we know that the affective part of school, the affective domain, is very important, but we are not putting our money where our mouth is, so to speak” (JE.I2.p.11.ll.466-468).

> Again, systematically our systems are focusing on that accountability system and everything else is secondary to that accountability system and many of our…the system hasn’t realized, or ideologically they haven’t realized that whatever happens here affectively is going to have an impact on what happens behaviorally. It is going to have an impact on what happens cognitively and it is going to have an impact on what happens academically. (JE.I2.p.11.ll.469-474).

All of the M/DTs support Juanita's assertions that too many educators still have not recognized that learning is emotional, and that when students feel safe and accepted and emotionally positive, learning will take place. Whether each would characterize it as the primary structural barrier may be questionable; however, they agree with Juanita that educators are harping on "student performance but forgetting that learning is what takes place in the mind, and teaching is what takes place outside of the head" (JE.I2.p.11.ll.478-480).

> Now, when we do a lot of teaching behaviors, in hopes that the learning is taking place, but learning is emotional. It's tied into a child's emotions and how they feel accepted and valued as an individual, and I think that our system has forgotten that a little bit. (JE.I2.p.11.ll.481-484)

All of the trainers support Juanita's thesis; Adrianne, Brenda, Carolyn, and Connie were equally moved and vocal on the issue. Adrianne applied the issue more generally, while Brenda linked it to cultural misunderstanding resulting from behaviors which often result in behavioral referrals for students whose interactional styles and experiences are different from those of the teacher. As previously established, Carolyn believes that teachers and administrators do understand the impact of the affective domain but that they have other priorities. Adrianne, agreeing with Carolyn, said the state's priority is measurability and that what is measured or graded, is what becomes mandatory, and "Right now what's measured and graded is the TEKS. See?" (AB.I2.p.3.ll.126).

The trainers' somewhat heightened consensus is that nothing else seen to matter; they are unable to get educators to understand the importance of the affective domain, or the connection between that domain and students' academic performance.

> …it is hard…to get people to understand that when a child comes into a classroom that if the child doesn't, first of all, feel valued, if they don't feel safe, you know. If these things are not in place then they are not going to perform for you. If anything, they are going to disrupt, you know. (AB.I2.p.3.ll.129-134)

The M/DTs observed that educators either ignore or do not make the connection, and hypothesize that all the instructional strategies in the world will not raise test scores or close the gap if they continue to only concentrate only on the cognitive domain.

TAKS' Impact on Instruction and on MDT

Berliner and Biddle (1995) stated that the "drill and (s)kill" methods resulting from the blitz of standardized testing also kills critical thinking and creativity through what they label "mind boggling strategies" (p. 306). The M/DTs arrived at a similar conclusion concerning the effects of TAKS on instruction, which they then connect to MDT. Brenda said that training was becoming more TASS [TAKS] centered than child-centered, and that if students are passing TAKS, educators perceived every thing as going well. She answered affirmatively when I asked if she thought that TAKS was driving instruction and agreed with the other trainers in their assessment that it was affecting pedagogy or the way people teach in negative ways.

The M/DTs concluded TAKS has produced several negative effects for instruction. First, it takes away creativity. Teachers are using drill and (s)kill" technique, the curriculum is being narrowed, and many teachers are unwilling to make accommodations to ensure the success of all students in their classes. Brenda notes:

> Teachers struggle with putting learning styles with individuals anyway, so when you have a state test that you are trying to ensure that the students pass you tend to focus more on…the test…rather than what…strategy or task …could be conducted to support student learning. In other words, you are making sure

> everything is centered around that TAAS rather than centered around the child. (BL.I2.p.1.ll.30-35).

The trainers say that another effect of TAKS is that some teachers have come to equate having students score well on the TAKS with good teaching, which, in turn, colors their perception of the need for MDT. When students score well, teachers believe that they are already good teachers, which raises the next point. Too many teachers are "teaching to the test."

The trainers do not place the blame solely on the teachers. They join Adrianne and Juanita in the opinion that the state could have done a better job of marketing the whole idea of TEKS. Adrianne explained that all the teachers needed to do was to follow the state curriculum, which is based on Bloom's taxonomy—a fact of which many teachers remain unaware.

The trainers understand that teachers should be emphasizing higher level skills such as comparing and contrasting, synthesizing and evaluating rather than reciting, identifying or filling in the blanks; however, as Adrianne relates, "You don't know that unless you look at that curriculum, unless you look at those objectives. And if you teach the way the objective is written, then the child will do fine on the test" (AB.I2.p.9.ll.367-370)

TAKS Impact on MDT

It is evident that Adrianne has strong opinions concerning the impact of TAKS on other aspects of educational practice. First, she believes, and the other trainers corroborate, that performance on the state administered test (TAKS) is a priority at every educational level in the state of Texas; consequently, training programs that address that issue are the one that will be highly attended. Therefore, MDT has to be linked to (TAKS/TEKS)—not a new concept. The M/DTs confirm that they have been trying, unsuccessfully in most instances, to help teachers and administrators to recognize the connection between the two for years. Adrianne said that there is a huge rash of new training at the ESC in TEKS and TAKS, and that at the campus level principals are in a panic—they are only approving training for teachers that have to do with increasing test scores. Using her experience as an example, she affirmed, "When I began to market REACH, showing how REACH can even help you in improving your test scores, then you would see some interest. So, some kind of way, you have to tie REACH into the state testing" (AB.I2.p.2.ll.87-89).

Juanita also understood the connection and the strategy that Adrianne described and explained that workshops which address the TEKS are mandated; teacher attendance, however, is not "officially" mandated. The M/DTs have a clear understanding of the practical aspects of the choices educators make about what training is valued. They agree that teachers who want to do well on TAKS must understand TEKS and will, therefore, attend those workshops. They also agree that teachers are "so overwhelmed with everything they have to do that sometimes they've not had the time to really sit there and read that curriculum document that by first…second…third grade my students have to have these performance behaviors down" (JE.I2.p.10.ll.430-436).

The TEKS workshops dissect or map the state curricula so that teacher can understand for what and when they have to prepare their students. Teachers immediately, and without persuasion, see the value in attendance. Juanita concludes, "So, many of our workshops are not mandated, but if you want the kids to be successful you better know about TEKS" (JE.I2.p.10.ll.440-448).

Juanita's responses support two positions taken by Adrianne. One, there is a precedent for mandated workshops or training, though not explicit, and two, most regular teachers do not systematically examine the state curriculum; they do not understand that it is based on Bloom's Taxonomy. However, because having their students pass the state assessment test is important to them, personally and professionally, and to the district, they will attend training that meets that objective. Juanita grasped and expressed the essential point, "And so, if that is the priority with the district and with the state, then that is going to be priority with the teachers. Yes, ma'am" (JE.I2.p.10.ll.447-448, 450). Carolyn concurs with Adrianne and Juanita regarding the impact of TAKS and delivers the bad news for MDT.

> …in this past year we have noticed a big decline in workshop attendance, and I think that's just due to the more emphasis on the kids passing TAKS. I think principals are being more resistant to letting their teachers out except for staff development that will directly help kids pass TAKS. (CW.I1.p.1.ll.21-25).

Trainers unanimously agreed on the tremendous impact that the state accountability/assessment system has on every aspect of schooling. They are also keenly aware of the consequences for administrators and teachers, as well as students, when students do not perform well on tests. Low passage rates have resulted in loss of jobs and funds, personnel transfers and demotions, sanctions, and threats of as well as actual school closings. The state accountability system affects every aspect of schooling. Describing the "real" attitudes of educators regarding state testing, Juanita surmised, "I think their real attitude is, 'Do what we have to do to pass that state assessment.' Okay?

That is what's driving our schools today, their performance on state assessments" (JE.I2.p.2.ll.53-54).

Resistance to MDT in Training Sessions and in the Classroom Setting

Multicultural/Diversity Training is a part-time focus for all M/DTs. Most of the trainers devote less than fifteen percent of their time to MDT, and that is usually in spent in "blocks" while they are in the process of preparing for a specific MDT event. The trainers do, however, have numerous encounters with administrators, professional staffs and teachers in their natural milieu as they provide technical assistance in several circumstances, including: 1) preparation for DEC visits; 2) workshop dealing with other functions for which they are responsible; 3) proactive on-site (the campus) staff development regarding issues of culture and/or diversity, which derive from site-based management or school plan initiatives; and 4) reactive state and/or district mandated training. Consequently resistance to MDT is examined in two parts, that which occurs during the MDT sessions and that which occurs in the school setting.

Teacher Resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training

When trainers talked about resistance to MDT, three categories of responses emerged. The first category, by frequency of mention and degree of intensity, dealt with content—content of the programs used by the trainers, and content in terms of topics or issues examined in the training context. A second category had to do with the why of teacher resistance.

Responses to the questions of what and why teachers resist MDT reflect the participants' world view or philosophical perspective, which trainers perceive as predominately conservation, and at best liberal as conceptualized by Sleeter (1996). Responses to why teachers resist MDT are also grounded in their philosophical perspective, and spotlight deficiencies in teacher knowledge about multicultural/diversity issues, lack of exposure to people who are different from themselves, and how belief systems are maintained. Responses to the question of how illuminate the lengths to which participants will to resist knowledge that challenges their deeply held value and beliefs, conceptualized as cognitive dissonance (Fessinger, 1957). I attempted to discuss each in turn, but as is typical in conversation, there is much overlap.

Educators Resist the Structure and Content of MDT

As discussed earlier in the text, one of the major problems at the inception of the Multicultural/Diversity Network was confusion over a definition of multicultural education and concepts surrounding the issue. The Multicultural/Diversity Trainer Profile revealed that most of the trainers had either no formal coursework or limited training in multicultural education. To allay the confusion that erupted because of lack of knowledge or seemingly contradictory information, the network members decided to engage trainers in a common training process. The first program authorized by the State was Gary Howard's "Respecting Ethnic and Cultural Heritage" (REACH) followed closely by Ruby Payne's *A Framework for Working with Adults and Children in Poverty* (COP).

Six trainers, the exceptions are Connie and Angelica, would prefer to use REACH as their primary training tool, but only Adrianne and Juanita, actually use the program, as prescribed, in their MDT sessions. The four, who do not use REACH, stated that they encountered resistance in varying degrees when attempting to use the program. Of the programs used by the trainers, the content of REACH is most aligned with the principles of multicultural education; its five principles are: multiple perspectives, everyone has a culture, the global bridge, head, heart, hands and healing, and co-responsibility. Ruby Payne's *Working with Children and Adults in Poverty* is based on an examination of different socioeconomic statuses and patterns of behaviors, attitudes, and values of individuals inhabiting different SES levels. The upper class is treated rather superficially. The middle-class is valorized. The lower classes are in need of help; educationally, they need to be prepared to enter the mainstream. The content of COP is aligned with the teaching the culturally different approach.

The trainers agree that participants are more likely to resist the REACH program; while ironically, there is more resistance to COP among the M/DTs, for example: three view it as stereotypical, and Connie adds an opinion that it is non-research based; Angelica deems both programs as too restrictive, and Carolyn said that COP had become redundant in her region. The two trainers who use the program, on the other hand, do not perceive COP training as stereotypical; however, their intentions are to gradually move toward a more multicultural approach and to embed multicultural concepts into other functions, such as parental involvement.

The M/DTs unanimously agree that educators are more likely to resist REACH than any of the other training programs in use, and they resist both the structure and content of the program. There are two closely related structural issues (here structure refers to the component parts of the training) which trainers identified as sources of resistance to the REACH program—self examination and disclosure (through personal stories). Another issue is that participants often come to the training with expectations that are different from those of the trainers. While trainers are hoping to bring participants to an awareness of themselves as cultural beings and, ultimately, to help them appreciate the importance of culture in the teaching/learning process, educators, overwhelmingly teachers, want instructional strategies that will assist them in dealing with particular children—usually children who are different from themselves. Participants, like the preservice teachers described in so much of the multicultural literature, share the societal taboo against discussing race and ethnicity, let alone racism, especially in a public forum.

Educators Resist the Structure of REACH

The M/DTs observed that the reasons the two identified structural factors regarding MDT are sources of resistance include both discomfort and disquietude, lack of trust, unwillingness to examine deeply held beliefs, attitudes and values, and fear that if they are moved toward a different perspective they will have to act upon it. More specifically, the trainers believe that educators resist structural components of REACH because of the dissonance participation in these activities/processes might cause. Six of the trainers, Adrianne, Brenda, Crystal, Connie, Juanita and Socks, identified avoidance, denial, anger, guilt, and fear as well as nonattendance as responses to self-examination and disclosure.

Looking in the Mirror

Adrianne, Crystal, and Juanita understand that self-examination is hard work and that the difficulty of going through that process differs according to one's level of cultural awareness and racial-identity development. As indicated above, such examination can result in emotional responses, and many people are just not ready to admit their biases, prejudices, and/or complicity in social inequalities, even to themselves. Adrianne stresses that cultural awareness and self-reflection involve a protracted process, and that we all are at different stages of development.

> One thing about the REACH training is, the REACH training is structured in a way that it really allows a person to really look at themselves, as who they are. And I think for some people, they really struggle with that, you know, because you are having to confront yourself. (AB.I2.p.1.ll.14-17)

Crystal appreciates the pedagogical elements of REACH but, like Adrianne and Juanita, recognizes that those are the aspects that scare some participants away. She described the process as pedagogically sound because "the natural state would be for people to work through things" (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.106-107). She also knows that the questions that are raised are hard ones. "What do I know about other cultures? How do I feel? Am I prejudiced? What is beyond the surface of what we project out?" (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.109-111). Crystal differentiates between REACH and other program, particularly COP, when she affirmed that it was not about me [educators] coming in and talking about other people. She says what makes it scary is, "This is talking about where I am on the program. And they do it in a really neat kind of way, but it is a little scary" (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.110-111).

Juanita understands the struggle that participants can have with self examination because she made some unexpected discoveries about herself as she experienced the process; her experience seems to capture both the essence of what the educators experience and the points made by the M/DTs.

> …it's [REACH] one which can make people very uncomfortable because it does make you look at what your cultural belief systems are. It does make you look at yourself as a cultural being. It does make you look at your biases. So it's a program by which a mirror is put to your face and sometimes those of us that know we're not the best looking creatures in the morning, and some of us aren't ready to look at ourselves**. …**With the Culture of Poverty, it is focused on students. REACH is focusing on you and sometimes that can be very scary for an individual. I know that when we went through REACH as participants there were some issues with me that I did not know I had, and my reaction to what was being said that I was like, I didn't realize that I had that bias deep within me. (JE.I2.p.6.ll.232-244)

Fear of Disclosure

Crystal cited the issue of disclosure as a major reason that participants in her area resist the REACH program. In her response, above she mentioned that REACH could be scary; she said it is particularly so "especially if you've got people around you that you know, and you may not want to share right at the beginning" (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.113-115). I simply said, "Yes," and she continued, "So that was one of the criticisms of the training" (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.122). Referring to a public forum among co-worker and friends in some cases and strangers in others, she said that people were not comfortable sharing their "deepest darkest" in such an environment. "It was a disclosure issue, bottom line," (CJ.I1.p.3.ll.130).

Juanita makes the point that some participants are resistant the entire three days of her training, and much of the resistance is demonstrated by an unwillingness to participate.

> We do not force them to participate. We welcome them to participate. We ask for active participation. That is the other ground rule. And other workshops where it comes to the point that their lack of participation may be having a negative impact on the group I have gone to them personally and privately and asked them if there is something that this workshop is not offering them that perhaps we can work at offering them or if this is something they're not ready for they're welcome to leave and that we would gladly talk to whoever sent them to let them know that the individual wasn't ready at this point. So we do give them the option. (JE.I2.p.7.ll.292-300)

While in Crystal's region disclosure is viewed as the major cause of negative response to REACH, and response to disclosure is mixed in Juanita's region; Adrianne views disclosure as one of the more positive elements of the training that she and her team conduct.

> What does it look like? What are the attributes of surface culture? What are the attributes, characteristics of deep culture? And then we ask them to explore their own cultures. So it is really an individual activity where they think about their own culture, and they think about what things are happening in their life that help to influence them—to shape them and mold them into the person that they are today. You know, and all of those are aspects of their culture. So they do that and then they get the opportunity to share with someone else, so they get to hear somebody else's story. So all over the room there are all these many stories. You know? And they are all wonderful stories, and they are all fascinating stories. (AB.I1.p.5.ll. 177-186)

Five of the six M/DTs who have used sharing stories as a part of their training have experienced resistance to the process. What seems to account for different degrees of resistance is the level of readiness among educators participating in the training. This bolsters the trainers' proposition that more urban, more diverse regions and districts which have proximity to colleges and universities are more likely to entertain, and even seek out opportunities to dialog about issues of culture and diversity.

Crystal represents a region that is self proclaimed conservative; the local terrain is unwelcoming to pluralism. Juanita's region is a "majority minority" (Hispanic American) region; language issues necessitate attention to culture and diversity, but lessons from the past encourage an assimilationist perspective. In fact, Juanita reports that Spanish speaking residents are likely to express a great deal of resistance, which is also a generational issue in the Spanish speaking community. Adrianne works in a major metropolitan urban region. The population is very diverse (the major groups within the student population are European, Hispanic, and African American followed by a rapidly increasing and diverse Asian population). She has access and cooperation with colleges and universities in her region, and her team members are well grounded in issues of culture and diversity. The differences in response to disclosure could have been predicted. The M/DT trainers also agree that participants resist the content of REACH on at least three grounds: 1) they have no interest in theory, 2) they are reluctant to discuss race or ethnicity and, therefore, social inequality, and, closely related, 3) they experience dissonance over the messages of REACH.

Educators Resist the Content of REACH

Educators are as resistant to the content of REACH as they are of its structure. The reasons are slightly different and so are participant reactions. The M/DTs were consistent and specific in their views about why teachers, in particular, resist the content of MDT; chief among them is a generalized resistance to information that challenges their deeply held attitudes, values and beliefs. These individuals are more likely to simply not attend. Others believe they are already good teachers of all student and therefore do not need to attend. Many of those who do attend agree with the perspectives of the presenter(s). For those who attend and resist, the M/DTs agreed upon two reasons for resistance (there are nonincluded others)—differing trainer/participant expectations for the training and reluctance to discuss certain issues, particularly race and ethnicity.

How Do I Teach This Child?

The M/DTs and the educators who participate in the training often hold different expectations for the workshops. Adrianne said, and all of the trainers concur, many of the participants want "a quick" fix rather than a discussion of theory and principles of multicultural education or the challenge of self reflection, evaluation, and change. This quick fix usually has to do with how to teach or deal with the behaviors and academic underachievement of students who are different from themselves. Carolyn's experience provides an illustration of conflicting expectations. She was called by a principal and asked to conduct a half-day staff development presentation on diversity. She attributed the resistance that she experienced to "miscommunication." She may have correctly identified the cause of resistance in this instance; she also summarized an experience that every M/DT has had.

> I went out and started presenting on cultural reciprocity, honoring differences, and that turned out not to be what a few of the teachers wanted. They wanted instructional strategies for how do I teach these little black kids, how do I teach these Hispanic kids. Tell me what to do. How do I teach the Asian kids?…They want somebody to come in and say this is how you do it. Here are your tools. Here are your materials. Go home and read them. Implement them." (CW.I1.p.2.ll.69-74, 79-84)

When Crystal and I talked about the same issue, her response was almost identical to Carolyn's except that when asked how to teach students who are members of identifiable racial and ethnic groups, she explained, "Until I meet that little black boy or little Hispanic boy or whatever, I don't know exactly because I can't tell you that all the black kids that walk into your classroom are going to act the same way!" (CJ.I1.p.10.ll.455-457). Metaphorically, Crystal concluded, "They want a cookie cutter recipe kind of thing, and so I try to express to them within every classroom you don't know who is there" (CJ.I1.p.11.ll.461-461). Adrianne, Angelica, and Juanita addressed the issue in more theoretical terms, stressing the importance of understanding the differences among race, ethnicity and culture, intra- as well as inter-group differences, and the danger of treating racial and ethnic group members monolithically.

Race, Ethnicity, and Culture: Taboo Issues

Resistance to REACH is also a function of a more generalized reluctance to discuss race, ethnicity, and even culture. Every trainer acknowledged this reluctance on the part of teachers/participants, but they often stressed one issue over the others and differ in degree about their perceptions of the significance that teachers place on race, ethnicity and culture for student achievement. The range varies greatly, including: 1) a view of total irrelevance; an appreciation for difference as manifest in acknowledging holidays and heroes, sharing foods, music, dance, and stories; and 3) a content integration approach, usually in English and/or social studies classes. The trainers also differ considerably on how they deal with these issues when they arise. Connie explained that any mention of race, ethnicity, or culture is "the kiss of death" for her workshop; yet, she persists in confronting these issues, often to the dismay of her "superiors." Angelica and Brenda avoid these issues as much as possible, with Angelica "letting sleeping dogs lie" and Brenda couching her training in poverty because "teachers can relate to that." She says when your are drowning you reach for what is at hand; she is hopeful that in interpreting the data on disproportionate representation of students of color in special education and the gaps in the test scores between students of color and students who are poor in comparison to their middle class European counterparts participants will develop awareness that something is amiss and their interest will be peaked to investigate the intersections of race, ethnicity and culture as factors in the problem. When I asked Angelica what happened when issues of race or ethnicity emerged, she responded:

> What I find is that in this area the people accept the poverty training more so than they would the REACH training. The REACH training takes educators through different perspectives and how each perspective might deal with certain issues. A lot of times people in this area don't want to deal with race or any of those types of issues. They would rather just not bring it up. You have heard the saying, "Let sleeping dogs lie." That is kind of what this area is like. (AJ.I1.p.5.ll.232-238)

I persisted, "So when issues of race and culture come up, how do participants typically respond?" Angelica was frank, "Do the best you can and use a method—whatever surface method you can use. Don't go in depth. Just sweep it under the rug as much as possible" (AJ.I1.p.5.ll.238-240). I did not want to know what Angelica did; I wanted to know how participants reacted, so I ventured again. "So, you don't bring up issues such as race or anything. What do you do if that issue comes up? What would be some typical response?

Angelica decided to play my game. She asked, “Children or educators?” I answered, “Your participants.” Angelica concluded: “My participants. They will listen, probably whisper, make notes, accept whatever you are saying and then take that information and do nothing with it” (AJ.I1.p.5.ll.250-252).

Crystal reported that the teachers in her region, likewise, are reluctant to engage in discussions of race, ethnicity or culture except in superficial terms but that she does not avoid these topics. However, as I sat in on three of her MDT sessions, I observed several unexploited opportunities to address issues or race, racism, and ethnicity. Culture was the centerpiece of her presentation—the culture of poverty. Adrianne, Carolyn, and Juanita deal with race and ethnicity as they conduct workshops using the REACH program; however, like Crystal and Brenda, culture is the centerpiece of their presentation. They embrace the principle that everyone has a culture that shapes who we are. In inducing this awareness of their own culture, the goal is to help teachers appreciate and ultimately take into account the importance of culture for students who are different from themselves—“We are alike because we are different.” Socks seldom does MDT workshops, but as she encounters teachers, administrators, and professionals in the school setting in her region, discourse on race, ethnicity, and culture are all avoided as irrelevant to student academic achievement.

The dissonance that is created among teachers/participants as they encounter messages that challenge their deeply held attitudes, beliefs, and values was discussed by each of the trainers and described as manifest in discomfort, anger, guilt, shame, denial and avoidance, but it was not fully elaborated. In describing what teachers resist, the trainers touched upon philosophical resistance which recurs in subsequent sections dealing with school culture and teacher bias. The fact that the discussion of trainer as well as participant response to content was so lengthy and so detailed has every thing to do with the very structure of the workshops—an issue that was not raised by the trainers, but which is discussed in some detail in the concluding chapter.

Educators Respond Differentially to REACH and COP

It is evident that the M/DTs experience more resistance, to content and structure, when using the REACH program. They do not typically have the same experiences with COP. The majority of the trainers (Angelica, Brenda, Connie, Crystal and Socks) concluded that educators in their areas are more comfortable with socioeconomic issues because they can more readily relate to them. For example, in Brenda's region, fifty percent of the population lives in poverty. Connie says educators are complicit in the "blame the victim" ideology. In the workshops, they like to "beat up on the poor," then they do not have to look at themselves, which leads to Adrianne and Juanita's assessment that focus makes the difference—REACH requires educators to examine themselves, COP puts the spotlight on others. An important outlier, stated explicitly by Crystal and suggested by Adrianne and Brenda, is the probability that the responses of educators of color to REACH and COP are the inverse of typical European educator responses.

Educators Resist MDT in the School Setting

The typical prepackaged MDT does not allow for genuine dialog between the M/DTs and the educators who participate in the training. In the school setting, however, the M/DTs observe and respond to curriculum, pedagogical practices, special education referral and treatment processes, and the climate or culture of the campus. Necessarily, many of their experiences with educators related to multicultural/diversity issues result from their field work. This may prove of greater value than off-site MDT for identifying resistance because the campus and the classroom is where cultural sensitivity, cultural competency, and acceptance, respect and honoring difference or the lack of such really counts.

As a result of conversations with educators (administrators, professional staff and teachers) and observations of school practices, the M/DTs realized that resistance to issues of culture and diversity and MDT results from a Eurocentric perspective which is manifest in educators' attitudes, school culture, and school practices.

A Eurocentric Perspective—From the Sidewalk to the Classroom

Seven of the trainers provided compelling examples of how "White privilege" or "Whiteness" or "Eurocentrism" played out in the local geography of their regions. At the campus level, the M/DTs experience resistance to multicultural education and MDT in conscious as well as unconscious efforts on the part of educators to maintain the status quo, and the status quo regarding culture and diversity is to ignore it or to make it a problem for someone else. The five themes of resistance which emerged from M/DTs experiences in the school setting are: 1) maintenance of a Eurocentric perspective, 2) negative attitudes about multicultural education and MDT, 3) lack of knowledge which results in mistreatment of students such as misdiagnosis and inappropriate referrals, and invisibility and devaluation; and 4) fear and misunderstanding about the families and communities from which students come which result in low expectations for students.

Maintenance of a Eurocentric Perspective

The M/DTs continually recounted experiences which signaled an emerging theme. Although Angelica mentioned “White privilege” especially among White males as permeating her region only once, she did so in a very matter of fact a manner. Brenda and Socks characterized their regions as racist, and Socks and Crystal described the regions in which they worked as backward. Sock and Juanita insisted that the perspectives in their regions were monocultural, monolingual and, therefore, assimilationist, and that cultures other than the dominant Anglo, middle-class culture were devalued. Carolyn underscores the lack of respect for difference in a region that is, ironically, one of the most diverse in Texas. Adrianne, Juanita and Connie are distressed over consequences for students of color which results from a lack of attention to multicultural/diversity issues. Connie refers to the complex of attitudes described above as a “my way or the highway” mentality.

I subsumed the attitudes as maintenance of the Eurocentric perspective, a perspective, which the M/DTs, particularly Adrianne, Brenda, Connie, Juanita and Socks, observed, enters the schools along with administrators, professional staff and teachers. They interspersed comments about their experiences with cultural and teacher bias throughout their interviews.

One of the more interesting aspects of their experiences was cultural and teacher bias was the strength with which educators hold on to beliefs, attitudes, values and assumptions, even in the face of evidence which contradicts their validity. Cultural bias is so strong that people will "buy into it" to their own detriment. Connie's experience during an MDT session is a case in point. She was preparing diagnosticians and teachers for a DEC visit. Prior to the training she describes, she had attempted to use chi square, the statistic used by the Federal government to highlight disproportional representation of students of color and low income student in special education, to explain the need to address the issue. Having had negative reactions from mostly White, middle-class, female teachers, she came up with some research and data that she thought would open their eyes or at least allow them to accommodate alternative explanations for the disproportionality other than the conservative view that it looks normal.

Connie used research on the lack of female superintendents in public education which showed that although eighty percent of the educators in her region area are female, ninety-six percent of the superintendents are male. She contextualized the data for the group by explaining that the superintendent's job does not require "special strength" nor the ability to "run real fast" nor jump high," and that women superintendents seem to be able to "play golf, spend money, schmooze, go to board meetings, just like men. And nobody can find women superintendent that do such a worse job than men do. And yet you have this disproportionality. (CB.I1.p.14.611-614)

Describing the teachers' reaction, she reported, "They do not see it" (CB.I1.p.599). I asked, "Why?" Responding that it was cultural bias, she shared the rationales that some of these women used which included: women were not prepared, women were not trying, and women did not want to be superintendents.

> And that's the way it looks...So they don't see the cultural bias. So one of the jobs I have is trying to convince them to look at their own culture. Cause first

> they have to look at their own culture. So they don't understand who they are, and they don't even understand that they have culture. They really don't. They are normal. And everybody else is weird or exotic. (CB.I1.p.14.618, 622-624, 638-640)

The other trainers provided examples of similar incidents; the one above illustrates how ingrained beliefs can and do become, the strength of ideology which can move an individual or group, consciously or unconsciously, toward acceptance of widely held attitudes, beliefs and values, even those which operate against their interest, and how individuals and groups resist information that contradicts their deeply held attitudes, beliefs, values and assumptions. This resistance, which the M/DTs insist is based on a Eurocentric perspective, is one of several themes which emerged through their description of experiences in the school setting; four other themes illustrate the tenacity of the Eurocentric perspective made explicit in the school setting.

Educators Display Negative Attitudes toward Multicultural Education and MDT

The MDTs agreed on three points concerning campus administrators: 1) they set the tone for their campuses, 2) for the most part, they do not support MDT unless it is mandated, and 3) their lack of support contributes to lack of attendance at MDT and lack of transfer of training (received through either MDT or technical assistance) to classroom practice among those who support the content, rationales, principles and strategies presented and wish to implement them. The reasons for lack support of MDT that campus administrators give and/or that the trainers perceive were enumerated earlier: 1) principals are too busy to participate in MDT, and subsequently delegate that responsibility to others, except under mandate; 2) MDT is not a priority for principals; 3) they do not see the connection between MDT and TAKS, which is their highest priority;

and 4) many administrators are conservative and assimilationist in their perspective—they subscribe to a biologically deterministic explanation for the achievement gap between student of color and students who are poor as normal and, therefore, beyond remedy, and/or they do not believe that the cultures of students is relevant.

The M/DTs agree that at the campus level, the fact that administrators do not recognize the connection between MDT and TAKS and that negative attitudes about students of color and those who are poor have the greatest impact on resistance on resistance to MDT. In the first instance, priorities, limited resources and lack of knowledge are factors. Administrators not only do not attend MDT; they often refuse to release teachers to attend because they view it as irrelevant.

In the second instance, too many administrators proceed from a deficit model regarding students of color and their families and communities. The M/DTs also believe that conservative, and even liberal, perspectives of administrators lead them to assimilationist practices. Students and their families are expected to conform to dominant cultural beliefs, values, and interactional patterns, while, according to the trainers, many administrators do not find much of value in cultures that are different from their own. Connie locates the problem in a "lack of honoring" difference, and the M/DTs contend that teachers take part in the process. A final consideration is that in some instances, even when an administrator wants to make changes, the existing school culture may be stronger than the administrators' ability to affect change.

Campus Culture – "The Lounge Lizards" et al

The trainers identified a group of teacher and professionals who are complicit in maintaining the status quo and whose tactics include passive resistance, that is, pretending to go along with initiatives aimed at making the classroom more culturally sensitive but having no intention to make the necessary changes to bring it about. Angelica said, "They listen, take notes, then do nothing." According to the trainers, there are several reasons that these teachers resist all forms of MDT.

A major reason for resistance is that some teachers do not believe that culture is relevant to student academic achievement. They believe that "one size fits all," often adopt a color blind perspective, and think that to discuss or recognize difference is divisive. Adrianne, Brenda, Connie, Juanita, and Socks assert that educators who hold these beliefs teach as they were taught and without regard to differences that changing student demographics have engendered. Juanita describes them as assimilationist and their perspectives as harmful to students. She and Socks contend that teaching from a monocultural perspective lowers the self-concept and self-esteem of student who are not members of the dominant culture and that the burden of change rests with the students and their families.

Predominant examples of this attitude were taken from trainers' experiences with English and social studies teachers who present one historical perspective or include decontentualized works of authors who are members of racial/ethnic groups. The trainers observed, however, that not all resisters stop at passive resistance or confine their resistance to their own classrooms.

Connie coined the term “lounge lizard” to describe teachers who actively resist MDT in the school setting by ridiculing those who would attempt to implement more culturally responsive practices in their classroom. The reasons for this active resistance are also varied. Some see MDT, in whatever form, as just another passing trend. The M/DTs acknowledge that veteran teachers have seen so many “reform” measures come and go that they are cynical regarding all change efforts. They feel that if they just wait it out, “This too shall pass.” Adrianne explained that this attitude was also prevalent regarding TAKS, but they were to learn differently. Unfortunately, as demonstrated in previous sections of the text, MDT does not have the same support or force from those in positions of authority.

Others feel that MDT usurps time that should be spent on “core academic” subject areas, and still others simply believe that MDT has no place in mainstream schooling. There is a core of material that students need to learn, and including culturally sensitive materials and practices will erode academic excellence. Regardless of the reason, the resistance is there, and it exerts a great deal of influence. Connie provides an example of a case where the principal did support ME, but the culture of the school was so entrenched that he, as well as his team, were intimidated.

Connie explained that she provided training to an entire school district that had recently become “majority minority.” Following the formal training sessions, a principal as well as his team of teachers expressed trepidation. Connie uses a trainer of trainers model, so participants are supposed to be empowered to go back to their campuses and implement aspects of the training. She recounted the teams’ response:

> We can't really bring this back because we've got some white teachers that are going to be really mad. And we don't feel like we're confident to go back. See my training is TOT [trainer or trainer]; they're supposed to be empowered to go back and deliver. They said well we agree with you, and we like what you said, and we like all the material and all that, but we're afraid of the other teachers. We don't think we can stand up and say this. (CB.I1.p.10.ll.495-497, 498-501)

When queried, in a follow-up interview, as to her perception of why the staff felt so uneasy, Connie identified the source of the anxiety as cultural bias and reiterated her opinion that systematic change was needed. In her opinion, the way to bring that change about was through outside intervention at the federal and state levels because the fear of resistant, and powerful, teachers, who Connie dubbed "the lounge lizards," not only resist MDT but intimidate those who try to make changes.

> And you can get in a lot of trouble because the lounge lizards will be after you if you don't do to suit them, but you can see to really solve this problem you're looking at systemic change. And until the federal government in the area of special ed. and the state government in the area of state testing, accountability, puts some teeth in there so that the push is toward equity and getting all kids an opportunity to learn at the highest possible level, and the push is to change the teachers we honor, who would be the teachers who were willing to make the effort to work with kids to get them at as high a level as possible rather than just sorting and selecting…(CB.I2.p.7.ll.309-315)
> .

The responses of the participants reflect their lack of efficacy as well as their perception of lack of administrative influence. There would be no transfer of the training to their school setting. The trainers are aware that principals exert differing degrees of influences on their campuses; however, it remains that administrative leadership is a major factor in total school culture and a critical factor for any type of school reform. This is particularly true for MDT.

A final group of teachers resist for more practical reasons. They believe that implementing multicultural principles and practices and teaching for diversity will increase an already burgeoning workload. Closely related to this, trainers report that many teachers do not feel competent to implement multicultural/diversity initiatives and they are unwilling to commit time to gaining needed information. The M/DTs all recognized that, again, TAKS would raise its head. The time that teachers do commit to implementing change is most likely devoted to increasing TAKS scores.

Socks' example of the Hispanic principal is applicable here as it highlights the power of culture, ideology, and hegemony at work in the school setting. She, like Despite Connie example, the trainers continue in their attempts to garner administrative support they because that if principals supported MDT, the school culture would be more conducive to implementing principles and practices that support multiculturalism and plurality, and the "lounge lizards" could not prevail.

Lack of Knowledge—Mistreatment of Students

Misdiagnosis and Inappropriate Referrals

At the professional level, Connie, Juanita and Brenda consider lack of knowledge a major factor in misdiagnosis and misplacement of students. While providing technical assistance to a district in Bilingual/ESL (one of her primary responsibilities at the ESC) Connie uncovered such misdiagnosis and misplacement of students of color and provided two specific illustrations of the occurrence, which other MDTs who have the function as a responsibility corroborate. The first had to do with placing students, particularly African and Hispanic Americans in speech therapy because they speak a dialect or have accents. A speech therapist, pointing to a female, African American student told Connie that she talked just like her mother. Connie responded, "Well you know, I talk like my mamma too" (CB.I1.p.11.ll.526). Connie was describing an experience shared by Juanita. What the therapists were doing is turning speech therapy into elocution classes. The therapist did not seem to understand that unless the child shows speech problems, expressive or otherwise, in her native language, whatever the dialect, there is no problem. Connie's example is typical of the experiences shared by trainers, Connie, Juanita and Socks among them, who have ESL/bilingual as a major responsibility.

> I mean we had them in this particular district—they were doing speech therapy to second language learners. 'Well is this person,' I said, 'Well are you doing the therapy in Spanish?' 'No.' 'Do you know if they have the problem when they speak Spanish?' 'Well, they don't have it when they speak Spanish.' I said, 'Well, they don't have a problem.' I said, 'What you're doing is, you're doing elocution lessons—you're doing—they don't belong in here.' But they don't want the kids, they said, 'Well these kids aren't going to be successful.' (CB.I1.p.11.ll.531-537)

One cause of such misdiagnosis and misplacement is lack of knowledge, but, as indicated above, even the lack of knowledge has to do with cultural bias as exhibited in the attitudes of the teacher and professional about potential for student success. It may also be a function of the education they received at Eurocentric institutions of higher education. Juanita, describing her own preparation as a speech therapist, opined: "I was taught only how to assess from an English speaking perspective," (JE.I2.p.4.ll.166-167).

Metaphorically, she spotlights the impact of this miseducation or partial education as a probable cause for some of the difficulties existing in her region with regard to English-language learners—difficulties which negatively impact students who attend schools in districts within her region.

> For example, at Region J we had twelve school districts that had a data element rating of 4. If that were an airport that's the red alert high terror, you know, warning level. Data element 12 is the possible overrepresentation of limited English proficient student in speech therapy. So, when we looked at that, we said, Twelve out of 33….hmmmmm…' Then we had seventeen that had rating 3. That's like your orange light at an airport. That means, like, danger, Will Robinson., you know? So we were quite concerned that more than half of the school districts here at Region J may have a possible overrepresentation of limited English proficient students in speech therapy. So when we looked at that we said, 'What could be the reason this is happening?' Well, one, limited English proficient students are not having trouble, but are learning a second language. Two, perhaps the bilingual program that is being utilized is not being utilized as the district wished for it to be utilized. Maybe it is utilized differently at different campuses. We're perhaps having bilingual programs that are not truly bilingual programs. They say they are, but it is an English only class. (JE.I2.p.4.ll.145-163)

Juanita understood the problems of other professionals and empathized with them. She hypothesized further: "Well, perhaps the speech pathologists don't have the skills that they need to assess children that are linguistically diverse" (JE.I2.p.4.ll.164-165). The problem is compounded when teachers, who are often the first professionals to identify a potential problem and make the referral, have more limited training, if any, in diagnosis of special needs. Juanita concluded, "Our teachers are referring children who truly are learning a second language, and they're misidentifying them, in their [the teachers] minds as a speech impediment" (JE.I2.p.4-5.ll.171-172).

Juanita's description, analysis and hypothesis illustrate the extent of a problem that seem to have evolved from both lack of knowledge (training from a Eurocentric perspective) and cultural bias (support for English only, even when the districts are approved for bilingual education). Eurocentrism is harmful as well as pervasive in the predominantly Spanish speaking region.

Connie underscored the cultural bias embedded in the scenarios and experiences described above as she returned to the therapist's assumption that student would not be successful unless they sounded like middle-class European Americans with no detectable dialect or accent. She, Juanita, Socks and Brenda raised another closely related issue. They observed that when schools and districts, formally or informally, adhere to an "English only" policy, administrators, staff, and/or teachers are frequently seen admonishing students against speaking their home language with friends, even during lunch and class changes. The trainers affirm that such practices not only devalue the language and culture of the students, it lowers their self-concept and self-esteem. In Chapter IV, Socks and Juanita emotionally related their personal experiences and those of their friends and family members with assimilation and acculturation gone awry. As educators they have witnessed their effects for countless students, one motivation for their work at the ESC. Connie is firm on the issue with educators she encounters, she confront them.

> You realize that you're setting up a barrier between the school and the home when you tell them that you want them to talk differently than their family. Don't do that! Don't go there!' Well they really get in a ball about that…(CB.I1.p.11.537-539)

Juanita believes that most educators do not have ill intent; they just do not realize the consequences of their action for students. Socks and Connie are not as magnanimous. Socks believes that in her region many educators are both racist and nativist and determined to keep African and Hispanic Americas in their placed, subordinated. Connie has made her perceptions clear. Referring to teachers, she concludes, "There is no altruism there" and to administrators and systems, "I don't depend on good intentions."

She feels that the “They can’t be successful” scenario is bogus. “Honoring, uh, is the problem” (CB.I1.p.11.ll.555).

Connie had previously discussed the “It’s My Way or the Highway” perspective, and Juanita and Socks described the devastating effects that assimilationist efforts, on the part of teachers, played in their lives and those of their family members. Since cultural superiority is embedded in a Eurocentric perspective, in schools it often results in student invisibility, cultural devaluation and low expectations for students of color.

Invisibility and Devaluation

The trainers frame their experiences with educators who do not appreciate, or devalue or ignore the cultures of certain students in the context of both a Eurocentric perspective and consequences for students. Juanita reiterated the fact that educators (administrators, teachers and professionals) are taught from a European perspective; one effect is that they, in turn, teach the way they were taught. Likewise, they esteem the knowledge which has traditionally been valorized, which becomes problematic when it is accompanied with a devaluation of other ways of knowing and/or being—epistemological and ontological concerns. Connie and Adrianne articulate the consensus of trainers.

Recall Connie’s description, Chapter IV, of being invited to a campus to conduct a 30 to 40 minute training session. She asked about the student demographics of the campus and was told that there was a 70 to 30 per cent European to African American split. Her visit occurred during the month of February. Connie could hardly express her incredulity; she noted the length of time the occasion has been observed, the abundance of available material, and the relative ease and minimal expense of putting up a Black History Month display, and exclaimed, “I mean you can do a Black History Month in a public school here without just overworking yourself. Well, I get there and there’s nothing. Nothing! No poster. No banner. No nothing! You wouldn’t know that they had… they did not want it to appear that they had African Americans there” (CB.I1.p.11.ll.516, 517-522).

Socks also described a similarly disturbing situation involving English language learners in a school where their numbers represented over fifty percent of the student population, and the principal was “Hispanic.” I had shared my experience that many people relate diversity to the big cities and do not seem to be aware of how much diversity there is in the rural areas of Texas. In fact, Carolyn, chastised herself for “not thinking about diversity as a rural issue.” Socks said she was warned by an Hispanic principal not to mistake his district for another with which she had experienced. Her interpretation was that the principal was “trying to act like it [diversity] doesn’t exist” (SR.p.5.ll.232). The principal explained, “‘Mrs. Rodriquez, remember this is not Ector County…’” (SR.p.5.ll.233). Socks then explained to me that, at the time, she was coming from a county that used bilingual education.

> He says, ‘This is not Ector County. This is Campo, Texas, Covington County, and we are on ESL.’ And I said, ‘Okay, alright. Thank you for the information.’ So I walked…..but I didn’t understand what he meant to me. And then when I started conducting the classroom observations, every single kid was a Hispanic kid. (SR.p.5.ll.235-240)

I wanted clarification, so asked Socks if she meant in special education or ESL. She explained that she had gone to every classroom in the building—special education classrooms, ESL classrooms and regular classrooms, and, “They were all Hispanic,” (SR.I1.p.5.ll.248).

> In the halls—all Hispanic students. And I am like, ‘You are only an ESL designated district?’ ‘Yeah, that’s all we have. They test out. They never qualified for bilingual.’ And I was like, ‘But every one of your kids is brown!’ I just couldn’t believe it. And this was an Hispanic administrator. (SR.I1.p.5.ll.249-252)

I acknowledged this as a situation that Juanita had also discussed and one that I had also experienced, to a lesser degree, as an African-American; “Sometimes people are so set on assimilating because of some of the problems that they have had that they are worse than some of the Anglos,” (EI, in SR.I1.p.6.ll.255-258). She assented, “Yes, they are. And more rigid and harder on that,” (SR.I1.p.6.ll.261).

Earlier, Juanita had provided a context for the principal’s reaction and perspective as well as an evaluation that his intentions were probably good; he probably felt that he was helping the students. She explained:

> But for many of us we were so assimilated and acculturated that we’ve got teachers now who don’t value the linguistic and cultural diversity of the students with whom they work even though they are the same Hispanic ethnic group. In fact, sometimes they are harder on kids than your European American because they remember the pain of being so different. They don’t want the kids to go through that pain, but in so doing, they’re bringing about new pain. (JE.I2.p.23.ll.1018-1023)

Of course, Socks and Juanita, because of their personal experiences and those of their family members, and bolstered by their independent study of the research, do not agree with the perspective they describe, nor do the other trainers. The African American trainers reported the same type of experience, and the European American trainers, especially Crystal, are sometimes confounded by the responses of members of racial and ethnic groups. What their comments and experiences highlight is that MDT is essential for all educators, a point continuously stressed by Adrianne, Brenda and Juanita. They explain that members of racial and ethnic groups often believe that because of their group membership, they understand the issues; however, the experiences of at least four trainers demonstrate that the assumption may be erroneous. There are critical intra-group as well as inter-group differences, misinformation and misunderstanding. Juanita was theoretical as she pointed to levels of acculturation as one issue that impacts immigrant groups, especially Hispanics, in U. S. society in relation to how students function in the mainstream school environment, how assimilationist expectations at school affects intergenerational relationships at home, and how treating a racial/ethnic group as a monolith can be deleterious to individual group members. Adrianne and Connie expressed a more practical concern related to educators with an assimilationist perspective; they maintain, educators are asking students to do the impossible. Connie posed a rhetorical question regarding the ability, especially among recognizable racial and ethnic group members, to "be White" in a society still plagued with race among other "isms."

Brenda, Adrianne, and Connie elaborated on the irony of expecting people of color, particularly those with distinguishing physical characteristics to become White, middle-class Americans in an essentially racist society. Connie explored the irrationality of this expectation for certain people; she used Chinese and African Americans in her examples. What these trainers realized and stated is that several essentially false underlying assumptions accompany such expectations. First, it implies that all immigrant experiences are the same as those of European immigrants; hence, with hard work and perseverance, and intelligence, anyone can "make it" in American society. Those who do not are lazy, complacent or less intelligent. Second, there is no consideration of involuntary immigrants who have endured caste like existence and slavery. Third, problems such as racism, classism, and sexism which contribute to structural inequalities and discrimination have been eliminated. Fourth, people who are not members of the dominant culture choose to forfeit their own cultures to adopt the attitudes, values, beliefs systems, and worldviews of the dominant and, therefore, "superior" culture.

Trainers believe that teachers' lack of knowledge about different cultures or how culture shapes everyone's response to the world around them is a function, among other things, of society's metanarratives, family and community life, and education, K-20 and beyond. Above, Juanita characterized her training as a physical therapist as "from a European perspective." Socks emphasized how education functions to support the Eurocentric perspective, "Look at the way we are educated. We are educated with one language. One culture. And that is not appropriate because of the diverse student population that we have" (SR.I1.p.2.ll.72-74). The good news is that with education and training, teachers can gain the necessary knowledge and skills to help all students succeed if they will pursue it. In the meantime, if teachers treat their cultures as normative or do not see themselves as cultural beings, they will continue to devalue the languages and cultures of the students, and therefore, the child and they will not attend to the affective domain.

Students of Color in Lower Tracks and Special Education—What Do You Expect?

The trainers described the issue of low expectations for students of color and students who are poor as both pervasive among educators and detrimental for the students. They also characterize it as a difficult issue to address because it results from deeply held, and sometimes unconscious, beliefs, attitudes and assumptions, which, in turn, generate practices that are long standing and perpetuated with good intentions even when invalid. Angelica captured the sentiment as she discussed "White privilege" in her region. She said that when African Americans are articulate and competent, they are viewed as exceptional. Socks described experiencing negative responses from educators during her presentations; her perception is that these educators do not feel that she, as a Mexican American female, has anything of value to share. In schools, students face the same assumptions along with the consequences of those assumptions.

The trainers observed that when students were underachieving academically, teachers often prematurely conclude that the problem is located in the innate intelligence, or lack thereof, of the child. School programs and/or interactional patterns are seldom questioned. Angelica, Brenda, Connie, Juanita and Socks believe the assumption has its roots in a conservative, sociobiological perspective and that teachers either refer the child to special education, give up on the child, or "dummy down" the curriculum. Connie provides an example of each; one has to do with teacher perspective, the other with consequences for students. In the first incident, as is her practice, she was applying chi square to show disproportionality in special education and the teachers did not accept its underlying assumptions. Connie's explanation:

> There are also a lot of teachers who believe that a child's intellectual ability and aptitude is there at there birth. In other words, there in the delivery room you have your high group, your low group, and pour medium group. It's done. It's a done deal. It's sealed at birth—their aptitude for learning. And you'll find a lot of teachers who believe that. So, they don't believe there's anything that they really can do. It's done. And that's why they can easily look at data and the graduation rate, the college entrance rate, and they believe that all they're doing is looking at what nature has provided. (CB.I1.p.5.ll.237-244).

The consequences for "dummying down" the curriculum in lower tracks and inappropriate referrals to special education are devastating. Connie related what she describes as a well documented scenario which Adrianne and Brenda also cited.

> They can enter school, like African Americans -- and it's been well documented in the research since about 1968 or earlier -- an African American child can enter into the school and score in the average range, but the more years they stay in school, the more they get behind. So that they're more behind in the twelfth grade than they were in the first grade. So they get further and further and further behind. So rather than accelerating the learning, the learning has actually slowed down and dumbed down…and the reason it's happened, remember, is the expectation is they can not learn anything anyway. (CB.I1.p.3.ll.120-128)

The trainers unanimously concur that limited English proficient (LEP) students are often victims of low expectations. As detailed in the foregoing section on misdiagnosis, teachers, and even professionals, mistakenly associate dialect and accent with lower intelligence. The M/DTs assert that all students placed in special education are at risk for drill and (s)kill teaching methods and having home work as well as seat work done for them in "content mastery." All of the trainers possessed classroom and/or school experience prior to taking their present positions. Speaking as K-12 teachers and professional, we shared our experiences with the predominance of nonchallenging curriculum in the lower tracks and with teachers doing students' home and seat work because is was easier to do it than to teach children—Brenda related, "They are not in the mode of teaching." Connie said that she had this conversation with teachers all the time, and shared the reaction of a group of English teachers of LEP students.

> 'You understand that your job is to teach English…. You are not to be doing their homework.'…'You're not the homework teacher.' I said, 'If your school really indeed needs someone to copy their homework for them, then why don't you get a student aid, a student tutor, and that person can hand them their homework, and they can copy it down. You don't need a certified degree teacher to do their homework for them.' …but everybody just laughs. It's just like water on a ducks back. No change is going to be…. (CB.I1.p.6.ll.291-297)

A final expectation has to do with behavior. Only Brenda and Adrianne talked about it, but it seems important because it intersects with the hidden curriculum of school, differing communication and interaction patterns, and behavioral referrals that may just be misunderstandings. Brenda believes that MDT could cut down on behavioral referrals because teachers might better understand interactional patterns and acceptable behaviors in other cultures that are different from their own. Brenda mentioned two examples, many European teachers are uncomfortable with shows of emotions, mot African American are less out off; European teachers may consider cross talk rude, and it is by their standards. Brenda said, "but we can be aware of and participate in three conversations at one time, and do." We slapped five. In cases of misunderstanding, behavioral expectations need to be explicitly taught.

Adrianne is a special education diagnostician who is acutely aware of misdiagnosis and inappropriate. She is also aware that some European teachers are afraid of African American males in particular and do not like people who are different in general. As has been the case with her statements, Adrianne makes connections. Here she connects teacher expectations and cultural insensitivity as manifest in misdiagnosis, inappropriate referrals, and tracking to consequences for students.

> …children know, they know whether a teacher likes them or not. They know too whether it has to do—because of the color of their skin or because they may dress differently or because they may have a disability of some kind or because they may look differently. They know. So until our teachers become culturally competent and not only that, culturally sensitive and create the environment where all children, and all inclusive environment, where all children are accepted, then we will continue to have high drop out rates. We will continue to have students that will not do well on the TAAS. We will continue to have high referral rates to special education, alternative schools. Our behavioral classes will continue to grow. We try to make this a medical problem and say these kids are on this and on that. A lot of this has nothing to do with that; it has to do with how we . . . It's just like you have someone to come as a guest in your home. If you don't treat them well, then they don't want to come back to your home. School for us as educators, that's our home. Students that come then we're inviting them into our home. We either say you're welcome or you're not welcome. And we say that to our parents as well. You're welcome or you're not welcome. (AB.I1.p.10-11.ll.441-458)

Adrianne's summation is an appropriate segue into the next theme. When educators devalue the language and culture of the students in their charge, it is highly probable that they have a low opinion of the families and communities from which they come.

Attitudes toward Families and Communities of Color—The Misunderstood and the Exotic

For the most part, trainers mentioned parental involvement in the context of a primary function into which MDT could be embedded. Brenda, for example, was attempting to integrate concepts from COP into her training. Crystal's strategy was to train other staff members and hope that they would integrate multicultural concepts into their training as she does. All of the trainers agreed that they could reach more people through functions other than MDT, but that such backdoor efforts support fragmentation. Adrianne and Juanita, REACH trainers, were not opposed to embedding content into other functions, but they were not as enthusiastic about the idea as the COP trainers. They were more inclined to try to find ways of making MDT more attractive in its own right such as demonstrating its importance for student achievement and for effective functioning in a multicultural society and global economy. All of the trainers agreed that MDT is important for helping teachers to deal more effectively with families and communities of color. That the M/DTs have to engage in such strategies suggests that educators, particularly teachers resist this knowledge. The trainers provided examples of how such resistance is manifest.

Cultural Misunderstanding and Stereotyping

The M/DTs have the parental involvement function as an area of responsibility, and agree that a great deal of misunderstanding occurs between European American teachers and families and communities of color. According to the trainers this is especially true of European American teachers and Hispanic parents. The misunderstandings, which often results in stereotyping, seem to revolve around the issue of differing expectations.

The M/DTs observe that teachers' views are that parents should be actively involved in the education of their children. In their formal/professional rhetoric, they want parents to become partners in the education of their children. Typical requests and expectations include: 1) participating in PTA/PTO; 2) attending parent/teacher conferences, on time, when asked, and preferably during school hours; 3) reading to students and/or helping students with homework and projects; 4) fundraising (for field trips, band uniforms, club materials, equipment, etc.); and 5) volunteering as chaperones for school and field events and in classroom activities.

The M/DTs observe that parents who are of middle- and upper-class socioeconomic status and who are more thoroughly assimilated and acculturated to dominant cultural values, regardless of race and/or ethnicity, can do these things and many will. These parents often take on an advocacy role for their children, especially in the areas of placement (i.e. gifted and talented, honors, special education). The misunderstanding occurs when educators are confronted with parents who do not share perspectives similar to their own. European American teachers and Latino/Latina parents both view parental roles in the educational process from a traditional perspective. The misunderstanding comes about because the traditions, which are cultural, are different.

School readiness provides a good example of misunderstanding between these teachers and parents based on different expectations. According to the trainers, middle class parents are more likely to concern themselves with whether their child is reading on grade level and to seek help, such as hiring tutors, when they are not. On the other hand, parents who are members of racial/ethnic groups and parents of students who are poor are more likely to view this as the teacher's domain. Connie's example is characteristic:

> They interpret [teachers] their Latino behavior towards school, which from their point of view, they're [Latinos] showing respect. They've sent the child, and then they expect the school to educate the child, and then they show respect to the teachers and administrators. In other words, they don't come up and meddle in your business. And if you ask them if they've prepared their child for school, 'Yes, I have…He works very hard around the house…. He helps his dad a lot,

> and he shows respect to people in authority.' That's how they prepare him for school. (CB.I1.p.2.ll.66-71, 72, 73-74)

In contrast:

> When teachers ask about preparedness, they are more responsive to conversation about phonemic awareness and reading a prize for reading the most books at the public library, and you didn't say dadadadadada. It's just that they misinterpret what the people, the way the people are interacting with them. (CB.I1.p.2.ll.766-77)

The foregoing example illustrates how parents and teachers defines caring as it relates to the child's education and how that view is embedded in the culture of the individual. The significance of these contrasting expectations is that teachers too often come to the erroneous conclusion that because parents of CLEED students are not as involved in schools in a typical middle class fashion, they do not care about their children's education. This perception results in stereotyping of parents and communities of color, which may result in low expectations for students. If the parents do not care about the education of their children, what can you expect from the child?

Two of the trainers, Brenda and Connie, discussed three related and important issues that were not spotlighted by the other trainers. Brenda and Connie talked about the impact of socioeconomic factors on parental involvement, which, they contend, administrators and teachers do not attend to effectively when asking for parental participation. Economic status affects such areas as transportation, flexibility of work hours, perception of ability to perform the required task, and the parents' school experience. A second factor had to do with advocacy. All of the trainers mentioned this parental role, but Connie stressed how culture and socioeconomic status intersect with level of advocacy, which works on the behalf of student who are members of the dominant culture. She pointed out that often immigrant groups and others coming into the U. S. do not understand the advocacy system in our educational processes.

> And this is a cultural side—that parents go to school to be advocates for their children [and] make all kinds of demands for resources for their children so that they make sure they know the right people, … know the right jargon to get their kids in the, to get the scarce resources for their children… I've taught my child to be respectful. I've got them all clean. They work at home; now, I send them to school, now you are going to take over. And they don't know that that's not how the system is working. That it's the sister in the Gucci bag and the Mercedes who knows how to go in there and get what she needs for her child, because she walks in as an advocate. So, and speaking the same language as the administrator. (CB.I1.p.2.ll.84-86, 88-89, 92-97)

Speaking the same language, according the Connie, is a matter of cultural competence and cultural capital that involves the "sorting and selection" process of schooling. She believes that lack of such capital by parents of color and those who are poor has negative consequences for their children as they more typically end up in lower tracks, and as immigrant parents, in particular, are "sold" special education.

Fear of the "Exotics"

Although only three trainers, Adrianne, Brenda and Connie, made extended comments on the issue of fear of certain students, particularly African males, it is also crucial to misunderstandings that result from lack of knowledge or misinformation derived from unreliable sources such as reports of isolated negative encounters from family and friends and distorted media portrayals. Adrianne was adamant concerning the referral of "our Black boys" to special education in general; both she and Brenda were specifically concerned with behavioral referrals. The fact that two of the three African American M/DTs viewed this issue as critical while trainers of other races/ethnicities, with the exception of Connie who has remained critical on almost every issue, especially race and ethnicity, did not even mention it may indicate that it, like race, is a taboo issue. Angelica, although an African American, is the only trainer who does not have an advanced degree in special education, her area of concentration is social studies; therefore, she may not encounter the situation directly.

Brenda and Connie both experienced teachers' fear as they extended invitations to MDT participants to have lunch at an ethnic restaurant. Brenda simply reported, in a resigned fashion, that they did not choose to accept the invitation. She believed that the fear was related to continued housing segregation when she referred to "commuter teachers" who do not know one thing about the whole or the "true" culture of the children. What Brenda found more problematic was the teachers' unwilling to learn more about their students because that would require reciprocity on their parts.

Connie elaborated, beginning with an evaluative statement, "They [European American teachers] perceive themselves as "normal" or "American," And everybody else is strange and weird, but they're just normal people,"(CB.I1.p.15.ll.687-688).

> Well, I've had them where they would sit there in my workshop and it would be time to go to lunch and they would tell me they were afraid to go into ethnic neighborhoods. Now, if you're afraid of the children, and you're afraid of their parents, I mean, what does that tell you? I mean, how far are you going to go with people you're afraid of? (CB.I1.p.15-16.ll. 690-699)

Connie attributed the fear not only to cultural bias but also stereotypical perceptions.

> 'I'm not going to that restaurant.' 'Why?' 'Well, it may be dirty.' 'What if somebody, a gang member will get me…So I can't even get them to uh go into an ethnic neighborhood without shaking in their boots, so what I mean where are you going to go with it? I mean it's not gonna happen if they're scared of who they're trying to teach and have no respect for them. (CB.I1.p.16.ll.725-726,732-735)

Both fear and exoticism are microcosmic manifestations of the conditions, such as segregated housing and the increasing economic gap between the haves and the have nots, which exist in the broader society. In schools, this idea of normalcy—a legitimization of the dominant cultural norms—serves to marginalize those who are different; five of the M/DTs were acutely aware of this, and Connie concluded:

> So that you think everything I do is normal. It's almost as though white people don't know they have culture. It's [culture] exotic. It's somewhere else. What I do, I am just a normal person. In which their "normality" then becomes the standard. Everybody else is judged against this standard of who they are. (CB.I2.p.15.ll.626-630).

For this reason, whether they are able to do so or not, Adrianne, Brenda, Crystal, Connie, Juanita and Socks understand the need to move from psychological explanations of racism that focus on individual prejudice to institutional racism that as manifested in social, economic, and political structures as an important, but often neglected, aspect of MDT. Adrianne, the most ardent REACH advocate, said that the program neglected to attend to the issue of "White privilege" and institutional racism. Crystal mentioned that African Americans in particular, and educators of color, were more likely to describe MDT as "not going far enough." Adrianne used the issue of tracking to make a similar point; she "called a spade a spade" (AB.I1.p.12.ll.530).

> For example, we still have issues of segregation when you have the largest group of representation in special education are African Americans. That's a form of segregation. That's a form of separation. It's still there. We just find other terminology to use. When you have 66% of your teachers in the State of Texas are White females, however, our black boys are in special education, or they are either labeled mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed. There is something wrong with that picture. Those are hard facts that people tend to not want to talk about. (AB.I1.p.12.ll.531-537)

Summary

The M/DTs, as a group, do not believe that educators are racist but that many are hegemonic and that educational institutions, for the most part, support the status quo. Each system at each level reinforces the other in a general resistance to change. This resistance is reinforced when the change challenges deeply entrenched school practices and widely held assumptions, attitudes, beliefs and value systems as in the case of MDT and multicultural education.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

> What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun? Or fester like a sore—and then run? Does it stink like rotten meat? Or crust and sugar over—like a syrupy sweet? Maybe it just sags like a heavy load. Or does it explode?
>
> —Langston Hughes

Introduction

This dissertation examined the perceptions of eight regional education service center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers in the state of Texas regarding structural barriers and teacher resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training (MDT). Geneva Gay (1994) provided a framework for understanding the need for multicultural education, which explored the interrelated factors of the social realities of life in the United States of America, cultural and human development, and teaching and learning. The reality of diversity in the United States is that it is highly pluralistic, socially stratified, and racially divided (Gay, 1994). Despite this reality, there is a widely held belief that American society should be homogenized—the myth of the “melting pot.” Myths, however, become reality, in the form of ideology (Althusser, 1971), for those who create, internalize, inhabit, and perpetuate them.

Alberto Rodriquez (1998) refers to studies that point to the strength of Anglo-European preservice teacher resistance to learning to teach for diversity “(Ahlquist, 1991; Cochran-Smith, 1993; Goodman, 2001; Jordan, 1995; McIntosh, 1989; Tatum, 1992b),” (p. 592). In 1992, Christine Sleeter’s often cited 2-year study of a multicultural professional development program had established that inservice teachers respond in similar fashion. Her multicultural staff development program was designed to improve teaching, and thereby, student achievement; she concludes:

> …for the most part, the teachers' perspective took as given the social context of the individual, and asked how to prepare the individual to live within the context. Most further assumed that, with some variation, society's rules apply to everyone; the rules may not always be fair but they are acceptable, and processes for setting them are fair. (p. 29-30)

Ellen Swartz (1993) cited examples, which I amended, of over six decades of what she refers to as "incisive critique on the inadequacies and inequities of school knowledge" (p. 493) (i.e. Asante, 1980, 1987; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977, Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Giroux, 1992; hooks, 1994; Nieto, 2000; Oakes, 1985; Sleeter, 1996), which reveal the ways that schooling privileges those of European ancestry. Yet, the process of schooling remains fundamentally unchanged (Greenman, Kimmel, Bannan & Radford-Curry, 1992), and the achievement gap between students of color and the poor and their European, middle class counterparts continues to widen.

As the achievement gap between these classes of students continues to widen, the population of students is rapidly increasing. Concomitantly, the teacher pool remains largely female, European, and middle class. There is concern that many of these teachers are ill prepared and/or unwilling to effectively teach all students (Bennett, 1995, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2001). Multicultural education is an idea, a process, an educational reform movement whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female 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, 2000; Banks & Banks, 1995).

It seems safe to conjecture that the progenitors of multicultural education might have expected a developmental progression from lesser to more radical approaches to multicultural education. However, the fact that over four decades later, Geneva Gay and Tyrone Howard (2000), in addressing the issue of multicultural education for the 21st century, must explain why multicultural preservice teacher education is critical and offer guidance for accomplishing that goal seems to support Swartz's allegation. Gay and Howard make a compelling argument that teacher education programs must prepare European Americans to teach ethnically diverse students of color, and contend that explicit preparation is required because of the increasing "racial, cultural and linguistic divide between teachers (predominately European American) and K-12 students (increasingly from ethnic groups of color)" (Gay & Howard, 2000, p.1; Cochran-Smith, 2003; Hodgkinson, 2003).

In today's formal educational institutions, a continuing tension exists between social reality and institutional policies, practices, and power allocations which is played out as teachers enter the field (Bourdieu, 1976; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) from their racial, gender, and social class locations (Sleeter, 1992) and attempt to teacher students who are different from themselves. The concept of resistance continues to appear in political analyses of curriculum, but after 1985, it became a point of departure rather than arrival as scholar like Henry Giroux (1983, 1992) reconceptualized it as a theory of hope and possibility.

In Chapter I, demographics of the student population, the teacher pool, and student scores on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) were used to document the “demographic divide” and to verify that Texas is one of the most diverse and bilingual states in the nation. Although the state, in the opinion of advocates for multicultural education (including Multicultural/Diversity trainers), has not gone far enough, Texas has been more proactive than many states as indicated by the formation of a statewide network designed to lessen fragmentation and to provide direction for addressing issues of culture and diversity.

The Texas Regional Education Service Centers, in the form of MDT, provide a vehicle for teachers to begin to develop the knowledge and skills that are necessary to more effectively educate all children, particularly children who are culturally, linguistically, economically, and educationally marginalized, (Larke, Webb-Johnson & Carter 1996). However, according to Texas Education Agency (TEA) data and trainer reports, MDT workshops are the least attended workshops in the agency’s catalogue of offerings. The trainers and the training programs are available to veteran teachers; the teachers, whether for personal or structural reasons, are not voluntarily using the services. Thus, there was a need to understand why teachers resist MDT.

The primary purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of Texas Regional Educational Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers with teacher resistance to training on issues related to diversity and multicultural education. Following a pilot study (2001-2002), it became clear that structural issues were inextricably tied to teacher resistance; thus, the second purpose of the study evolved—to identify and understand any structural barriers that prevent effective delivery of MDT. A final purpose was to gain a greater understanding of how these trainers view their roles in light of their social locations.

The guiding research question was: What factors affect resistance to Multicultural/Diversity Training in the State of Texas? Two specific questions were drawn from this central concern:

1. How is resistance to multicultural/diversity training manifested by educators who participated in the training sessions and by those who the trainers encounter in the school setting?
2. What were the structural and personal barriers that impeded or prevented the trainers from effective delivery of multicultural/diversity training?

Structural Barriers to MDT

Three themes emerged as structural barriers to effective delivery of MDT, contextual factors including the regional perspectives, lack of administrative support, the Texas Accountability System, and special education as a dumping ground.

Geography—Local Perspectives

As indicated in Chapter V, the extent to which the local area fosters a conservative or liberal perspective influences the program used for MDT. The trainers did not perceive that any region subscribed to a radical structuralist perspective, and those that acknowledged the relevance of culture and diversity to student achievement did so from a limited perspective (Fallahi, 1994).

Trainers were in agreement that the culture of the region in which the ESCs are located influences MDT in different ways but particularly in terms of the content of the training offered. Area perceptions, which the trainers maintain permeate down to the individual teacher and classroom level, range from the perception in Socks' region that MDT is totally irrelevant to an acceptance of exploring issues of culture and diversity in Adrianne and Juanita's regions. This is not to imply that all or even the majority of teachers fully agrees with area perception, but there is a tendency for teachers to conform to local norms and expectations, the dictates of the district, and the culture of the campus.

The trainers concur that at least three factors are important in determining the dominant perspectives of the different regions: 1) location and size of districts within the region; 2) number and diversity of communities of color; and 3) proximity to colleges/universities. Large districts located in urban areas are more likely to attend to issues of culture and diversity. Districts with large numbers of diverse student populations are also attentive to these issues. An interesting variation on the effect of numbers exist in regions with two predominate populations which have coexisted over a long period of time (i.e. African American and European American or Hispanic American and European American). In these instances, there is a tendency to maintain the often caste-like relationships that have existed in the past or for European Americans and the people of color to perceive advances in race relations very differently (Ogbu, 1978).

Lack of Administrative Support

There was a convergence of perception among trainers the there is a lack of support for MDT at every level of the educational hierarchy which is congruent with research findings, anecdotal accounts and policy reports. Although administrative support is vital, according to the trainers, the higher up the ladder they go, the less support they receive. Only Angelica and Crystal report interaction at the level of superintendent and that was a "one-on-one" to elicit support for MDT. Adrianne, Crystal, and Juanita have, on occasion, had principals participate; Connie required that principals accompany their staffs to training; however her workshops were short-lived. During her seven years as a trainer, Brenda had one principal to participate. Carolyn and Socks take the question of administrator participation in MDT as rhetorical. All of the trainers discussed the rationale that administrators give or the reasons for nonsupport as they perceive them. Following is a partial list: 1) Superintendents do not participate in MDT except under mandate; 2) Principals are too busy to participate in MDT; they delegate that responsibility to others, except under mandate; 3) MDT is not a priority for principals; they do not see the connection between MDT and TAKS, which is their highest priority; 4) Many administrators are conservative in their perspective; and 5) Some administrators are racist

Often when administrators support MDT, by releasing staff to attend, they do so on their own terms. The trainers report that it is hard to convince them of the importance of sending the same people to the training so that they can build capacity on the campuses. Administrative support for multicultural education is crucial. Keith Wilson (2002) questions, "How can a house stand if the foundation is weak?" (p. 3). He further asserts:

> Multicultural education will be as successful as commitment (local, state, and/or national), programs initiated under the guise of multiculturalism must receive

> reinforcement from administrators who are accountable for the success of established multicultural initiatives. (p.3)

The Accountability System

Wayne Ross (1997) published an article in the *Times Union* (Albany, NY) that was subsequently reprinted in *Theory and Research in Social Education* which conceded that “higher standards for core subject areas accompanied by rigorous testing programs linked to the new standards” has gained growing consensus on educational reform as “the best way to improve public education” (p. 404). Ross does not discount the importance of expectations but holds that “the search for a ‘magic bullet’…degrades the competence of local institutions, teachers and student to establish their own goals”…This approach also diverts attention away from the conditions of learning and teaching that must be changed if schools are to be improved” (p. 404). The author, recognizes the logic, “what gets tested gets taught,” and acknowledges that high-stakes testing can focus instruction, but he believes that the educational costs outweigh the benefits ((Alford, 2001; Kanpol, 1999; McNeil, 1999).

> When test results are the primary indicator of school effectiveness, we tend to treat test scores, rather than meaningful learning, as the goal of schooling. This distortion of the purposes of schooling produces a number of deleterious effects on teaching and curriculum. (Ross, 1997, p. B1)

Texas Regional Education Service Multicultural/Diversity Trainers unanimously share Ross’ view.

There is total agreement among trainers that the state accountability system is the engine that drives the education system. Although comments regarding accountability are interspersed throughout the trainer’s interviews as a structural inhibitor or barrier to

MDT, trainer perceptions of the issue can be described succinctly through seven observations, which again, involve administrators. First, it appears that many administrators accept a limited, technical rational, approach to measuring student achievement. They seem to believe that TAKS presents and accurate and adequate indication of what is taught and learned in school. Second, many administrators participate in initiatives for change such as MDT because of fiduciary interest or to maintain minimal compliance with federal and state regulations. Third, administrators, for the most part, do not seem to recognize the connection between attention to the affective domain and student achievement, particularly for students of color. They view issues of culture and diversity as irrelevant. Fourth, those who do make the connection often delegate responsibility to those who have no authority to exact consequences for noncompliance. Fifth, many administrators are operating from the level of self interest; that is, they are more concerned with the ratings of their districts and campuses on the TAKS, which influences evaluation, funding, hiring and firing and personnel placement, than with the academic achievement and total personal growth and development of all of the students in their charge. Sixth, a few administrators are racist or they subscribe to a conservative perspective which views underachievement among certain groups of students as a natural state of affairs defying remedy, Seventh, school administrators are often joined by parents, and students themselves to exert tremendous social pressure on teachers to see that student perform well on high-stakes tests. Ross describes the results of such pressure, “an increasing portion of instructional time is devoted to test preparation and “cramming’ rather than focusing on learning” (p. 404). In this study, Brenda was most vocal on this issue as she described teachers teaching to the test, loss of creativity in the classroom, and the classroom as a test-centered rather than a child-centered space.

The pressure of the accountability system, along with prepackaged curricula, often has negative affects such as the deskilling of teachers and reduction of teacher autonomy, (Kanpol, 1999; McNeil, 1999). They [teachers] are often unwitting victims in a hegemonic process that at times appears overwhelming (Giroux, 1992, 1983; Kanpol, 1999). This feeling of inefficacy is not only perceived as pervasive among teachers, four of the eight trainers display a similar malaise as they unquestioningly bow to the will of external pressure.

Teacher Resistance to MDT

Teacher resistance was found in two contexts. In the MDT training sessions the reasons for resistance were ideological. In the classroom setting, the resistance was manifested in pedagogical practices.

Resistance to Content

The majority of the trainers use an approach termed “teaching the culturally different,” which, as originally conceived, attempts to raise the achievement of students of color, although more through culturally compatible education programs than through raising student self concepts (e.g., Jordan, 1985; Ramirez & Castaneda, 1974; Shade, 1982). “Partly, because this approach does not address structural barriers to economic access, it is not the approach most advocates of multicultural education prefer,” (Sleeter, 1989, p. 55). Even the REACH program, which trainers identify as a source of resistance by teachers/participants to MDT in several regions, does not adequately address institutional racism or White privilege; it represents a combination of a human relations and a multicultural education approach. The single group approach and the education that that is multicultural and social reconstructionist approaches do not factor into the MDT equation as operationalized in ESC training in Texas. This does not mean that individual trainers do not include such issues in their training.

In fact, that may well be the intent of trainers who seek to imbed issues of culture and diversity into other functions such as parental involvement and of those who have the finesse to make these issues focal without encountering the resistance that some trainers describe. Sleeter (1989) acknowledges, “Advocates often articulate their agendas for school reform using language that recognizes the resistance multicultural education typically encounters” (p. 56).

Findings Support Ideological Resistance

Christine Sleeter’s (1992) framework and findings are again applicable, and, along with Rodriquez (1998) and Gay and Howard (2000), were predictive of trainer perception of ideological resistance to MDT. First, multicultural education is about “them”. MDT like training for teaching gifted and talented students is located under the special education umbrella; however, teachers respond differently to the two areas. Regular teachers, for example, vie for opportunities to teach the “gifted and talented” because it is perceived as easier to teach students who are already academically successful and motivated, because the focus moves from passing the TAKS to preparation for college and careers, and because teaching gifted and talented and AP

(Advanced Placement) classes is accompanied by personal and professional prestige. Opportunities for such training are often announced throughout the catalog under regular education offerings because of those reasons, and teachers seek them out. On the other hand, as noted by Brenda and Adrianne, MDT is more typically only offered under special education and many regular teachers fail to look for training opportunities in that area. When regular teachers do turn to MDT, it is too often not for the reasons multiculturalist would hope. MDT is often seen as a vehicle for response to crisis.

MDT as Crisis Intervention

The trainers' discussion of MDT as crisis intervention is consistent with the literature of multicultural education as well as that of resistance to multicultural education. One such example is the "quick fix" search. Teachers want instructional strategies, but display a lack of interest in concepts, principles, or the theoretical underpinnings of multicultural education. Carolyn and Connie were very vocal as opposing this use of MDT while Adrianne, Angelica and Juanita recognize the importance of providing concrete applications that teachers can utilize immediately. Brenda believes that such strategies are essential, and although Crystal did not address the issue directly, because she supports Ruby Payne's concept of moving the student from the informal to the formal register, the implication is that she would be in favor of sharing instructional strategies. Socks did not speak to the issue at all since, from her perspective, her region does not have a MDT program. What seems problematic for the trainers is that too often teachers come to believe that a specific strategy, such a cooperative learning, works well for all members of a particular group, treating the group as a monolith and ignoring intra group differences. When the strategy does not prove effective for certain students, teachers may not try other methods and sometimes blame the student for nonresponsiveness.

The most glaring example of MDT as crisis intervention strategy, and one central to M/DTs, is overrepresentation of "minority" students in special education. The trainers are special educators first. I had conceptualized multicultural education from the perspective of a regular education teacher seeking to provide an inclusive, culturally sensitive classroom for all of my students. Juanita explained

> And, ideally, that should have been it. Had that happened, ideally, this would not be a special ed issue. It's become a special ed issue because that didn't happen, and kids are inappropriately placed in special ed. (From an Interview with Juanita Estreban, March, 2003)

It was because of overrepresentation of students of color and students who are poor in special education that the network began to deal with issues of culture and diversity and became the genesis of MDT. Our exchange underscored the use of MDT as a crisis intervention strategy. The M/DTs expressed concern that such use distorts the principles, goals and visions for MDT as conceptualized by the trainers and thus renders the ineffective for their stated purpose(s). The trainers believe that this issue of overrepresentation of students of color in special education is also function, among others, of unrecognized "White" privilege. The trainers' experiences are that for many workshop participants, disproportionality looks normal.

White Privilege—A Fundamental Role in Teacher and Cultural Bias

A concept recognized by all of the trainers and emphasized by Adrianne, Angelica, Brenda and Connie is that of White privilege. They maintain that those who are privileged in society often do not perceive themselves as such. Angelica was specific in identifying the phenomena as pervasive among "White" males in her region. Adrianne mentioned it as manifest in her training sessions. Although not certified REACH trainers, Brenda and Crystal reported the same results as did Adrianne, Juanita, and Carolyn to responses among participants to a REACH exercise that they all have used. When asked to rate their perception on fairness and social issues such as securing a loan or buying a home on a scale from one to one hundred, Whites perceived more equal status among groups pursuing such ends. On the other hand, participants of color perceived less equitable inter group access. Likewise, Whites perceived society as fairer and race relations as better than did participants of color. Individuals of color perceived White privilege when European Americans did not (Chizhik & Chizhik, 2005; Sleeter, 2000/2001).

Connie highlighted the fact that even the education service centers mirror the gender structure of the rest of the education hierarchy. The majority of the ESC trainers are female while European American males are disproportionately highly represented in administrative positions.

> Okay, in education 80% of the people who work in education are women. Your just statistically your more likely to end up with a woman doing a workshop than men. Men in education tend to… the 29% in education tend to end up in administration positions, and they don't do workshops. They manage programs, but they don't stand and deliver workshops, so you're not likely in our culture to see very many men doing a workshop. (CB.I1.p.9.ll.392-390)

The foregoing discussion and scenarios lend credence to the normalcy perceived in the superior positionality of middle and upper class European males and supports an impressive body of critical literature (i.e. Asante, 1980, 1987; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977, Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Giroux, 1992; hooks, 1994; Nieto, 2000; Oakes, 1985; Sleeter, 1996; Swartz, 1993; Woodson, 1933/1977) which reveals the ways that schooling privileges those of European ancestry, who are male and economically advantaged, while "deprivileging" those who are female, of color and economically disadvantaged (Swartz, 1993).

As an example, Swartz (1993) cites Woodson's (1933/1977) assessment of the role that public education has played in "the denigration of Africa, the dismissal of African and diasporic African achievements, and the exacerbation of the relationship between racism and self-concept" (p. 493). Swartz surmises that Woodson describes how schools have taught forms of ethnocentrism in each domain of knowledge and observes that more than half a century later, Asante (1980; 1987) confronts the same hegemonies when describing "how the constructs of a European-centered world view excludes and dismisses the historical and cultural knowledge of people of African descent while falsely claiming and promoting European knowledge as objective and universal" (Swartz, 1993, p. 493).

Asante (1987) compared Eurocentrism to an "aggressive seizure of intellectual space, like the seizure of land, [which] amounts to the aggressor occupying someone else's territory while claiming it as his own" (1987, p. 9). Eurocentric ideology and cultural content, according to Swartz (1993) is "a form of racism and cultural hegemony that is entwined with class, gender, and other inter- and intra-group forms of omission, denigration and misrepresentation" (p.493). It is a conservative ideological perspective held by many teachers; Geneva Gay, in a town hall meeting at the annual meeting of the

National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) describes teachers as not so much racist as hegemonic. Thus, they exhibit philosophical (ideological) resistance to MDT.

Findings Support Pedagogical Resistance

Sonia Nieto (2000) conceptualizes pedagogy as more than the strategies and techniques that teachers use to make learning more active or engaging, but also how teachers perceive the nature of knowledge and what they do to create conditions that motivate students to learn and become critical thinkers (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Larke, Wiseman, & Bradley, 1997; Nieto, 2000; Pang, 2001). The trainers support Nieto's assertion that "most classrooms…reflect the belief that learning can best take place in a competitive highly charged atmosphere. Techniques that stress individual achievement an extrinsic motivation are most visible. Ability groupings, testing of all kinds, and rote learning are the result" (p. 101).

Adrianne, Brenda, Connie and Juanita, in particular, affirm that teacher pedagogy is also influenced by their lack of knowledge of the diversity of their students and how cultural and language differences affect learning. They acknowledge that many teachers, because of their training still function within a monocultural framework and are thus unprepared for the various cultures, languages, lifestyles and values they confront in their classrooms. They agree that the result is that many teachers attempt to treat all students the same way, reflecting the unchallenged assumption that equal access and equity are synonymous.

The effect is that students from subordinated cultures are most negatively affected by such a perspective. Martin Haberman (1991a) uses the concept “pedagogy of poverty” to describe a practice in urban schools which limits teaching strategies to asking questions, giving directions, giving assignments, and monitoring seatwork, strategies, which Nieto maintains is based on the “dubious assumption that children of disempowered backgrounds cannot learn in creative, active, and challenging environments” (Nieto, 2000, p. 101).

Pedagogical Resistance—Lack of Evaluation, Played Out in the Field

The perceptions of the multicultural/diversity trainers toward pedagogical resistance to MDT are played out in the field; that is, they encounter pedagogical resistance, not in MDT sessions, but as they attempt to help teachers understand how the affective domain factors into academic achievement, for example: how students process knowledge differently, how to bridge the gap between where student are and where they need to be to succeed academically, how different patterns of communication and interaction lead to teacher/student misunderstanding that often result in behavioral referrals, how their Eurocentric perspectives and expectations for students factor into academic underachievement, particularly for students of color and students who are poor.

One Model of Education and It Is “My Way”

Many teachers’ refusal to change the way they teach because they view their role as more traditional—givers of knowledge. Connie mimicked, it is “my way or the highway.” Essentially, these teachers teach as they were taught. They were, no doubt, successful in school themselves and are experiencing success with many of their students. Brenda reminded us that in the context of high stakes testing, if their students are passing TAKS, too many teachers come to believe that they are doing their jobs. They do not recognize that passing the TAKS means that the students have achieved, at most, a minimal level of competency in the tested areas, or that many scholars believe that holding test scores up as standards of academic achievement may lead to a narrowed curriculum as well as the deskilling of teachers as they rely on prepackaged materials designed to improve students' test taking skills (Alford, 2001; Kanpol, 1999; McNeil, 1999).

I Do Not Know, but I Have Been Taught

Most teachers, even with the requirement that teacher education programs include courses that address culture and/or diversity, are trained from a monocultural perspective which is Eurocentric. Juanita, trained as a speech therapist, spoke to the fact that her university training was from a European perspective, and she and Connie attribute much of the misdiagnosis and misplacement, particularly of non-English proficient students and students with dialects, to such training. Another factor involves the nature of education as a psychologically based discipline, which valorizes individuality and the myth of meritocracy and subscribes to pathological models. Most education majors can complete their degree programs with one course in multicultural education, not a single course in the sociology of education, and no course work having to do with economics, ethics, philosophy, or politics. Despite contestations to the contrary, interdisciplinary study is not encouraged, unless, as is happening in many states, subject areas are being subsumed under a boarder umbrella (e.g. science teachers being expected to teach physical as well as biological science or former social studies teachers held accountable for history). The interdisciplinary nature if multicultural education renders many teachers, even with advanced degrees, unprepared to teacher it effectively; thus, generating justified feelings of inadequacy.

Bewildered, Detached, 'Burned-Out,' and Maybe Racist

Educators, researchers and multicultural advocates often fail to realize that teachers are just people. Although, the literature supports the fact that many in the profession are caring individuals who strive to make a difference in the lives of children, there are also those who teach for other reasons—it is a job, it is a job until I begin a family, it is a job that allows a parent(s) and children to be at home during the same time periods while the parent is still producing earnings to maintain or to supplement household income, it is a job until a potentially higher earner completes college or professional school, it is a job in which I am biding my time until I retire because I have put too much time in to quit, it is a relatively respectable job that pays well in my small hometown where career options are limited. There is not a practicing teacher who has not heard some variation of these statements; yet, the education literature tends to include the "halo" when discussing teachers or to portray them as battling heroes for the underdog or just for "the right and ethical thing."

The multicultural/diversity trainers in this study also accede that there are teachers, cultural workers, such as those described in the literature, but they offer additional perceptions of some of the teachers they encounter in MDT and many of the teachers they encounter in the school setting. First, some teachers are just lazy. Second, many teachers are fearful on at least two dimensions—fear of reprisals for unpopular opinions and teaching methods, and fear of making mistakes. Henry Giroux (1992) warned that teacher fear of moving against the grain is legitimate in recognizing the risks they take in doing so. Geneva Gay and Tyrone Howard (2000) discussed the fear that lack of knowledge engenders when teachers attempt to teach for diversity. Third, other teachers are racist, at worst, and/or unconsciously hegemonic (King, 1991).

Teachers are also more likely now, than ever, to be overwhelmed by the increasing roles they have to play and the number of responsibilities they are expected to assume; however, there are those who refuse to perform essential tasks. A task of all professionals is to keep abreast of current issues, changes, and policies, procedures and standards of their profession. When Adrianne, Carolyn, and Socks call attention to the fact that most of the teachers with whom they interact are ignorant of Blooms Taxonomy as the basis for Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) or that even veterans teachers have never looked at data for their students' test results as a basis for instruction, one has to wonder at the title "professional." Certainly, some districts are less inclined than others to make such data available; however, classroom teachers, and the MDT trainers, know that teachers avail themselves to what they feel they need or what they think is important. To have to be "spoon fed" what is essential to student success is perceived by trainers as a sign of laziness or noncaring, either of which is a negative for students.

Brenda observes that regular teachers often do not choose to make accommodations for individual students, “they are not in the mode to teach.” She and Connie believe that, especially at the secondary level, many teachers do no feel that it is their job to teach or reteach materials that students should have mastered before they reach their classrooms. This type of teacher attitude has devastating effect for students who are performing below grade level—those who are in most need of their help.

Summary of Findings

In 1996, the state of Texas decentralized fourteen major functions to the twenty regional education service centers, which had previously been carried out at the state level. Accompanying each function is a training component. Among the functions providing more opportunities for staff development are those with federal categorical funding such as special education. MDT falls under the special education umbrella; however, it was two years before members of the Multicultural/Diversity Network received any guidance from the state regarding purpose, program focus, or implementation strategies. When the state did intervene, the intervention was directed at a specific purpose and resulted from federal concerns from the U. S. Office of Special Education and the U. S. Office of Civil Rights regarding the overrepresentation of “minority students” in special education. This issue of disproportionality called attention to MDT, since they were the only network dealing with culture and diversity.

The state’s recommendation (2001) to the Multicultural/Diversity Network and the regional ESC’s was that they attend to local issues of disproportionality. Because this issue has ramifications for district funding, participation in MDT increased for schools and districts with higher scores (3s and 4s) for overrepresentation of students of color in special education; however, the remedy of choice is technical (monitor and improve the diagnostic-referral-placement process) rather that affective (implement culturally sensitive developmentally appropriate curriculum and processes). For MDT, this has meant a further turn away from the concepts, principles, and practices of multicultural education. Prepackaged, and therefore prescriptive, programs characterize the content of the MDT process, a one size fits all model, which Geneva Gay (1994) warned against.

> When planning for ME in school programs, it is important to allow different conceptions of ME to be expressed in the decision making process rather than insist on one definition" (p.1).

An additional factor contributing to that trend is lack of knowledge on the part of trainers. All of the trainers are required to hold at least a masters degree in their areas of expertise. Geneva Gay (1994), as she admonishes against volunteerism in implementing multicultural education, reminds us…. Yet, as it relates to multicultural education, anyone who shows interest or is exposed to some form of MDT becomes qualified to serve as a trainer. Certainly, some of the trainers pursue coursework and individual study to increase their levels of knowledge, but, could I, for example, decide to "read up" on special education or take one or two courses and qualify as a special education consultant for the ESC? If the answer is no, then lack of training represents the same lack of value for MDT at the ESC that has been shown at the state and federal levels (Gollnick, 1995) and in many districts and campuses; MDT becomes a crisis intervention strategy or, at best, an approach for teaching those who are culturally different.

The overall perception of Texas Regional Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainers is that they are enmeshed in a hegemonic complex in which many administrators and teachers are complicit, that too many teachers have low expectations for students who are different from themselves and, therefore, conform to a deficit model when dealing with those students, and that it will take federal and state intervention to effectively implement MDT. What is very strange for me is that in all of the discourse about intervention, trainers did not mention communities of interest. Despite positioning themselves as advocates for pluralism, only Adrianne seems to grasp the power potential of communities of color. Because multicultural education grew out of the struggles of the 1960s and African Americans ignited those struggles, in not recognizing that potential, trainers contain MDT as one more program of intervention in schools which strives to "help them" rather than as an empowering idea and process with a reform agenda to create school environments where all students can learn, and thrive, and grow, and think critically about themselves, the world, and their place in it.

Significance of the Study

This study augments the literature on resistance to multicultural education and multiculturalism by focusing attention on in-service teacher resistance and professional/staff development. The adult learners involved (or not involved) in MDT are, for the most part, products of the same teacher education programs as the preservice teachers who have been the subject of much of the existing literature on resistance and whose social, racial and ethnic locations reflect similar prospective as those expressed by perspective teachers (Sleeter, 1992). In fact, veteran inservice teachers may have been less exposed to formal knowledge of the role of culture and diversity in student achievement than prospective teachers. For the same reasons, the study illuminates issues in teaching for social justice, and change through reform initiatives, by applying these concepts to the lesser studied areas of veteran teacher resistance as well as identifying structural inhibitors which, unexamined, evolve into barriers for effective delivery of training in multicultural/diversity issues and implementation of multicultural education initiatives.

The study may also prove significant to at least five additional audiences: 1) policy makers at the Texas Education Agency and administrators of its Regional Education Service Centers, 2) Regional Multicultural/Diversity Trainers, 3) administrators at the district and campus levels, 4) teachers, and 5) students, particularly students of color, and the communities and families from which they come.

In light of the abundant literature, and its relation to MDT as presently conceived and implemented, the Texas Education Agency and its Regional Education Service Centers may need to reexamination the structure and content of MDT when juxtaposed with its stated purpose, as well as the true level of support which they hold for social justice and pluralism. More urgently, considering the posture of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights and the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, the state might want to align their efforts at reducing disproportionality to the research on “best practices” in professional development, organizational development and change, effective schools, multicultural education.

The regional multicultural/diversity trainers must engage in self-reflectivity, that is examine their philosophical perspectives, which influence their goals for MDT, their roles in the implementation of MDT, their commitment to the principles of social justice and pluralism, and their preparation for conducting MDT, if they except the responsibility for training, not only teachers and staff and administrators, but other trainers. They may need to revisit the goals and strategies set forth by the Multicultural/Diversity Network. Are they aligned with the principles the trainers wish to espouse? Or Are they a "hodge-podge" of accommodation to external forces (i.e. local culture of the regions, administrative perspectives, school culture, cultural and teachers teacher bias), and/or internal discomfort with multiculturalism and pluralism.

District and campus administrator might want to examine whether, as Adrianne, Brenda and Juanita, there is a connection between multicultural education and student achievement, if only in the self interest of the district as a function of the accountability system. And, if so, campuses support initiatives to make their school environments places where all students can become successful.

Teachers must face the reality of diversity and what it means in their classrooms, where student should be the major concern. New teachers, in particular must realize that they, more than veteran teachers are likely to face even increasingly diverse student in their classrooms. As older teachers, the "baby boomers" retire in alarming numbers, the torch is passed. They have an opportunity to make a "real" difference, through collaboration, caring, and commitment, in the lives of their students. Are they willing to do the hard work of teaching for diversity? Hard work, because they are not fully prepared—their prior personal experiences, school experiences and teacher preparation programs have not prepared them. It will take commitment and independent initiative to become effective teachers of culturally, linguistically, economically, educationally, diverse students. I venture to propose that with the realization of Marshall McLuhan's "global village," teachers need more and better preparation to effectively teach all students.

Communities and families, regardless of socioeconomic conditions, must arm themselves to participate, collaborate, and advocate for their students. The devaluation of the cultures and identity of students of color, the special education "sales pitch", tracking, discriminatory discipline policies, missionary teachers who disempower students who differ from themselves, and schools that resemble factories and prisons and operate as such pose a dire threat. All stakeholders must interrogate teachers' resistance and structural impediments to a vision of an education for social justice, pluralism, and human potentiality for all students.

Recommendations for Further Research

With respect to structural barriers to MDT, studies need to be conducted that connect the diffusion of information, organizational change, and other relevant literature to multicultural/diversity issues in an effort to assess the processes by which other, more successful, initiatives (i.e. antidiscrimination, IDEA, sexual harassment legislation) have become institutional policy. The rhetoric of education as political seems to have been lost to many multicultural education advocates since its inception which was born of the Civil Rights Movement.

To further understand teacher resistance to MDT, I would recommend conducting a study of experienced teachers to determine if M/DTs' perceptions of them are supported. If multicultural education is concerned with dialectical problem posing, is socially constructed, involves multiple world views, and is particularistic, then we need to hear the voices of teachers, as well as students, on these issues.

Studies should be conducted studies to determine which philosophy of MDT has the highest impact on altering participants' attitudes towards diversity. Currently trainers tend to promote a certain program based on their personal preference or the perspective of the local community.

We also need to understand how the participants' attitudes change during MDT and how this impacts their practice. Currently, the success of MDT is measured by the perceptions of the participants themselves, and the evaluations are often based on variables such as enjoyment or whether the material was useful. Even when asked if they intended to use any of the knowledge, materials, or strategies presented there is no follow-up to ascertain whether the intentions were acted upon. It is critical that we understand the effect MDT has on educational practice. That knowledge will enable us to construct more effective programming in the future.

REFERENCES

Ahlquist, R. (1991a). Manifestations of inequality: Overcoming resistance in a multicultural foundations course. In C.Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education* (pp. 89-105). London: Falmer Press.

Alford, B. J. (2001). The Texas accountability system past, present, and future through one educator's lens: A continuing journey toward system improvement. In A. Horn & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *American standards: Quality education in a complex world* (pp. 107-130). New York: Peter Lang.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatus. (B. Brewster, Trans.). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays,* (pp. 127-186). London: Monthly Review Press.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1973). No one model American. Washington, D. C.: Author. *Journal of Teacher Education, 224*(4), 264-265.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 49*(3), 381-386.

Anyon, J. (1995). Race, social class and education in the inner city. Teacher College Record, 97(1). Retrieved June 7, 2001, from http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=9510055042&db=afh.

Apple, M. (1978). Class, codes and control, Vol. 3: Toward a theory of education transmissions. *Curriculum Inquiry, 9*(3), 251-257.

Apple, M. (1983). *Ideology and curriculum.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and text: A political economy of class and gender in relations in education.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1993*). Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Appleton, N. (1983). *Cultural pluralism in education*. New York: Longman.

Asante, M. K. (1980). Afrocentricity: The theory of social change. In A. Asante & A. Vandi (Eds.), *Contemporary Black thought.* Buffalo, NY: Amulefi.

Asante, M. K. (1987). *The afrocentric idea.* Philagelphia: Temple University Press.

Asante, M. K. (1991/1992). Afrocentric curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 49*, 28-39.

Atwood, J. (1994). Good intentions, dangerous territory: Student resistance in feminist writing classes. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *12,* 125-143.

Au, K. H., & Kawakami, A. J. (1985). Research currents: Talk story and learning to read. *Language Arts, 62*(4), 406-411.

Baker, G. C. (1978). The role of the school in transmitting the culture of all learners in a free and democratic society. *Educational Leadership*, *36,* 134-138.

Baker, G. C. (1983a). Motivating the culturally different student. *Momentum, 14*, 44-45.

Ball, D., Lubienski, S., & Mewborn, D. (2001) Research on teaching mathematics: The unsolved problem of teachers' knowledge. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching,* (4th ed., pp. 433-456). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Ballantine, J. H., & Spade, J. Z. (Eds.). (2001). *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Baltes, B. (1998). “Not another multicultural education workshop” (sigh): Why teachers feel intimidated by more workshops in multicultural education. In H. E. Klein (Ed.), *Creative teaching act I* (pp. 55-57). Madison, WI: Omni Press.

Banks, C. A. M., & Banks, J. A. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 152-158.

Banks, J. A. (1981). Culture and the bilingual classroom. *Multiethnic education: Theory into practice.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1983). Multicultural education and the quest for equality. *Phi Beta Kappan*, *64,* 582-585.

Banks, J. A. (1984). The social studies, ethnic diversity, and social change. *Elementary School Journal, 87*(5), 531-543.

Banks, J. A. (1992). Multicultural education: Approaches, development, and dimensions. In J. Lynch, C. Modgil & S. Modgil (Eds.), In *Education for* cultural *diversity: convergence and divergence,* (Vol. 1), (pp. 83-94). London: The Falmer Press.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1996). Multicultural education: Transformative knowledge and action. New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1997). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 3-31). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (2000). The social construction of difference and the quest for equality. In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), *Education in the new century,* (pp. 21-45). Arlington, VA:

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD 2000 Yearbook).

Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In. J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banks J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Baptiste, H. P. (1979). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies*. (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Baptiste, H. P., & Baptiste, M. (1980) Competencies toward multiculturalism. In D. Gollnick (Ed.), *Multicultural teacher education: Preparing teacher educators to provide educational equity* (Vol.1, pp. 44-72). Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Bard, M. (2002). *Multicultural education in the classroom*: *Waves of change.* Retrieved October 19, 2002 from http://www.journalism.indiana.edu/gallery/student/j201spring02/nechchai1/index.html.

Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.

Bennett, C. I. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(4), 250-265.

Bennett. C. I. (1999). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Berliner, D. C. (2002). High stakes testing, uncertainty, and student learning. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10(18). Retrieved, May, 2002, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n18/.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting change (Vol. VIII).* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Bogan, R. C., & Bilken, S. N. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bogan, R. C., & Biklen, S. N. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Social reproduction and social reproduction. In Jerome Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487-511). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* London: Sage.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* New York: Basic Books.

Boyer, J. B., & Baptiste, H. P. (1996a). The crisis in teacher education in America: Issues of recruitment and retention of culturally different (minority) teachers. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 779-794). New York: Macmillan.

Burnette, J. (1998). *Reducing the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education.* Reston, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education.

Carpenter, A. (2000, April). *An ethnographic study of preservice teacher resistance to multiculturalism: Implications for teaching.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Chan, C., & Treacy, M. J. (1996). Resistance in multicultural courses: Students, faculty and classroom dynamics. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(2), 212-221.

Chizhik, E. W., & Chizhik, A. W. (2005). Are you privileged or oppressed? Students' conceptions of themselves and others. *Urban Education*, *40*(2), 116-143.

Clasen, R. E. ((1979). Models for the educational needs of gifted children in a multicultural context. *Journal of Negro Education, 48*(3)*,* 357-363.

Cochran-Smith, M, (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*, 541-570.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Standing at the crossroads: Multicultural teacher education at the beginning of the 21st century. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(3), 3-11.

Cockrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with "diversity' and multiculturalism" in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 351-366.

Cohen, D. K. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(3), 311-329.

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (2000). Instructional policy and classroom performance: mathematics reform in California. *Teachers College Record, 102*(2), 294-343

Commission on Multicultural Education. (1973). No one model American. *Journal of Teacher Education, 24,* 264-265.

Corcoran, T. B. (1995). Helping teachers teach well: Transforming professional development. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education Brief, 1-12.* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Corcoran, T. B., & Goertz, M. (1995). Institutional capacity and high performance schools. *Educational Researcher, 24*(9), 27-31.

Consortium for Policy Research in Education. (1999). *Deepening the work: A report of the sixth year of the Merck Institute for Science Education, CPRE Evaluation Report.* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Author.

Cortez, A. (2001). Why better isn't good enough: A closer look at TAAS gains. In R. A. Horn & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *American standards: Quality education in a complex world,* (pp. 307-318). New York: Peter Lang.

Cremin, L. A. (1957). *The republic and the school: Horace Mann on the education of free men.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 18-36.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). The implications of testing policy for quality and equality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(3): 220-225.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Performance based assessment and educational equity. *Harvard Educational Review, 64* (Spring), 5-30.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465-483). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia, S. P. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Davis, N. J. (1992 July). Teaching about inequity: Student resistance, paralysis, and rage. *Teaching Sociology, 20*(3)*,* 232-238.

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

Desimone, L. M., Porter, A.C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 81-112.

Dewey, J. (1916). [1966] *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Macmillan Company.

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

Eby, R. (1925). *The development of education in Texas*. New York: Macmillan.

Edwards, R. C. (1972). *The capitalist system.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Elmore, R. F., & Burney, D. (1996 March). *Staff development and institutional improvement: Community district 2, New York City.* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Epps, E. G. (Ed.). (1974). *Cultural pluralism*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Educational Quarterly*, *18*(4), 335-356.

Escalante, J., & Dirmann, J. (1990). The Jamie Escalante math program. *Journal of Negro Education, 59*(30), 407-423.

FairTest. *Tables on state testing.* (1997). Cambridge, MA: Author.

Fallahi, M. (1994). *Multicultural education: A challenge for all.* Paper presented at the fourth annual conference of the National Association for Multicultural Education, Detroit, MI.

Farber, K. S. (1995). Teaching about diversity through reflectivity: Sites of uncertainty, risk, and possibility. In R. Martin (Ed.), P*racticing what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education* (pp. 49-63). Albany, NY: State University Press.

Festinger, L. A. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Fillilove, R. E., & Treisman, P. U. (1990). Mathematics achievement among African American undergraduates at the University of California, Berkeley: An evaluation of the mathematics workshop program. *Journal of Negro Education*, *59*(3), 463-478.

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school.* Albany, NY: New York University Press.

Freire, P. (1998a). [1970]. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1998b). [1989]. *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fulton-Scott, M. (1983). Bilingual multicultural education vs. integrated and non-integrated ESL instruction. *NABE Journal*, *11*(3), 1-12.

Gaines, M. (2002).Regional educational service centers. In J. A. Vornberg (Ed.), *Texas school organization and administration* (pp. 53-70). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research-An introduction.* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Garcia, R. L. (1982). *Teaching in a pluralistic society: Concepts models and strategies.* New York: Harper & Row.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Garet, M. S., Birman, B. F., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Herman, R., Yoon, K. S. (1999*). Designing effective professional development: Lessons from the Eisenhower program.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L. Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Journal of Educational Research, 38*(4): 915-945.

Gay, G. (1975). Organizing and designing culturally pluralistic curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, *33*(3), 176-183.

Gay, G. (1991). Culturally diverse students and social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 144-156). New York: Macmillan.

Gay, G. (1994). A synthesis of scholarship in multicultural education. *Urban Education Monograph Series.* Retrieved August 25, 2002, from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/area/issues/educators/leadrsho/le0gay.htm.

Gay, G. (1995). Mirror images on community issues: Parallels between multicultural education and critical pedagogy. In C. Sleeter & P. MacLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference* (pp. 155-190). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

Gay, G. (2000b). Town meeting. Annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME). Orlando, FL.

Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *Teacher Educator, 36*(1), 1-16.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Selected essays of Clifford Geertz* (pp. 3-30). NY: Basic Books.

Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly*, *7*, 7-18.

Giles, R. H., & Gollnick, D. M. (1977). Ethnic/cultural diversity as reflected in federal and state educational legislation and policy. In F. H. Klasson & D. H. Gollnick (Eds.), *Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies* (pp. 115-160). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). Hegemony, resistance, and the paradox of educational reform. *Interchange*, *12*(2-3), 3-36.

Giroux, H. A. (1983a). *Theory and resistance in education: pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1983b). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, *53*(3) 261-293.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Giroux, H. A (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2001). (Rev. and expanded ed.).*Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(3), 213-238.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1989). *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle: Teacher empowerment and school reform.* Albany: State University Press of New York.

Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Gold, M. Grant, C. A., & Rivlin, H. (Eds.). (1977). *In praise of diversity: A resource book for multicultural education.* Washington, DC: Teacher Core, Association of Teacher Education.

Gollnick, D. M. (1980). Multicultural education*. Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, 50*, 1-17.

Gollnick, D. M. (2001). National and state initiatives for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. (1986). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Goodman, D. (2001). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gordon, B. M. (1985). Toward emancipation in citizenship education: The case of African American cultural knowledge. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *12,* 1-23.

Gramsci, A. (1995a). [1871]. *Antonio Gramsci: Prison notebooks*. Vol. 1. J.Buttigieg (Ed.). J. Buttigieg and A. Callari (Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1995b). [1871]. *Antonio Gramsci: Prison notebooks*, *Vol. 11*. J. Buttigieg (Ed.) J. Buttigieg and A. Callari (Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Grant, C. A. (1977a). Education that is multicultural and P/CBTE: Discussions and recommendations for teaching education. In F. H. Klassen & D. M. Gollnick

(Eds.), *Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies* (pp. 63-80). Washington, D. C.: Ethnic Heritage Center for Teacher Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Grant, C. A. (1977b). *Multicultural education: Commitments, issues and applications.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Grant, C. A. (1989). Urban teachers: Their new challenges and curriculum. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(10), 764-770.

Grant, C. A. (1994a). Toward a common definition of multicultural education. *Insights in diversity.* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Grant, C. A. (1994b). Challenging the myths about multicultural education. *Multicultural Education, 2*(2), 4-9.

Grant, C. A., & Ladson-Billings, G. (Eds.). (1997). *Dictionary of multicultural education*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Grant, C. A., &, Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1988). Race, class, and gender and abandoned dreams. *Teachers College Record, 90*, 19-24.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *After the school bell rings* (2nd ed.). Barcombe, England: Falmer Press.

Greene, M. (1986). In search of a critical pedagogy. *Harvard Education Review*, *56*, 427-441.

Greene, M. (1996). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenman, N. P., Kimmel, E.B., Bannan, H. M., & Radford-Curry, B. (1992). Institutional inertia to achieving diversity: Transforming resistance into celebration. *Educational Foundations*, *6*, 86-111.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Resources Information Center annual review paper*, *29*, 75-91.

Guskey, T. R. (1986) Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(9), 5-12.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes effective professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(10), 748-750.

Haberman, M. (1991a). Can culture awareness be taught in teacher education program? *Teacher Education*, *4*(1), 25-31.

Haberman, M. (1991b). The rationale for training adults as teachers. In C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education* (pp. 275-286). Albany, NY: State University Press.

Haberman, M. (1991). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. *Phi Beta Kappan*, *73*(4), 290-294.

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

Haberman, M. (1995b). Selecting "Star" teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(10), 777-781.

Hanley, M. S. (2002). *New horizons for learning: Teaching and learning strategies*. Retrieved June 10, 2006, from http://www.newhorizons.org/strategies/multicultural/hanley.htm.

Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. W. (1992). Racial development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 52,* 21-39.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In G. Sykes & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.

Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1977). Meaningful bilingual bicultural education: A fairytale. *NABE Journal*, *1,* 49-54.

Higginbotham, E. (1996). Getting all students to listen: Analyzing and coping with student resistance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(2), 203-211.

Hilliard, A. G., III. (1991/1992, December/January). Why we must pluralize the curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, *49*(4), 12-16.

Hilliard, A. G. III. (2002). Informal address presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Hodgkinson, H. (2001). Educational demographics: What teachers should know. *Educational Leadership, 58*(4), 6-11.

Hodgkinson, H. (2003). Demographics and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53(*2), 102-105.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Horn, R. A., & Kincleloe, J. L. (2001). *American standards: Quality education in a world complex, The Texas case.* New York: Peter Lang.

Horn, R. A. (2001). The question of complexity: Understanding the standards movement in Texas. In R. A. Horn & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *American standards: Quality education in a complex world* (pp. 73-104). New York: Peter Lang.

Howard, G. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1998). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative material* (pp. 179-210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hutto, N., Fisher, A., & Czaja, M. (2002). The Texas education agency and governance of education. . In J. A. Vornberg (Ed.), *Texas school organization and administration: 2002* (pp. 71-88). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Jenks, C., Lee, J. O., & Kanpol, B. (2002). Approaches to multicultural education in preservice teacher education: Philosophical frameworks and models for teaching. *The Urban Review, 33*(2), 87-105.

Johnson, J., Dupuis, V., Musial, D., Hall, G. E., & Gollnick, D. (2002). *Introduction to the foundations of American education.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jordan, M. L. J. (1995). Reflections on the challenges, possibilities, and perplexities of preparing preservice teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(5), 369-374.

Josselson, R. (1995). *The narrative study of lives: Vol. 4. Ethics and process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kanpol, B. (1999). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (Eds). (1977). *Power and ideology in education.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Keeley, S. M., Shemberg, K. M., Cowell, B. S., & Zinnbauer, B. J. (1995). Coping with student resistance to critical thinking: What the psychotherapy literature tells us. *College Teaching, 43*(4), 140-145.

Kendall, F. E. (1983a). *Diversity in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kendall, F. E. (1983b). Presenting multicultural education to parents. *Momentum, 14,* 11-12.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). “Goin’ home to the armadillo”: Making sense of Texas educational standards. In R. A. Horn & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *American standards: Quality education in a complex world.* New York: Peter Lang.

King, E. W. (1980). *Teaching ethnic awareness*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146.

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

King, N. J. (1980). *Staff development programs in desegregated settings*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner: A definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America’s schools*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time.* London: Verso Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a Black professor teaching White students. *Theory into Practice*, *39*, 79-85.

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

Lamont, M., & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural capital: Allusion, gaps and glissandos in recent theoretical developments. *Theoretical Sociology, 6,* 153-168.

Lareau, A. (1987). Social class differences in family-school relationships: The impact of cultural capital. *Sociology of Education, 60,* 73-85.

Larke, P. J., Webb-Johnson, G., & Carter, N. (1996). Effective classroom management in culturally diverse classrooms: Strategies for educators. *Teacher Education Journal*, *6*(1), 42-55.

Larke, P. J., Wiseman, D., & Bradley, C. (1997). The minority mentorship project: Changing attitudes of preservice teachers for diverse classrooms. *Action in Teacher Education, 12*(3), 5-11.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lielich, A., Tuval-Mashiah, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). Narrative Research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, 47*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Linde, C. (1993). *Life stories: The creation of coherence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mackeracher, D. (1996). *Making sense of adult learning.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D., & Redmond-Jones, D. (2001). Reconstituting schools: "Testing" the "theory of action." *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 113-132.

McFalls, E. L., & Cobb-Roberts, D. (2001 March/April). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2): 164-172.

McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom, 49*(4), 10-12.

McIntyre, A. (2002). Exploring whiteness and multicultural education with prospective teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(1), 31-49.

McLaren, P. (1980). *Cries from the corridor*. Toronto: Methuen.

McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* New York: Longman.

McLaren, P., & Leonard, P. (1993). *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter.* New York: Routledge.

McNeil, L. M. (1999). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing.* New York: Routledge.

Mean, B., & Olson, K. (1994). The link between technology and authentic learning. *Educational Leadership, 51*(7), 15-18.

Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive studies. *Sociology of Education, 65*(1), 1-20.

Mehan, H. (2001). Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive studies. In J. H. Ballantine & Spade, J. Z. (Eds.), *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (pp. 62-72).Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Meyers, P. (1975). The long shadow of work: education, the family, and the social division of labor. *The Insurgent Sociologist, 5*(4), 3-22.

Morris, M. (2001). Multiculturalism as jagged walking. *Multicultural Education*, *8*(4), 2-8). Retrieved July 16, 2006, from http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.hww/results/results_single_ftPES.jhtml.

Moss, G. (2001). Critical pedagogy: Transformation for education that is multicultural. *Multicultural Education, 9*(2), 2-11.

Nieto, S. (2000). Affirming *diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. Number 107-110.

Noel, J. R. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: From awareness through emotion to action. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *46*(4), 267-273.

Noddings, N. (1995a). Deweys philosophical orientation. *Philosophy of education* (pp. 24-30). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Noddings, N. (1995b). Deweys theory of knowledge. *Philosophy of education* (pp. 31-36). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (4th ed.). New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (1990). *Multiplying inequities: The effect of race, social class and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Oakes, J., Wells, A. S., Jones, M., & Datnow, A. (2001). In J. H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds.), *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (pp. 320-329). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste.* New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (2001). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. In J. H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds.), *Schools and society: A sociological approach to education* (pp. 343-354). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pang, V.O. (2001). *Multicultural education: A caring-centered, reflective approach.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Payne, C. R. (1983). Multicultural education: A natural way to teach. *Contemporary Education*, 54, 98-104.

Polan, C. A., & Mathison, C. (1999) Dismantling defensiveness and resistance to diversity and social justice. *Action in Teacher Education, 20*(1), 15-22. Retrieved on July 16, 2006, from http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/results/results_single_ftPES.jhtml.

Richardson, J. (1997 March). Dealing with resisters biggest challenge for staff developers. *The Developer*. Retrieved October 19, 2002, from http:///www.org/library/develpoer/dev3-9rich.html.

Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. *Handbook of research on teaching*, (4th ed. p.938-945). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* Qualitative research methods series, no. 30. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Rist, R. C. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *40*(3), 411-451.

Roberts, L. F., & Poats, L. B. (2002). Cultural and ethnic diversity in Texas schools: Implications for leadership effectiveness (with case studies). In J. A. Vornberg (Ed.), *Texas public school organization: 2002* (pp. 139-183). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Rodriquez, A. J. (1998). Strategies for counterresistance: Toward sociotransformative constructivism and learning to teach science for diversity and for understanding. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *35*(6), 569-622.

Ross, E. W. (1997). Standards, testing, and curriculum control. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 25*(4). 404-406.

Schofield, J.P. (2000). Review of research on school desegregation's impact on elementary and secondary school students. In J Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 597-616). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shade, B. J. (1989). *Culture, style, and the education process*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Shade, B. J. (1992). Afro-American cognitive styles: A variable in school success? *Harvard Education Review*, *52,* 219-244.

Shor, I. (1980). *Critical teaching and everyday life*. Boston: South End Press.

Sizemore, B. A. (1979). The four M curriculum: A way to shape the future. *Journal of Negro Education, 48*, 341-356.

Slavin, R. E. (2001). Cooperative learning and intergroup relations. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Multicultural education as a form of resistance to oppression. *Journal of Education, 171*(3), 51-71.

Sleeter, C. E. (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

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

Sleeter, C. E. (1992b). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender, and social class locations. *Educational Foundations*, *6*, 7-35.

Sleeter, C. E. (1994). White Racism. *Multicultural Education*, *62*(1): 1-24.

Sleeter, C. E. (1995). Teaching Whites about racism. In R. Martin (Ed.), *Multicultural education for a culturally diverse teaching force* (pp. 117-130). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism* SUNY series, social context of education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2000/2001). Diversity vs. White privilege. *Rethinking Schools, 15*(2). Retreived July, 2003, from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/Archives/15_02/Int152.htm.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (November, 1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(4), 421-444.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). A rationale for integrating race, gender, and social class. In L. Weis (Ed.). *Class, race, and gender in American education* (pp. 144-157). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant. C. A. (1994). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (2nd ed.). New York: Merrill.

Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference* SUNY series, social context of education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Smith, G.M. (1967). 'Usefulness of peer ratings of personality in educational research. ' *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 27, 967–9.

Smylie, M. A., Bilcer, D. K., Greenberg, R. C., & Harris, R. L. (1998). *Urban teacher professional development: A portrait of practice from Chicago.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Spindler, G. D. (Ed.). (1982). *Doing the ethnography of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sparks, D. & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. *Journal of Staff Development,* 40-57.

Stent, M., Hazard, W., & Grant, C. A. (Eds.). (1973). *Cultural pluralism in education: A mandate for change.* New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Supovitz, J., & Goerlich, Z. (2000 Fall). Why they stay away: Survey reveals barriers to teacher participation. *Journal of Staff Development, 21*(4), 1-6. Retrieved October 15, 2002, from http://www.nsde.org/library/jsd/supovitz214.html.

Suzuki, B. H. (1984). Curriculum transformation for multicultural education. *Education and Urban Society, 16,* 294-322.

Swartz, E. (1993). Multicultural education: Disrupting patterns of supremacy in school curricula, practices, and pedagogy. *Journal of Negro Education*, *62*(4), 493-506.

Sykes, G. (1996). Reform of and as professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(7), 465-467.

Sykes, G. (1999). Make subject matter count. *Journal of Staff Development,* (2), 50-51.

Tatum, B. D. (1992a). *Assimilation Blues: Black families in a white community.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Tatum, B. D. (1992b). Talking about race, learning about racism: An application of racial development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(1), 1-24.

Tatum, B. D. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record*, *95*(4), 463-476.

Texas Education Agency. (2003). *Snapshot 2003 summary tables: State totals*. Education Service Center Region: Author. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&prgopt=20...

Texas Education Agency. (2004*). Snapshot 2004 summary tables: State totals.* Education Service Center Region: Author. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/cgi/sas/broker?_service=marykay&_program=perfrep.perfmast.sas&prgopt=20...

Texas Education Agency. (2004) *Snapshot 2004 summary tables: State totals.* Retrieved April 16, 2007, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/snapshot/2004/state.html

Texas Senate Bill 1158. (1997). 75th Session. Chapter 8. Regional Education Service Centers.

Ukpokodu, O. N. (2003). The challenges of teaching a social studies methods course from a transformative and social reconstructionist framework. *Social Studies,* *94*(2), p, 75-80. Retrieved July 13, 2006, from http://web11.epnet.com/DeliveryPrintSave.asp?tb=1&_ug=sid+7A66394C-8C7D-...

U. S. Census Bureau. (2005). *Changing student demographics in schools, kindergarten through grade 12.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 5, 2006, from http://www.census.gov./pro/2005pubs/p20-533

U. S. Department of the Commerce. (2002). *American community survey. Spanish at home – state.* Retrieved on April 16, from http://www.census2010.gov/asc/www/Products/ranking/2002/R06T040/htm.

U. S. Department of Commerce. (2004). *American community survey. Spanish at home – county.* Retrieved on April 16, 2007, from http://www. census2010.gov/asc/www/Products/ranking/2004/R06T040/htm.

U. S. Department of Commerce. (2002). *Percentage of people 5 years and over who speak a language other than English: American community survey ranking table county.* Washington, D. C.: Author. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from http://www.census.gov/ccs/www/index.html.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (2004). *Percentage of people 5 years and over who speak a language other than English: American community survey ranking table state.* Washington, D. C.: Author. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from http://www.census.gov/ccs/www/index.html.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Guidance of the comprehensive school reform program.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on August 23, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/programs/compreform/guidance/ page_pg5.html/exp'0.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Guidance on the comprehensive school reform program.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on August 10, 2007, from http://.ed.gov/programs/compreform/guiadance/page_pg5.html?exp'0.

Van der Klink, M. Gielen, E., & Nauta, C. (2001). Supervisory support as a major condition to enhance transfer. *International Journal of Training and Development, 5*(1), 52-63.

Vornberg, J. A. (Ed). (2002). *Texas public school organization: 2002*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Weil, D. (2001). Couching the standards debate in historical terms: Developing a dialectical understanding of the standards debate through historical awareness. In R. A. Horn & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *American standards: Quality education in a complex world* (pp. 45-71). New York: Peter Lang.

Weis, L. (1985). *Between two worlds: Black students in an urban community college.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weis, L. (Ed.). (1988). *Class, race, and gender in American education.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Weis, L., & Fine M. (Eds.). (1993). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race and gender in United States schools.* Albany: State University of New York.

White, R. (2001). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics.* Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research Inc.

Willis, P. (1981) [1977]. *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilson, K. (2002). *Multicultural education.* Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.edChange.org/multicultural/papers/keith.html.

Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The miseducation of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Press.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). *Educating teachers for diversity.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research for Teacher Learning.

Zeichner, K. M. & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

Teacher Resistance to Multicultural Education

Pilot Study—Interview Schedule

1. How did this diversity program get started?

2. What are its goals?

3. What are the requirements?

4. Is the program mandatory___yes ___no?

5. If Yes, for whom? Every faculty member? Representatives from every school? Please Indicate.

6. Describe a typical workshop. Do you have more than one model?

7. How did you get involved in this program? Can you describe faculty reaction to the workshops?

8. When you encounter resistance from faculty, what form does it take?

9. Tell me a time when resistance was particularly problematic.
(Here, I want respondents to describe an experience in as much detail as possible. I asked for other examples and probed for a time when resistance took a different form.)

10. How did you deal with the resistance?

11. Tell me about times when you thought the workshop was successful.

12. Tell me about time when you thought the workshop was not successful.

13. What are your “overall hopes for programs of this type?

APPENDIX B

A Case Study of Texas Regional Education Service Center Multicultural/Diversity Trainer Perceptions' of Teacher Resistance and Structural Barriers to Multicultural Education

(Dissertation—Interview Schedule and Multicultural/Diversity Trainer Profile)

Name: ________________________
Address:
____
Phone Number: ____________________E-mail address: _________________________
Sex: M_____ F_____
Age: _____
Race/Ethnicity: ____________________
Service Center Region: _____
Official Title: _____________________

1. How many years have you been an ESC trainer? _______

2. How long has your training effort focused on issues of multicultural education and/or diversity? _______

3. How many multicultural/diversity workshops have you conducted? _______

4. When is your next multicultural/diversity workshop scheduled? __________

5. How many workshops will you conduct before the end of August 2003? _______

6. What is your educational background or area of specialization (i.e. English, mathematics, bilingual education, special education)? ___________________

7. How many formal courses, _____ workshops/training _____have you had in the area of multicultural education?

8. Where did you receive your coursework and/or training?

9. What type of curricula do you use in your workshops? Please be specific (i.e. REACH, The Culture of Poverty, Self-developed).

10. Why did you choose the curriculum that you use?

11. How did you arrive at your present position?

12. Would you be willing to participate in an interview concerning participation or lack of participation in workshops offered by the Education Service Centers? Yes: _____ No: _____

13. Does your training focus on issues other than multicultural education or diversity? Yes: _____ No: _____ (Check one.) **If the answer is yes**, please specify your area of specialization ____________________

14. Approximately what percentage of your time is spent conducting or preparing to conduct multicultural/diversity training? ______%

15. What do you consider your major function at the Education Service Center?

16. What changes would you make in the present multicultural/diversity training program?

17. If you could affect change, why would you do so?

18. What is your personal goal for multicultural/diversity training? For example, describe what you want to accomplish or what outcomes you expect (or strive for) with workshop participants?

VITA

Name: Eronif Ibrahim

Address: Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77804

E-Mail Address: ibrahim@neo.tamu.edu

Education: B.A., English/Vocal Music, Florida Memorial College, Miami Florida, 1969
M.S., Mass Communication, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1976
Ph.D., Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University at College Station, Texas, 2007

Certifications: Certified Trainer
Teacher Certification: Texas, 9-12, English, Reading, Speech Communication, Generic Special Education; North Carolina, 9-12, English
Bourne Writing Project

Work Experience: College Teaching
Teaching K-12
Social Service and Education Administrator
Grant Writer, Speech Writer, Editor
Researcher
Recruiter Counselor
Independent Communication Consultant

Major Presentations: Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, 2004
Annual Meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME): 2001, 2002, 2003; Texas NAME: 2003
Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Education (ATE): 2003
Annual Meeting of the Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1996

Major Publication: *Rural Economic Development for Community Self Reliance*, Florida A&M University, funded by a grant from the Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1995