NCRTL Special Report

Educating Teachers for Cultural Diversity

by Kenneth M. Zeichner

The Issue

This report addresses various dimensions of one of the major policy issues in U.S. teacher education for the foreseeable future–the need to help all teachers acquire the attitudes, knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to work effectively with a diverse student population. In the coming years, American students will be increasingly different in background from one another and from their teachers, and many will be poor. Because the demographic composition of the teaching corps is unlikely to change significantly, even under the most optimistic scenario,[1] and because alternative routes will most likely continue to supplement rather than replace regular campus-based programs, the problem of educating teachers for diversity, in most instances, will continue to be one of educating white, monolingual, and mostly female teacher education students during preservice teacher education in college and university settings to teach diverse learners effectively. In many areas of the country, the students these new teachers will be asked to teach will have backgrounds and life experiences very different from their own so that teaching will require a great deal of intercultural communication.[2]

Kenneth M. Zeichner, professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, is a senior researcher with the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. The author would like to thank the following people for their comments and criticisms of an earlier draft of this report: Mimi Bloch, Ann DeVaney, Mary Dillworth, Mary Gomez, Carl Grant, Karen Hoeft, Mary Kennedy, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Bill McDiarmid, Susan Melnick, Lynn Paine, Bob Tabachnick, Bill Tate, Henry Trueba, and Ana Maria Villegas.

Although an adequate definition of diversity needs to be broad and inclusive, my use of the terms *diversity* and *diverse learners* in this report focuses primarily on differences related to social class, ethnicity, culture, and language.[3] I am specifically concerned about those situations where (a) white, monolingual teachers have different ethnic, cultural and/or language backgrounds than their students and (b) the students are those with whom teachers typically do not succeed (i.e., they are mainly poor students of color).

After outlining several aspects of the problem, I discuss different ideas in the literature about what teachers need to be like, know, and be able to do to work successfully with diverse students; different strategies used in teacher education programs to prepare teachers for diversity as it is defined in this report; and different conceptions of teacher learning and teacher development which are associated with these different strategies of teacher education.

At the onset, I would like to express my agreement with Grant and Secada's (1990) and Ladson-Billings's (1991c) conclusion that the issue of preparing teachers for diversity still has a marginal status in the mainstream teacher education literature. Despite a substantial literature which addresses the growing disparity between the characteristics of our teaching force and those of the students in our public schools, the problems associated with recruiting more teachers of color, and the problems of inequity in schools and the society, there has been relatively very little attention in the current literature of teacher education reform to issues of educational and social inequity and to ideas about how to prepare teachers to teach an increasingly diverse student population more effectively (Liston & Zeichner, 1991).

Many of the documents reviewed in preparing this report were part of the fugitive educational literature or in less accessible journals and were obtained through personal contacts rather than literature searches. The fact that much of the literature on preparing teachers for diversity is not readily available to the general teacher education community confirms the low status of this issue in the "official" agenda for teacher education reform.[4] With the exception of the Holmes Group's (1990) *Tomorrow's Schools*, the most widely publicized of the reports on teacher education and proposals for reform (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986) give only surface attention, at best, to issues related to educational equity and teacher education when it comes to detailing proposals for improving teacher education programs (Gordon, 1988; Grant & Gillette, 1987; Zeichner, 1990b).[5]

In contrast, attention to the problem of preparing teachers to teach a diverse student body is not a new concern in U.S. teacher education. For example, in 1969 the widely publicized task force report of the National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, *Teachers for the "Real World"* (Smith, 1969), clearly identified the failure of teacher education programs to prepare teachers to teach effectively what at that time were referred to as "culturally disadvantaged" students.[6] In concluding that most teacher education programs prepared education students to teach children much like themselves, instead of children of *any* social origin, this report called for a major overhaul of teacher education programs in terms of their approach to issues of diversity and equity:

> Racial, class, and ethnic bias can be found in every aspect of current teacher preparation programs. The selection processes militate against the poor and minorities. The program content reflects current prejudices; the methods of instruction coincide with learning styles of the dominant group. Subtle inequalities are reinforced in institutions of higher learning. Unless there is scrupulous self-appraisal, unless every aspect of teacher training is carefully reviewed, the changes initiated in teacher preparation as a result of the current crisis will be, like so many changes which have gone before, merely differences which make no difference. (pp. 2-3)[7]

There is a lot of evidence that the situation has not changed very much in the 23 years since Smith delivered this condemnation of teacher education. There is abundant evidence, for example, that "culturally encapsulated" cohorts of prospective teachers continue to be prepared by programs in

our colleges and universities for culturally homogeneous school settings (Hodge, 1990; Trent, 1990).[8] While most teacher education programs acknowledge the importance of pluralistic preparation of teachers (at least enough to satisfy accreditation bodies such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education which have multicultural standards),[9] in practice, most of these represent a monocultural approach (Brown, in press; Goodlad, 1990). There is also clear evidence that teacher education students generally try to avoid teaching in urban schools and other schools serving the poor where the need is greatest and the work most demanding (Haberman, 1987, 1991a; Wahab, 1989).[10]

> Schools and colleges of teacher education are turning out class after class of young, white, female teachers who would rather work in white, middle-class suburbs. Unfortunately, their services are most needed in low-income schools, whose students come from races, cultures, and language groups for whom these new teachers feel unprepared (Ladson-Billings, 1990, p. 25).

If teacher education programs were successful in educating teachers for diversity, we might not have today such a massive reluctance by beginning teachers to work in urban schools and in other schools serving poor and ethnic- and linguistic-minority students.[11] Just educating teachers who are *willing* to teach in these schools however, only begins to address the problem of preparing teachers who will *successfully* educate the students who attend these schools. Educating teachers for diversity must include attention to the quality of instruction that will be offered by these teachers. More of the same kind of teaching, which has largely failed to provide even a minimally adequate education to poor and ethnic- and linguistic-minority students, does not improve the situation.

The Growing Disparity Between Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Students

Probably the area which has received most attention in the literature related to educating teachers for diversity is the demographic changes which have led to an increasing gap between the backgrounds of teachers and their students. There is no doubt that the student population in our public schools has become increasingly diverse and that it will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. It is predicted that about 40 percent of the nation's school-age youth will be students of color by the year 2020 (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989). Already, students of color comprise about 30 percent of our public school students, are the majority in 25 of the nation's 50 largest school districts (Banks, 1991), and are the majority in some states like New Mexico, Texas, and California (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). In the 20 largest school districts, students of color comprise over 70 percent of the total school enrollment (Center for Education Statistics, 1987).

These students of color are more likely to be poor, hungry, in poor health, and to drop out of school than their white counterparts (Children's Defense Fund, 1991). The failure of school to enable all children to receive a high-quality education regardless of race or ethnocultural background represents a major crisis in U.S. education and is clearly in conflict with the purposes of education in a democratic society.

This crisis of inequality is not limited to our large urban centers. Even in places as middle class and white as Madison, Wisconsin, for example, this crisis can be seen in such indices as the differential levels of achievement of white and African-American students in the public school system (Ptak, 1988). These problems can also be seen outside of urban areas where poverty and inequality

hamper many rural students (Ornstein & Levine, 1989). During the last decade, the economic situation in rural areas has worsened dramatically (O'Hare, 1988). Since 1978, for example, poverty in rural areas has grown at twice the rate of urban areas (Rosewater, 1989). Throughout the U.S. public school system, the failure to educate poor and ethnic- and language-minority students is clearly evident in such measures as high school graduation and dropout rates, achievement test scores, school attendance and suspension rates, and classification patterns for special education and gifted and talented programs.[12]

The composition of the teacher education student group is in stark contrast to that of public school pupils. Several recent studies have shown that teacher education students are overwhelmingly white, female, monolingual, from a rural (small town) or suburban community and that they come to their teacher education programs with very limited interracial and intercultural experience,[13] even in states with a lot of cultural diversity like California (Ahliquist, 1991).[14] Teacher education students also feel uncomfortable about personal contact with ethnic- and language-minority parents (Larke, 1990a). The lack of ethnic diversity among prospective teachers is similar to the situation for the inservice teaching corps where about 12-14 percent are nonwhite (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990).

According to the recent America Association of Colleges for Teacher Education data on teacher education students across the United States, few teacher candidates come from urban areas of any size and only 15 percent would like to teach in urban areas. Zimpher (1989) concludes her analysis of these data with the observation that there appears to be a general affinity among teacher education students to teach students who are like themselves in communities which are familiar to them.[15]

Recent research has shown that many teacher education students come to their preparation programs viewing student diversity as a problem rather than as a resource, that their conceptions of diversity are highly individualistic (e.g., focusing on personality factors like motivation and ignoring contextual factors like ethnicity), and that their ability to talk about student differences in thoughtful and comprehensive ways is very limited (Paine, 1989). These students generally have very little knowledge about different ethnic groups in the United States, their cultures, their histories, their participation in and contributions to life in the United States (Wayson, 1988; Wahab, 1989) and often have negative attitudes about cultural groups in the United States other than their own (Law & Lane, 1987). John Goodlad (1990) has also found that teacher education students also are not even convinced in all cases that all students are capable of learning:

> The idea of moral imperatives for teachers was virtually foreign in concept and strange in language for most of the future teachers we interviewed. Many were less than convinced that all students can learn; they voiced the view that they should be kind and considerate to all, but they accepted as fact the theory that some simply cannot learn. (pp. 264)[16]

While it is possible for these and other similar factors to be remedied by preservice teacher education programs, the likelihood is that they are not adequately addressed by programs as they are currently organized. Although research on teacher learning has demonstrated that teacher education programs, under certain conditions, are able to have an impact on certain aspects of teacher development (e.g., Grossman & Richert, 1988), the empirical evidence overwhelmingly supports a view of preservice teacher education as a weak intervention (Kennedy, 1991; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).[17]

Another dimension that must be considered in an analysis of demographic trends in teaching and teacher education is teacher educators in college and universities. Here we find a situation of cultural insularity much like that within the students with regard to ethnicity but very unlike the students in terms of gender. Recent studies of preservice teacher education across the United States have shown that the gender distribution among education faculty mirrors the patriarchal distribution in schools among teachers and administrators and is in sharp contrast to the composition of teacher education students. Ducharme and Agne (1989) conclude that the education professoriate is approximately 65 percent male and 35 percent female. When Ducharme and Agne examined the racial dimensions of teacher educators, the problem was severe:

> Minorities are much less represented in the education professorate than are women. In the RATE study, 2.9% of the full professors are minority; 6.4% at the associate level; and 9.9% at the assistant professor level. The representation of minorities appears to be growing, but the growth may be short lived inasmuch as these institutions showed a total of only 8% minority in doctoral programs. (p. 75)[18]

According to many, the lack of professors and students of color in teacher education programs makes the task of educating teachers for diversity especially difficult to achieve because of widespread agreement about the importance of a culturally diverse learning community to the education of teachers for diversity:

> If we are going to promote an appreciation for diversity and equity in the organization and content of our programs, it must be simultaneously reflected in the make-up of our programs, both among students and faculty. Prospective teachers will be better prepared to help students appreciate cultural diversity, if they have learned through experience to appreciate it as a reality and not an academic exercise–a reality they experience through interactions with a diverse faculty and student body. (Hixson, 1991, p. 18)

Also, the reluctance of teacher education program graduates to seek employment in urban school districts is not surprising when one considers that fewer than 5 percent of the 45,000 or so education faculty in the United States have taught for even a year in the classrooms of one of our large urban school districts (Haberman, 1987). It is also reasonable to suspect, given the socialization patterns of education faculty (Lanier with Little, 1986), that most of the education faculty, who must be counted on to improve the preparation of teachers for diversity, lack the same kind of interracial and intercultural experience as their students. Thus, there is a real question as to whether the expertise needed to address the preparation of teachers for diversity is currently found within the faculty who staff our teacher education programs. Staff development for teacher education faculty will undoubtedly be an important component of whatever strategies are taken to address the problem of diversity in U.S. teacher education.[19]

This report focuses on the ways in which educators and teacher educators have thought about improving the preparation of white, monolingual teachers to teach effectively poor, ethnic- and language-minority students who have largely been failed by the U.S. public school system. This limited focus does not imply that ethnic- and language-minority students are the only students who are failed by our schools[20] or that the failure of ethnic- and language-minority students is the responsibility only of ethnic- and language-majority teachers and administrators. The teaching of students who share the ethnic and language backgrounds of their teachers still poses many

real problems (e.g., see Rist, 1970) beyond the scope of this report, as does the problem of teaching multicultural content and developing a respect for diversity in all educational settings, regardless of the composition of the student group (Grant, 1978).

Ideas about what teachers need to be like, to know, and to be able to do to teach ethnic- and language-minority students successfully. Before considering the different approaches which have been taken to the problem of preparing teachers for cross-cultural teaching and their assumptions about teacher learning, I want to spend some time outlining in brief the kind of teaching toward which these efforts are aimed. A relatively large literature has accumulated in the last decade in which statements have been made about the characteristics of successful teaching for ethnic- and language-minority students.[21] Some of this literature is intended to apply to the teaching of minority students in general (Cummins, 1986; National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 1989), while other literature has outlined elements of good pedagogy for a particular segment of this population such as language-minority students[22] or for particular ethnic groups such as Latino or African-American students.[23]

It has also been very common within this literature for scholars to stress the tremendous variation within certain of the general ethnic-group categories, such as Hispanic American and Asian American, and to discuss what is needed to teach specific groups within a general ethnic classification. An example of this would be statements about the teaching of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans within the category of Hispanic American or about the teaching of Hmong students and Chinese Americans within the category of Asian American.[24] Even within these more specific categories (e.g., Puerto Rican) there is still tremendous variation according to geographical location, social class, gender, sexual orientation, language proficiencies, and length of time in the United States. Scholars who discuss the successful teaching of specific groups of ethnic- and/or language-minority students are often very critical of those who lump together the needs of different groups of students and/or treat specific ethnic groups as monolithic entities possessing uniform discernible traits (Garcia, 1974; Gibson, 1984).[25] "The attempt to consolidate diversities mistakenly suggests that all diversities are the same and thus have the same needs" (Ladson-Billings, 1991c, p. 1).

> When we get to the place where we assign characteristics to groups, saying black kids are tactile-kinetic learners and white kids are abstract analytical learners, then we're engaging in the worst sort of stereotyping. . . . What we should not lose sight of is that variation within cultural groups is often greater than variation between groups. (Murrell, 1990, p. 50)

Despite the importance of these observations about the different needs of specific ethnic- and language-minority groups and the diversity within groups, the general statements in the literature about successful teachers and teaching for different ethnic- and language-minority students are remarkably similar. With a few exceptions, there appears to be a common set of dispositions, knowledge, and skills which are needed to teach ethnic- and language-minority students, regardless of the particular circumstances of specific groups of students.[26] In fact, one of these capabilities seems to be the desire and ability of teachers to learn about the special circumstances of their own students and their communities and the ability to take this knowledge into account in their teaching (Irvine, 1989).

Throughout the recent history of U.S. teacher education, the position has been taken by some that no special kind of teaching is needed for particular groups of students such as ethnic- and language-minority students. It has been argued that good teaching in one context is good teaching

in another and that the same knowledge, skills, and dispositions will enable a teacher to be successful in all classrooms and for schools to be successful with all students (e.g., Gentile, 1988). Very little is said in the teaching and school effectiveness literature (e.g., Good, 1990), for example, about how the particular social class, ethnic, and language backgrounds of the students should influence instruction.

Much of the research literature on school and teaching effectiveness is culture blind (Murrell, 1990).[27] Although these models of effective instruction can contribute much to our understanding of effective instruction for ethnic- and language-minority students,[28] it is not possible, in the view of some scholars, to create a model of the good teacher without taking issues of culture and context into account (e.g., Cole & Griffin, 1987; Delpit, 1988). In fact, culture and context seem to be the key elements in contemporary statements about teaching which promotes the success of ethnic- and language-minority students. In the sections below, I review several of the most important aspects of successful teaching for poor students of color as described in the literature.

High Expectations

The first common element in many contemporary statements about effective teachers for ethnic-and language-minority students is the belief by teachers that all students can succeed, and the communication of this belief to students.[29] Equally important is the personal commitment by teachers to work toward achieving success for all students, particularly those poor students of color who have often not succeeded in school (Hodge, 1990). This may seem like common sense, but many teacher education students continue to cling to the belief that some students just cannot learn, whatever the school context (Goodlad, 1990).

In contrast to this condition, the literature is clear about the importance of creating a classroom context in which all students feel valued and capable of academic success (Cummins, 1986; Olsen & Mullen, 1990). In her studies of successful teachers of African-American students, Ladson-Billings (1990) describes some of the ways in which teachers' beliefs about the ability of all of their students to succeed, were communicated to students:

> As I talked with and observed all of the teachers in the study, I was astounded at their constant faith in their students. Even when they scolded the students, the teachers would remark "You're too smart to be doing that," or "You cannot convince me that you're not worth the effort." (p. 23)

Part of what is involved here, according to Ladson-Billings (personal communication, January 1992), is that a personal bond is created between the teacher and her pupils. The teacher ceases seeing his or her students as "the other" and addresses students' psychological and social development along with their academic development (Comer, 1988). Expectations are high for students' success, but they are not expressed in a manner that undercuts the care and concern crucial to the development of a student's positive self-image and sense of efficacy. If teachers treated the fates of their students as they treat those of their own children, according to Grumet (1988), we would come closer to realizing the purposes of education in a democratic society. Few of us would "excuse our own children from their futures" in the way that we sometimes do for other people's children:

> Ethics and the common culture provide the procedural form and cultural content for our current concepts of schooling. And if ethics and the common culture could gather together the concern and attention that we devote to our own children and extend this nurture to other people's children, then we might indeed find in the school the model for a just society that Dewey envisioned. (p.164)

Another way in which a faith in the ability of students to succeed is communicated is by providing students with academically demanding work instead of the watered down and mechanical curriculum that is so often the norm for many ethnic- and language-minority students.[30] Moll (1988) describes the way in which teachers' expectations need to shift, in his analysis of successful teaching for Latino students:

> In contrast to the assumption that working class children cannot handle an academically rigorous curriculum, or in the case of limited-English proficient students, that their lack of English fluency justifies an emphasis on low level skills, the guiding assumption in the classrooms analyzed seemed to be the opposite: that students are as smart as allowed by the curriculum. The teachers assumed that the children were competent and capable and that it was teachers' responsibility to provide the students with a challenging, innovative, and intellectually rigorous curriculum. (p. 467)

Scaffolding

It is not enough, however, merely to make the curriculum more rigorous. The lack of respect for their cultural traditions and languages, so long the norm in our public schools, will ensure that many ethnic- and language-minority students will continue to fail to achieve academic success. The literature is clear about the need for some type of scaffolding or bridging between the cultures of the school and home. The point here is to allow cultural elements which are relevant to the students to enter the classroom. In some cases, the intent seems to be to use the scaffolds to help students eventually give up the culture of the home for the dominant culture of the school. Cummins (1986) refers to this as the "subtractive approach." Fordham's (1988) analysis of the phenomenon of "racelessness" among African-American high school students is an example of this situation. This approach is not what most scholars are referring to when they discuss the importance of cultural inclusion to the academic success of ethnic- and language-minority students.[31]

In other cases, the intent seems to be to use the scaffolds to help students learn the culture of the school while maintaining identification and pride in the home culture. Cummins (1986) refers to this as the "additive approach."[32] Ladson-Billings's (1990, 1991a) discussion of "culturally relevant teaching," in which students' culture is utilized as a way both to maintain student culture and to learn and overcome the negative effects of the dominant culture, is an example of this approach to building bridges between home and school. Ladson-Billings (1990) argues that the ability to foster academic excellence *and* the maintenance of cultural integrity represent pedagogical excellence, nothing less. The maintenance of ethnocultural identity seems to be critical to the academic success of ethnic- and language-minority students in most cases (Tharp, 1989).[33]

In scaffolding, a set of supports are constructed for students that enables them to move through related experiences from the home toward the demands of the school (Mehan & Trujillo, 1989). Many different ways of providing these supports and of providing greater "cultural synchronization" (Irvine, 1989) between the home and the school are discussed in the literature. These include the use of particular teaching strategies, such as sheltered bilingual education (Watson, Northcutt, & Rydell, 1989) and assisted teaching (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), and the reorganization of lesson formats, standards for behavior, curriculum materials, and assessment practices to make them more inclusive and sensitive to linguistic and cultural variations (e.g., Cole & Griffin, 1987; Cummins, 1986; Olsen & Mullen, 1990).[34] It is argued that the curriculum should be inclusive of a wider variety of traditions

and connected to students' own experiences and that instruction should build on students' experiences to expand their knowledge and capabilities (Tabachnick, 1991).[35]

There are two critical elements involved in the principle of cultural inclusion. First, there is the incorporation of the languages and cultures of the learners into the academic and social context of schooling in ways that facilitate and support academic learning and cultural identity (Hollins & Spencer, 1990). The creation of classroom settings permit students to apply language and task-completion skills already in their repertoire (Cole & Griffin, 1987).

Second, there is the explicit teaching of the codes and customs of the school (the culture of the classroom) so that students will be able to participate fully in the mainstream or, as Lisa Delpit (1988) puts it, students are helped to establish their own voices but are coached so that those voices produce notes that will be heard clearly in the larger society. Knapp and Turnbull (1991) succinctly capture this dual aspect of the principle of cultural inclusion in their synthesis of research on factors associated with school success for children in poverty. They argue that poor children will be better able to meet the academic challenges of school if the following principles are followed:

> Teachers know and respect the students' cultural/linguistic backgrounds and communicate this respect in a personal way to the students. The academic program allows and encourages students to draw and build on experiences they have, at the same time that it exposes them to unfamiliar experiences and ways of thinking. The assumptions, expectations, and ways of doing things in school–in short, its culture are made explicit to the students by teachers as they explain and model these dimensions of academic learning. (p. 334)[36]

Teacher Knowledge

In order for teachers to be able to implement the principle of cultural inclusion in their classrooms, they need to have general sociocultural knowledge about child and adolescent development; about second-language acquisition; about the ways that socioeconomic circumstances, language, and culture shape school performance and educational achievement[37] as well as specific knowledge about the languages, cultures, and circumstances of the particular students in their classrooms.[38] They also, as Trueba (1989a) and Montero-Sieburth (1989) point out, must be able to use this knowledge in the organization of the curriculum and instruction to stimulate student learning. It is clearly possible for teachers to have the knowledge but not know how to employ it pedagogically (Diez & Murrell, 1992). Finally, according to some (e.g., Banks, 1991; Hollins, 1990), teachers need a clear sense of their own ethnic and cultural identities in order to be able to understand those of their students and their families.

There is a danger involved in the accumulation of knowledge about specific cultures that is commented upon frequently in the literature. The concern is that the accumulation of knowledge about specific cultures will actually increase the chances that teachers will act in inappropriate ways. Mehan and Trujillo (1989) summarize one aspect of the problem:

> Because it is impossible for beginning teachers to acquire a sufficient ethnological knowledge base of the language groups he or she will encounter, the knowledge they do acquire tends to be stereotypic. It can also be dangerous because these stereotypic notions often lead to a cultural deprivation view. (p. 2)

Another aspect of the problem is related to the fact that, despite the importance of teachers' understanding of general aspects of the cultures and languages of their students (Grant, 1991),

there is no such thing as a typical Latino student, African-American student, or typical student from any specific ethnocultural background. Successful teaching for ethnic- and language-minority students needs to be sensitive to the differences in particular students' backgrounds and experiences and to affirm respect for individual as well as group characteristics. Lucas, Henze, and Donato's (1990) descriptions of high schools that were highly successful with Latino students clearly underlines the importance of teachers having more than knowledge of the general characteristics of specific ethnocultural groups:

> While faculty and staff were sensitive to the importance of students' languages and cultures, they did not treat students simply as members of an undifferentiated ethnic group. They recognized students' individual strengths, interests, problems, and concerns rather than characterizing them by reference to stereotypes. (p. 325)[39]

What teachers need to be capable of, according to some, is gaining information from their own students and the local community and learning how to transform it for pedagogical use (Cazden & Mehan, 1990). The disposition and skill to conduct research on their own students and their students' families and communities is a necessary addition to the more general knowledge about human development and general cultural knowledge because, in the final analysis, it is each student's everyday life experiences, influenced in unique ways by factors such as social class, ethnicity, language, culture, and gender, that affect the academic and social development of students (Huber, 1992; Laosa, 1977). Heath's (1983) work in Appalachia is a widely cited example of teacher research in this tradition. This seminal study showed that, when teachers began to monitor more closely their own practices and to understand the differences in the way in which language was used in their classrooms and in the children's homes, they began to overcome some of the gaps in communication that had previously served as obstacles to the achievement of working-class black students in the newly integrated school.

Teachers need to be knowledgeable of a variety of strategies like the ones employed by Heath by which they can gain information about the communities represented in their classrooms. These strategies include, according to Villegas (1991), "making home visits, conferring with community members, talking with parents, consulting with minority teachers, and observing children in and out of school to discern patterns of behavior that may be related to their cultural background" (pp. 36-37).

Teaching Strategies

When we consider the specific instructional methods considered to be successful with ethnic- and language-minority students, the consensus seems to be that a focus on meaning making and content is the key. This is opposed to the common focus on decontextualized skills often experienced by ethnic- and language-minority students (Moll, 1988). Successful teachers of ethnic- and language-minority students create opportunities for students to learn to use, try, and manipulate language, symbols, and information in the service of making sense or creating meaning. It is the sense making and knowledge construction by students that is central.

Cummins (1986) contrasts two general orientations to teaching, the transmission model and the reciprocal interaction model. In the transmission model, which Cummins argues is associated with the disempowerment of minority students,

> the teacher's task is to impart knowledge or skills that she or he possesses to students who do not yet have these skills. . . . The teacher initiates and controls the interaction, constantly orienting it

> towards the achievement of instructional objectives. . . . The curriculum . . . frequently focuses on the internal structure of the language or subject matter. Consequently, it focus predominately on surface features of language or literacy . . . and emphasizes correct recall of content taught by means of highly structured drills and workbook exercises. (p. 28)

In the reciprocal interaction model, an orientation which Cummins (1986) claims is associated with the empowerment of minority students and their academic success, there is a genuine dialogue between the teacher and students and guidance and facilitation, rather than control of student learning by the teacher. According to Cummins, "A central tenet of the reciprocal interaction model is that talking and writing are a means to learning" (p. 28). In this orientation, student-student interaction and a collaborative learning context is encouraged. Also, according to Cummins, "This model emphasizes the development of higher level cognitive skills rather than just factual recall, and meaningful language use by students rather than the correction of surface forms" (p. 28).

The conclusion that the reciprocal interaction model is more closely related to the academic success of ethnic- and language-minority students than the more common transmission model does not mean that only a particular set of teaching methods or curricular programs is appropriate for classroom use. Although there have been many attempts in the literature to identify particular practices and curricular materials which have been successful in promoting learning for ethnic- and language-minority students (e.g., Natriello, McDill, & Pallas, 1990; Slavin & Madden, 1989), important questions have been raised about the efficacy of some allegedly progressive reciprocal practices (e.g., Delpit, 1986).

What is agreed upon in the literature, despite some ambiguity with regard to particular practices and programs, is that teachers need to have a wide variety of teaching strategies and practices at hand to be able to respond to the varied needs of their students (e.g., Anderson, 1987; Nieto, 1992). There is also agreement about the need for teachers to have a deep understanding of the subjects they teach so that they will be able to "create the multiple representations necessary to address the diversity of prior experiences and understandings present in their classrooms" (McDiarmid, 1989, p. 92).

There is also consensus in the literature about a number of other things that teachers need to know or to be able to do to teach ethnic- and language-minority students successfully . These include the ability to develop an inclusive multicultural curriculum that incorporates the contributions of different social groups (Tabachnick, 1991)[40] and the ability to create a collaborative classroom environment using such practices as cooperative grouping, peer tutoring, and mixed-ability grouping (Hixson,1991; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). There is almost universal condemnation of the practices of ability grouping in the elementary school and tracking in the secondary school and a strong feeling by many that teachers need to have knowledge about the ways that schools structure inequality through such practices (Hodge, 1990).

Two other areas that receive a lot of attention in the literature are assessment and parent involvement. It is argued that teachers need a good understanding of the school community and of how to involve parents and other community members in authentic ways in the school program (Ada, 1986; Grant, 1991). Parents and other community members need to be encouraged to participate in students' education and to be given a significant role in determining what an appropriate education is for students of color in particular schools (Delgado-Gaitan, 1991; Delpit, 1988; Zeichner, 1991a). According to Comer

(1988), the sharing of information and power within a school by adults across racial, class, and cultural lines makes it more probable that students will be able to cross these lines as well and perform well on both sides.

Assessment is felt to be one of the major obstacles to the school success of ethnic- and language-minority students (First, Kellogg, Willshire-Carrera, Lewis, & Almeida, 1988). Cummins (1986) argues that teachers need to become advocates for minority students with regard to assessment, rather than legitimizing the location of the problem in students. The literature encourages teachers to learn about curricular-based assessment practices used to understand students' performance in a variety of contexts such as student portfolios, checklists and inventories, and notes from teachers' observations (e.g., Moll, 1988; National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1991; Valencia, 1991).

Finally, a group of what Sleeter and Grant (1987) and Liston and Zeichner (1991) refer to as social reconstructionist educators has been very critical of the home-school incompatibility theory and the solution of cultural inclusion which have figured so prominently in the literature in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.[41] These educators argue that it is too simplistic to claim (or imply) that cultural dissonance between the school and the home is responsible for the academic failure of ethnic- and language-minority students because this solution leaves unexamined the social, economic, and political inequalities underlying the problems within schools while claiming to offer fundamental solutions to them (Villegas, 1988). Effective teachers of ethnic- and language-minority students, in addition to their activities within the school, need to be involved in the broader political struggles for achieving a more just and humane society. They must be involved in helping to establish the societal preconditions for the achievement of broad scale school and societal reforms.[42]

For, as Weiner (1989) points out, while teacher education programs can educate teachers to teach diverse students with respect, creativity, and skill within their classrooms, they cannot prepare individual teachers to substitute for the political and social movements needed to alter the systemic deficiencies of our society and its school systems. McCarthy (1990) criticizes what he sees as an unwarranted optimism about the impact of multicultural education alone on the social and economic futures of minority students. He argues that the objective of building bridges between the home and the school privileges individual mobility over systemic change.

In summary, while these criticisms do not challenge the wisdom of the strategy of building bridges between home and school or the strategy of culturally relevant instruction within the classroom, they do criticize the adequacy of educational reforms alone for dealing with the economic, social, and political dimensions of the problems of poor students of color. These critics of home-school compatibility theories assert that teachers need information about the dynamics of privilege and economic oppression in the United States and that the development of teachers' social consciousness and their moral commitment to work toward the elimination of societal inequalities, outside the school as well as within, is a critical aspect of educating teachers for an educational system that realizes the purposes of education in a democratic society (Zeichner 1991b). See Table 1 for a summary of what it is felt teachers need to be like, to know, and to do to teach poor students of color successfully.

Alternative Approaches to the Education of Prospective Teachers to Teach Ethnic- and Language-Minority Students

Despite the marginalization of this issue by the general teacher education research community (Grant & Secada, 1990), several different strategies have been employed in U.S. teacher education programs in an attempt to better prepare teachers to teach ethnic- and language-minority students. There are two ways in which these strategies could conceivably be employed by teacher educators. One possibility is for "teacher education for diversity"[43] to be integrated throughout the various professional courses and field experiences in a teacher education program.[44] In this case, the infusion approach (Burstein, Vaughn, Wilcoxen, & Brewer, 1992), we would have entire programs which focus primarily on preparing teachers to work with ethnic- and language-minority students. Programs would either focus on preparing teachers to educate a variety of different groups of students of color, such as is found in most urban school districts (e.g., McCormick, 1991), or on the preparation of teachers to educate specific groups of students, such as Native American students or African-American students (e.g., Noordhoff & Kleinfeld, in press; Tippeconnic, 1983). In addition to professional education course work, it is also possible to address the issue of cultural diversity in the various arts and sciences courses that are taken by students prior to certification. This is especially important, as Hixson (1992) points out, in states where professional education course work is minimal.[45]

Another way for "teacher education for diversity" to be dealt with by teacher educators is as a subtopic or add-on to a regular teacher education program in one or a few courses or field experiences, where the other courses remain untouched by issues of diversity. This is the segregated approach. Probably the most common way in which the segregated approach is implemented is with the addition of a course on multicultural education or ethnic studies to a program (e.g., Bennett, 1988).

Despite a clear preference for the integrated approach to "teacher education for diversity" by scholars who have assessed the work of teacher education programs (Gay, 1986), the segregated approach is clearly dominant in U.S. teacher education programs (Garibaldi, in press; Grant & Sleeter, 1985). There are very few teacher education programs of a permanent nature which have integrated attention to diversity throughout the curriculum.[46] It is also very common for any course work related to cultural diversity beyond basic survey courses to be optional rather than compulsory (Gay, 1986).

There is good reason for the preference for an integrated approach to issues of cultural diversity. Research studies have clearly demonstrated the very limited long-term impact of the segregated approach on the attitudes, beliefs, and teaching practices of teacher education students.[47] Sleeter (1988) concluded the following from her analysis of course work in multicultural education in Wisconsin teacher education institutions:

> Including a relatively small amount of multicultural education training in students' preservice programs does not have much impact on what they do. It may give them a greater repertoire of teaching strategies to use with culturally diverse students, and it may alert them to the importance of maintaining high expectations. For significant reform of teaching to occur, however, this intervention alone is insufficient. (p. 291)[48]

Given the small number of programs which represent an integrated approach to "teacher education for diversity," I decided to focus in this report on the specific instructional strategies which

are discussed in the literature by teacher educators, independent of how they have been employed within the context of particular teacher education programs. These strategies will then serve as a set of orientating categories for case studies of several exemplary programs to be conducted by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning in 1992-93.[49]

One of the most common elements addressed in "teacher education for diversity" is the expectations that teacher education students hold for ethnic- and language-minority students. There seem to be several ways in which teacher educators attempt to deal with the problem of low expectations that Goodlad (1990) found to be widespread among teacher education students across the United States. One way is by exposing students, either through readings or direct contact, to examples of successful teaching of ethnic- and language-minority students. An example of this is in PROTEACH at the University of Florida where students are required to read specific books and articles describing the successful teaching of students who often do not succeed in school (Ross, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). The kinds of readings that would be used include Lucas, Henze, and Donato's (1990) rich descriptions of several California high schools serving Latino students; Ladson-Billings (1990, 1991a) studies of successful teachers of African-American students; Moll's (1988) studies of successful teaching of Latino students; and Paley's (1989) account of the complexities of interracial teaching including a vivid demonstration of the inadequacies of a "culture-blind" approach to teaching.

This attention to cases of success is often supplemented by helping students examine the ways in which schools help structure inequality through various practices in curriculum, instruction, grouping, and assessment. There are many powerfully documented cases of failures which can be instructive for students (e.g., Anyon, 1980; McNeil, 1986; Rist, 1970). For example, students could read and discuss particular cases in which the principles of culturally relevant teaching are violated such as in Fine's (1987) study of an urban high school. Fine vividly documents the ways in which students of color in this one high school were silenced by school practices that violated the principle of cultural inclusion:

> The intellectual, social, and emotional substance which constitutes minority students' lives was routinely treated as irrelevant to be displaced and silenced. . . . At the level of the curriculum, texts, and conversation in classrooms, school talk and knowledge were radically severed from the daily realities of adolescents' lives and more systematically allied with the lives of teachers. (pp. 163-164)[50]

Another way in which the problem of low expectations has been addressed is by the use of the selection process to screen out students on the basis of cultural sensitivity and commitment to the education of all students. Haberman's (1987) work at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee on the development of an admissions interview to screen candidates for urban teaching is illustrative of this approach.

Yet another way in which teacher educators have proposed to counter low expectations and give teachers a framework for organizing classroom learning environments is to give serious curricular attention in teacher preparation programs to research on the relationships among language, culture, and learning. This research, which has accumulated over the last decade, has convincingly demonstrated the superiority of a situational, as opposed to a stable-trait, view of intelligence and competence, which sees behavior as a function of the context of which it is a part (Cazden & Mehan, 1990; Mehan & Trujillo, 1989). This research also provides us with numerous examples of how learning environments are created in schools which facilitate the success of students of color who

often do not succeed.[51] Comer's (1988) call for grounding the preparation of teachers in knowledge of human development is an aspect of this general strategy. One example of this approach is found at the State University of New York at Binghamton where teacher education students both read and conduct their own ethnographies which address the relationships among language, culture, and learning (Teitelbaum & Britzman, 1991). Bowers and Flinders (1990) argue that there are two things that teachers realize after being exposed to this sociocultural knowledge base:

> [The first has to do with] the need to view students' behavior, in part, as the expression of patterns learned through membership within their primary culture. The second has to do with the belief that teachers' professional judgment should include a knowledge of how their own cultural patterns may both obstruct students' ability to learn and influence their own judgments about students' performance. (p. 72)

Biography

One of the places that "teacher education for diversity" often begins is with helping teacher education students to understand better their own cultural experience and to develop more clarified ethnic and cultural identities. There is a consensus in the literature that the development of one's own cultural identity is a necessary precursor to cross-cultural understanding (e.g., Banks, 1991; Quintanar-Sarellana, 1991).[52] Examples of this approach to helping mainstream teacher education students locate themselves within our culturally diverse society include the work of King and Ladson-Billings (1990) at Santa Clara University, the work of Hollins (1990) at the University of California-Hayward, and the work of Gomez and Tabachnick (1991) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. All of these examples involve an autobiographical component in which students learn to recognize and appreciate their own cultural heritage as distinctive and worthwhile.

> Part of the teacher education curriculum should be aimed at resocializing preservice teachers in ways that help them view themselves within a culturally diverse society. This could entail restructuring self-perceptions and world views. Part of designing appropriate experiences for preservice teachers is making meaningful connections between the students' personal/family history and the social context of life as experienced by different groups within a culturally diverse society. (Hollins, 1990, pp. 202-203)

Attitude Change

A next step, according to some teacher educators, is to learn more about and then to reexamine the attitudes and values they hold toward ethnic groups other than their own.[53] As Banks (1991) argues:

> Helping students understand their own cultural experience and to develop more clarified cultural and ethnic identifications is only the first step in helping them to better understand and relate to other ethnic and racial groups. They also need experiences that will enable them to learn about the values and attitudes they hold toward other ethnic and cultural groups, to clarify and analyze those values, to reflect upon the consequences of their values and attitudes, to consider alternative attitudes and values, and to personally confront some of their latent values and attitudes toward other races. (p. 141)

Some teacher educators who have written about their efforts to help their students reexamine their attitudes and beliefs about various ethnic groups have stressed the importance of both the intellectual challenge and social support that comes from a group of students to the process of attitude change (e.g., Gomez & Tabachnick, 1991;

King & Ladson-Billings, 1990). The existence of a cohesive cohort group, where students stay in close contact with each other over a period of time, is often cited as a critical element of "teacher education for diversity" (e.g., Grant, Zeichner, & Gillette, 1988; Nelson-Barbara & Mitchell, in press). Even with the existence of collaborative learning environments, however, the process of helping students confront their negative attitudes about other ethnic and language groups is often a very difficult one in which students often resist and rebel against the efforts of teacher educators to enlighten them (Ahlquist, 1991).

Banks (1991) uses case studies (some of which are written by students) in his ethnic studies course at the University of Washington to help his students examine their attitudes and values toward other groups.[54] Gomez (1991) helps her language arts students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison reexamine their attitudes toward people of color by having them read various accounts of what it is like to live and be educated in the United States for many minorities. Gomez asks her teacher education students to read such works as Richard Rodriguez's (1982) autobiographical account of his schooling, *Hunger of Memory*, and Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines's (1988) stories of the lives of poor urban African-American families, *Growing Up Literate*.

Field Experiences

Often teacher educators put mainstream education students in direct contact with children and/or adults with ethnic backgrounds different from their own. These experiences include relatively brief community field experiences outside of school settings with poor children and adults of color that are connected to course work and coupled with guided reflective analysis of the experiences.[55] These community field experiences are often used as a basis for helping prospective teachers learn how to interact in authentic ways with parents and other adults from different ethnocultural backgrounds.[56] It has not been demonstrated, however, that students will be able to carry over the learnings gained from these extra scholastic experiences to their work as classroom teachers.

One example of a community field experience is the human service project option in the required School and Society course at Knox College. The purpose of this option, according to Beyer (1991), is to enable prospective teachers, many of whom have led lives that have kept them distant from poverty, to come to grips with social inequality in a direct way. In addition to reading about poverty in the School and Society course, students who elect this option work in various social service agencies or in some more informal socially or economically disadvantaged setting such as a home.

Other direct experiences often include the required completion of a minimum number of practicum and student teaching experiences in schools serving ethnic- and language-minority students (Bowen & Salsman, 1979; Ross, Johnson, & Smith 1991)[57] and intensive cultural immersion experiences in which students live and teach in a minority community and often do extensive community service work (e.g., Mahan, 1982). This latter approach of cultural immersion was characteristic of the National Teacher Corps program from 1965-1980 (Smith, 1980). With this strategy, community people of color without professional education backgrounds are often placed in the role of teacher educators, in part to compensate for the lack of diversity typical of teacher education faculties (Rivlin & colleagues, 1974).

Another possibility, which combines elements of the previous strategies into one program component, is to require practicum and student

teaching experiences in schools serving students of color that include a community component as part of the clinical experience. Hillard (1974) argues that practicum and student teaching courses will do a better job of preparing teachers to be successful in cross-cultural settings if they extend beyond the school into the diverse communities served by particular schools. Linking a community field experience to a course in which students are serving in the role of student teacher may help students develop competencies in understanding and dealing with the community served by their schools, in ways that go beyond what can be gained from a community field experience standing alone in the teacher education curriculum (Mungo, 1982).

Often these field experiences in schools serving ethnic- and language-minority students are coupled with seminars that provide structured and guided reflection about teaching in these schools. Gomez and Tabachnick (in press), operating out of the tradition of narrative inquiry, have their students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison tell stories about their teaching in their weekly seminars. Gomez and Tabachnick (1991, in press) present convincing evidence that the telling of stories about teaching in a collaborative context that is intellectually challenging and socially supportive helps student teachers reexamine the "scripts" that guide their teaching. The literature on clinical teacher education and on teacher development clearly supports the view that this kind of guided reflection about teaching during practicums and student teaching is critical to determining the educational value of the experience and that teaching experience without such guided reflection is often miseducative (see Baty, 1972; Zeichner, 1990a).[58] The necessity of direct intercultural experience, however, is universally supported:

> If teachers are to work successfully with students from cultures different from their own, it is imperative that the training program provide for more than intellectualization about cross cultural issues. Teacher growth in this area is possible only to the extent that the teacher's own behavior in a cross cultural setting is the subject of examination and experimentation. (Hillard, 1974, pp. 49-50)

Cultural Knowledge

Another strategy used by teacher educators in "teacher education for diversity" is to try to overcome the lack of knowledge by teacher education students about the histories of different ethnic groups and their participation in and contributions to life in the United States. Ellwood (1990) argues that an ethnic studies component in a teacher education program can potentially do a great deal to prevent mistakes by teachers that are rooted in cultural ignorance:

> If student teachers studied linguistics long enough to understand that, say, an African-American dialect is as rule-bound and linguistically sophisticated as the dialect which has gained prominence as "standard American English," they may be less inclined to judge their students as unintelligent simply because they speak a different dialect. If they also studied Afro-American history and literature, gaining an appreciation for the immense love of language running through African-American culture, they might be able to recognize in their own Black students, skills and linguistic strengths that could be built upon in the classroom. Similarly, if we gained an appreciation for the tenacious struggles minority people have waged historically in this country around education, it might be a little bit harder to jump to the immensely unlikely conclusion that "those parents" do not care about the education of their children. (p. 3)

Ladson-Billings's (1991b) work at the University of Santa Clara shows that the approach of exposing students to aspects of our history that they have not been exposed to in their schooling appears to cause many students to question their own education and why they were not given access to certain points of view. For example, two of Ladson-Billings's former students remarked in their journals after viewing "Eyes on the Prize," an award-winning civil rights documentary:

> This [video] made me so angry because of how little I know about the Civil Rights movement. I'm 21 years old and almost all of this is completely new to me. (white female liberal studies major) (p.13)
>
> I had no idea of the riots and marches and violence that went on for civil rights. Why wasn't I taught this? (white male communications major) (p. 13)[59]

Another part of this strategy is to provide students with information about some of the unique characteristics and learning styles of students from different ethnic groups. Because these are general characteristics, however, not limited to specific cultural groups or necessarily applicable to individual learners in specific classrooms, many would avoid inappropriate stereotypic responses to students as members of groups which ignore individual characteristics. A necessary supplement to the information about general group characteristics is teaching teacher education students how to learn about and then incorporate into their instruction information about their own students, their families, and communities.[60] McDiarmid and Price (1990) describe how group information alone (what is often referred to in the literature as the ethnic-studies approach) is likely to affect teacher education students:

> The presentation of information on ethnic and religious groups may actually encourage prospective teachers to generalize and, eventually, to prejudge pupils in their classrooms. More commonly, teacher education students may become unsure about how to think about culturally different children. On the one hand, they are taught to be suspicious of any generalization about a group of people; on the other, they encounter materials and presentations that, in fact, make generalizations about normative values, attitudes, and behaviors among different groups. (p. 15)

One example of a teacher education program that attempts to teach prospective teachers to do research about their own students, their families, and communities, in the tradition of Heath's (1983) seminal work in Appalachia, is the Teachers for Alaska program at the University of Alaska (Noordhoff & Kleinfeld, 1990, 1991, in press).[61] This program supplements general information about particular groups of Native Alaskans with a focus on developing prospective teachers' dispositions to find out about the context, helping teachers learn experientially about their particular students and their communities, and then helping them learn how to use their information in their teaching.

There is much discussion in the literature about how to take knowledge about particular ethnic groups or contexts and to make use of it in developing multicultural curriculum materials and culturally relevant instructional strategies and classroom organizational structures. Much of this work focuses on the integration of a multicultural perspective into all that a teacher does in a classroom (e.g., Bennett, 1990; Sleeter & Grant 1988; Tiedt & Tiedt, 1990). With regard to curriculum, the emphasis is often on two things: (1) skill in analyzing existing curriculum materials for ethnocentric bias and adapting them to correct biases and (2) skill in developing inclusive curriculum materials on their own, often taking advantage of knowledge about the local community.

Instructional Strategies

With regard to instruction, prospective teachers are often taught various instructional strategies which are sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences and which enable them to build upon the knowledge and experiences (the cultural resources) that students bring with them to school (see Gollnick & Chinn, 1990).[62] Prospective teachers are also taught about a variety of curriculum-based and culturally sensitive methods of assessing students' work and about the ways in which many conventional assessment methods discriminate against ethnic- and language-minority students.

These, then, are the major strategies that are discussed in the literature for educating teachers for diversity (see Table 2). While there are more detailed presentations available in the literature both about the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions that teachers need to have to successfully teach ethnic- and language-minority students (e.g., Hunter, 1974; Garcia, 1990) and about the elements of a culturally responsive teacher education curriculum (Irvine, 1989), the strategies outlined here capture the essence of "teacher education for diversity" as it is portrayed in the literature.

Different Views of Teacher Learning

The different strategies of "teacher education for diversity" described in the literature reflect different views about how teachers learn to teach. First, different strategies can be distinguished according to the degree to which they emphasize factors of selection or socialization. Those which emphasize socialization can be further distinguished according to the degree to which they attempt to influence prospective teachers by facilitating changes in the fundamental values, attitudes, dispositions and belief systems of students,[63] in the information and knowledge that students have about different ethnocultural groups, or in their skills to engage in curriculum and instruction in particular ways.

One point of view, exemplified by the work of Haberman (1987, 1991a, 1991b), does not place much faith in the power of conventional preservice teacher education programs to prepare white, monolingual teacher education students to teach diverse learners and places the emphasis on selection mechanisms rather than socialization strategies. Haberman (1991a, 1991b) argues that most typical majority teacher education students are developmentally not capable of dealing with the complexities associated with intercultural teaching and that teacher education programs are not capable of producing the kind of fundamental changes in values, attitudes, and dispositions needed for the successful teaching of ethnic- and linguistic-minority pupils.

Some empirical data exist which support Haberman's position and show how various strategies of "teacher education for diversity" often legitimate and strengthen the very attitudes, values, and dispositions they were designed to correct. Haberman and Post's (1992) analysis of a human relations experience offered to students at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Ginsburg's (1988) analysis of the impact of multicultural course content at the University of Houston are two examples of studies which do not leave one optimistic about the potential for conventional preservice teacher education programs to facilitate fundamental changes in students.[64] For example, Haberman (1991a) details the failure of the human relations experience to change students values related to cultural awareness:

> Indeed, many of our students became more insensitive and hardened in their positions by attributing more negative values to school children, their

> parents, and their neighborhoods. After 120 hours of direct experience in schools serving a multicultural population, these preservice students became better at supporting their original predispositions. . . . Rather than the cure-all assumed by teacher educators, direct experience in these culturally diverse situations merely served to enhance and strengthen the social values with which our students began. (p. 29)[65]

Others, while sharing Haberman's belief about the importance of changes in the basic values and dispositions of students, have offered many different ideas about how to bring these changes about. Efforts to help students develop a clearer sense of their own cultural identities and to reexamine their attitudes toward and beliefs about different ethnocultural groups aim at the same kind of fundamental changes in students. So too do many of the community field experiences and immersion experiences described in the literature. Some research conflicts with findings about the impotency of teacher education experiences. Teacher educators such as Gomez and Tabachnick (1991), Beyer (1991), and Ladson-Billings (1991b) have presented the stories and journal writings of their students which demonstrate the powerful impact of some of these experiences. One of Ladson-Billings's (1991b) students commented about her community field experience volunteering in a soup kitchen and shelter for the homeless two hours per week:

> This experience affected me in a very powerful way. Being a part of this atmosphere, brief as it was, taught me a few things about our society. It showed me a completely new perspective on life that I had never before been exposed to. I learned quite a bit about the differences and similarities between my life and their lives. . . . Talking to Elvin [a boy in the shelter] showed me how very similar he is to me. It was apparent to me that his life could have taken a very different path, and that likewise, that my life could have taken a very different path. This realization was very sobering to me and it taught me to empathize with his situation. On the other hand, the world of Julian Street is so very different from my world on campus. I noticed how easy it is to become narrow minded when my perspectives are constantly being influenced by the same atmosphere. (pp. 15-16)

Beyer (1991) presents some of the journal writings of Heidi, one of his students, which discuss the impact of viewing the film "The Women of Summer"[66] in an educational foundations class:

> Saw Women of Summer and I couldn't believe it. The entire time I was in complete awe. . . . These women did things because they felt it, not because it was the proper or socially acceptable thing to do. . . . I sat through the movie with my textbooks and notepads, wearing nice clothes and feeling relatively secure in my life. All the time I'm wondering what does this all mean? Everything I have and all my material possessions don't add up to much when compared to the action that these women took. (p. 124)

Finally, Hollins (1990) shares a journal entry by one of her students in her educational foundations course at California State University, Hayward, which demonstrates the impact of class activities that were designed to help students develop a greater sense of their own ethnocultural identities:

> I got a renewed sense of my identity and I focused on the idea that I too belong to an ethnic group. With this realization came a renewed sense of pride in my ethnic origins. I have begun to understand the pride that the other ethnic groups feel and the damage that our society causes by stigmatizing people who are different. (pp. 206-207)[67]

Whether these and other similar changes in the perspectives of students are associated with long-lasting impact on students' world views, values, and dispositions is still an open question. Very little evidence exists in the literature that the changes documented by teacher educators are long lasting (Bennett, 1988) or that they influence the

way in which prospective teachers actually teach (Grant & Koskella, 1986). Generally, we know very little about the development of teacher education students' cognitions, beliefs, and skills with respect to the teaching of diverse learners (Grant & Secada, 1990; Sleeter, 1985), including how particular teacher education strategies influence teacher learning.

We do know, however, that direct intercultural experience is important to the teaching of diverse students and that carefully structured guided reflection about these experiences is important to making these experiences ones that result in shifts in the attitudes, beliefs, dispositions, and theories that govern teachers practices. The literature clearly gives us clues about the way in which "teacher education for diversity" should be constructed.

Conclusion

This report has attempted to describe the emerging consensus in the literature (as well as some of the debates) with regard to teaching across cultures in elementary and secondary school classrooms and the variety of organizational structures and teaching strategies used in U.S. teacher education programs to prepare teachers for cultural diversity. In doing so, it has focused on the preparation of white, monolingual student teachers to teach poor students and students of color who have not traditionally succeeded in school. There is a sense however, in which all teaching is intercultural, regardless of the specific context in which it occurs. Because of the multiple microcultural identities of all students, regardless of their backgrounds, along the lines of gender, race, social class, language, religion, exceptionalities, all human experience is intercultural and all individuals are intercultural beings (Gollnick, in press). And because all human experience is intercultural, *individuals* within any give group will be affected somewhat differently by particular teachers' actions. There is often as much variation within cultural groups as there is between groups.

Accordingly, this report has stressed the dangers of labeling students according to any single subcultural group membership and has emphasized the importance of teachers learning how to study both the cultures of their own classrooms and the home and community cultures that their students bring to school with them.

Although various aspects of culturally responsive teaching (e.g., high expectations, scaffolding) are discussed throughout the report as the most likely ways to promote school success for poor students of color, some of the limitations as well as some of the complexities of this cultural compatibility theory are also addressed. For example, as Villegas (1988) has pointed out, greater cultural compatibility in the classroom, by itself, does not begin to address the social, economic, and political inequalities underlying many school problems. And, as Bloch and Tabachnick (1991) point out, most examples in the literature of successful efforts of cultural inclusion or culturally compatible teaching have occurred in relatively homogeneous environments where students share many characteristics. What cultural compatibility means in more multicultural contexts in which students share fewer characteristics with each other is not as clear. As Bloch and Tabachnick (1991) argue, when more than one ethnocultural group share a single classroom, adjustments made by the teacher for one group may not be important or successful for another group or for all of the different subgroups within the one group.

Another important issue related to teacher education for diversity is the question of teacher development over time. Although I have now mapped out two frameworks representing the range of existing positions on what and how teachers need to be taught to teach across cultures, there is

very little discussion in the literature of how this learning should be related to a teacher's career. The implication is that prospective teachers need to learn how to be and do all of the things that are discussed in this report by the time that they begin their first year of teaching. Given what we know about what student teachers bring to teacher education (e.g., the lack of interracial experience), and about the complexity of the process of teachers' learning to teach across cultures (e.g., see the program evaluation data discussed in this report), this is probably an unrealistic expectation (Villegas, 1992). Much more work needs to be done to look at the process of teacher education for diversity developmentally. Learning to be the kind of teacher described in this report is probably a career-long process. Identifying which things need to be addressed within preservice teacher education and which things either can or must wait until later in a teacher's career is an important task.

Also, despite the agreement by many researchers about certain aspects of what teachers need to know, be like, and to be able to do to teach cross-culturally successfully, there is still a great deal of uncertainty about both the elements of successful teaching across cultures and about how to prepare teachers for cultural diversity. Given this uncertainty, and the likely long-term nature of the process of teacher learning associated with learning to teach across cultures, probably one of the most important things we can do as teacher educators, as Zimpher & Ashburn (in press) argue, is to use an approach that enables teachers to talk and think together about the various kinds of problems they encounter related to cultural diversity and how they are addressing them. While the concepts of reflective teaching and teachers as researchers implied by this suggestion do not necessarily by themselves help us do a better job of addressing the needs of all students in our diverse society, they can be construed in ways that directly connect the deliberations of teachers to the ongoing struggle for a more human and decent society (Zeichner, 1992).

Finally, as has been pointed out in this report, most of our existing knowledge about teacher education for diversity comes from very brief and often vague self-reports about the use of particular teacher education strategies and program structures. With few exceptions, there are no detailed descriptions available which illuminate the lived reality of these efforts and their consequences over the long term for the prospective teachers who participate in them. A much closer look at the reality and long-term consequences of these various approaches to teacher education for diversity is now needed. We need to learn more about the particular kinds of field experiences and courses that facilitate the kind of personal and professional transformations that many white, monolingual student teachers must undergo to become successful teachers in cross-cultural situations.[98]

Endnotes

[1]As Banks (1991) argues,

> Even if we are successful in increasing the percentage of teachers of color from the projected 5% in 2,000 to 15%, 85% of the nation's teachers will still be white, mainstream and largely female working with students who differ from them racially, culturally, and in social class status. Thus, an effective teacher education policy for the 21st century must include as a major focus the education of all teachers, including teachers of color, in ways that will help them receive the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to work effectively with students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social class groups. (pp. 135-136)

[2]If one adopts a pragmatic and contextualized definition of "culture," taking into account each individual's membership in multiple and overlapping microcultural groups (e.g., according to race, primary language, religion, gender, exceptionalities, age, etc.), then by definition each of us is an intercultural being and all teachers have to be concerned with the problem of intercultural communication regardless of their particular cultural identity and the demographic composition of their student group (Gollnick, in press). While I accept this view of culture, this report focuses on a particular aspect of the problem of intercultural communication in the classroom where the teacher is white and monolingual, with little previous interracial experience, and where the students are poor and mainly of color. Because each individual is an intercultural being, even in this situation of significant teacher-pupil differences, the teacher will share certain characteristics with her students. It is a different aspect of the problem of intercultural communication though than that which exists in other contexts such as when white, monolingual teachers are teaching in schools where the students share many more background characteristics with their teachers and where, historically, students have experienced success in school. I would like to thank Ana Maria Villegas for helping me to see more clearly that what is addressed in the report is a particular aspect of the more general problem of intercultural communication.

[3]While gender clearly interacts with these factors in influencing the character of the classroom environment and the quality of student learning (e.g., see Fordham's, 1988, discussion of gender differences in the socialization of academically successful African-American high school students), an analysis of the specific ways in which gender intersects with teaching and teacher education is beyond the scope of this report. For an excellent discussion of some of the important issues related to gender and teacher education, see Maher and Rathbone (1986).

[4]One recent exception to this general pattern is the Fall 1991 issue of *Teaching Education*

[5]Some other reports, like the report of the Association of Teacher Education's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Reform (ATE, 1986) and that of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (NCETE, 1985), do not go even as far as mentioning the issues related to diversity and equity other than the need to recruit more minority teachers.

[6]This report itself strongly rejected the label of "culturally disadvantaged." For example, it was argued that

> disadvantaged youth are stigmatized as culturally disadvantaged. This designation tends to exclude them from the broader cultural activities and denigrates the culture they have evolved. The latter is a form of racism and the former is colonialism. . . . Specifically rejected here is the theory that the disadvantaged state is a consequence of inferior culture, inferior socialization by inadequate parents, a stifling of cognitive stimulation in the preschool years, or an inferior intellectual endowment. Acceptance of such theories has increased racism and only worsened the situation for the disadvantaged. Teachers must be trained to respect the potential strengths of the disadvantaged rather than be armed with a set of mythologies, masquerading as theories of social science, which only discourage the economically disadvantaged or minority youths from investing in education. (p. 4)

[7]Eddy (1969) also charged that teacher education programs failed to prepare teachers for working with students from backgrounds different from their own. She argued that prospective teachers entered their teacher preparation programs with little significant interracial and intercultural experience and that their programs left them encapsulated within their own sociocultural backgrounds.

[8]For example, Goodlad (1990) concluded with regard to the problem of urban education in his national study of teacher education programs in the United States:

> With few exceptions, the programs in our sample were oriented toward suburban or relatively mildly urban school settings, where most of the participants did their student teaching. We had hoped, and indeed expected, that urban universities would orient their curricula and teaching primarily, if not exclusively, to the urban environment, but this proved only occasionally to be the case. (p. 254)

[9]The reactive nature of teacher education programs responses to external pressures is nicely illustrated in a recent front-page article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Teacher Education Programs Face Pressure to Provide Multicultural Training." In this article it is argued, for example, that "teacher educators in colleges and universities nationwide are being forced to rethink their curricula as more school districts demand that their teachers incorporate issues relating to race and gender in their lessons" (Nicklin, 1991). It is often asserted in the literature that the public schools are often the stumbling block to the realization of enlightened teaching practices. On the issue of diversity, it is clearly outside forces, such as external mandates from states and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and complaints from school districts like the ones reported by Nicklin which have pressured the university teacher education community to contemplate change.

[10]There is some evidence that prospective teachers from historically black teacher education institutions go into teaching in urban schools at a higher rate than the general population of teacher education students (see Reed & Simon, 1991).

[11]Two-thirds of the white teacher education students surveyed in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education/Metropolitan Life survey of 472 teacher education students across the United States (AACTE, 1990) indicated that they would not like to teach in a situation with limited students of English proficiency.

[12]e.g., Bastian, Fruchter, Gutter, Greer, and Haskings, 1985; Committee on Policy for Racial Justice, 1989; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990.

[13]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1987, 1989; LaFontaine, 1988; Irvine, 1989.

[14]The fact that teachers as a group are interracially inexperienced persons who generally want to teach white, middle-class children is not a new phenomenon. Coleman (1966) came to this conclusion 26 years ago.

[15]In a survey of student teaching directors representing 25 states conducted by Mahan & Boyle (1981), it was estimated that from 60-100 percent of preservice teacher education students did not desire *any* field experiences in multicultural settings.

[16]In a survey of inservice teachers conducted by Trent (1990), teachers reported that their competency in teaching blacks and other minorities was severely limited in part because of inadequate exposure in their preservice teacher education programs to course content familiarizing them with the experiences of minorities and limited cross-race contact inside or outside of school. It should be pointed out, though, that there is some evidence that preservice teacher education students feel that their programs have prepared them to teach ethnically diverse students (Diegmueller, 1990).

[17]It should be noted that the literature on teacher development (e.g., Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986) suggests that there are different patterns of development for prospective teachers in elementary and secondary teacher education programs, in part, due to the differences in the students who enter these programs and, in part, because of the different patterns of organization of elementary and secondary teacher education programs. Even given these differences, one cannot be too optimistic about the potential of preservice teacher education, at any level, for overcoming the effects of anticipatory socialization.

[18]The white male dominance of the faculty of schools, colleges, and departments of education is not unique to teacher education in U.S. colleges and universities (Howey & Zimpher, 1990).

[19]Mills (1984) reports on an innovative way to deal with the lack of cultural diversity among teacher education faculty and students in many institutions. This particular project involved a partnership between two institutions in Louisiana, one predominately white, the other historically black. Student teachers from the two institutions interacted with each other in a series of seminars. Another approach to this issue is to include experiences in a teacher education program which enable nonfaculty persons of color to serve in instructional roles (see Mahan, 1982). Yet another way to deal with the problem of the parochial nature of the education professoriate and to prepare teachers for cultural diversity is to form a consortium of a number of teacher preparation institutions. This consortium then contracts the services of teacher educators whose expertise is in the area of teaching in culturally diverse settings. Students from the consortium colleges and universities come together in a central location for a period of time, usually not less than a semester, to participate in courses and field experiences with an emphasis on multicultural education. At least two of the existing consortiums (the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest) focus on preparing teachers for urban schools and are headquartered in Chicago and Kansas City, Kansas, respectively.

[20]See Eller (in press) for a discussion of the problems of educating poor whites in Appalachia.

[21]There is also a vast literature focusing on successful schooling of ethnic and language minority students which addresses school-wide and school district-level factors (e.g., Shields, 1991). The focus in this report is on the kinds of teachers and teaching which are discussed in this literature.

[22]Garcia, 1990; Grant, 1991; Moll, 1988; Ruiz, 1990; Tikunoff and Ward, 1991; Trueba, 1989b, 1991.

[23]e.g., Hollins & Spencer, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1990, 1991a; Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990; Schuhmann, in press.

[24]Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990; Trueba, Jacobs, and Kirton, 1990; Valencia, 1991.

[25]The language-minority population in the United States is extremely heterogeneous with over 100 distinct language groups (Garcia, 1990), and there is tremendous diversity in language within some minority group populations such as Native Americans (Hodgkinson, Outtz, & Obarakpor, 1990).

[26]Teachers will apply this knowledge, skills, and dispositions in different ways, of course. I am not suggesting a uniform pedagogy with no room for adaptation to different contexts.

[27]In many other models of good teaching or teacher knowledge, where culture may not be invisible, it still plays a minor role. For example, in the widely influential framework for teacher knowledge which was developed in the Stanford University Knowledge Growth in the Professions Project, knowledge of learners and context is classified as an element of pedagogical content knowledge and is hardly noticeable in all the attention which is given to subject matter (see Shulman, 1987). Thus far, culture also seems to be largely absent from the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1990).

[28]One of the contributions of this generic research to the teaching of ethnic- and language-minority students is the finding that teachers who have a sense of efficacy (believe that they are capable of making a difference in their students' learning) are more likely to have academically successful students (Brophy & Good, 1986).

[29]e.g., Delpit, 1988; Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1990; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990.

[30]e.g., Anyon, 1980; Levin, 1987; McNeil, 1986; Oakes, 1986; Ortiz, 1988.

[31]Ferdman (1990) discusses two different aspects of the subtractive approach to cross-cultural teaching. The assimilationist perspective emphasizes the dysfunctionality of differences and the maintenance of the dominant culture. Here the "subordinate" culture is assimilated into the dominant one. In contrast, in the melting pot perspective, a new hybrid culture is formed from the interaction of various cultures.

[32]Ferdman (1990) refers to this as the "pluralist approach."

[33]Fordham's (1988) work demonstrates that some highly academically successful African-American high school students give up their cultural identity in order to achieve academic success. Although this phenomena of "racelessness" undoubtedly occurs in other cases as well, it is more common to see cases of school success for ethnic- and language-minority students in which a strong effort has been made to instill pride in students' about their ethnocultural backgrounds. Lucas, Henze, and Donato's (1990) rich descriptions of high schools which were successful in facilitating academic achievement for Latino students is an example of how the maintenance of cultural identity is important to academic success. See Ferdman's (1990) discussion of how literacy instruction needs to support students' cultural identities for one explanation of why this may be so.

[34]Some specific examples of the restructuring of classroom practices to accommodate the cultural resources that students bring to the classroom include the use of peer learning centers and joint turn taking in reading groups in Hawaiian classrooms (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), the use of community-related themes in classroom writing projects (Moll & Diaz, 1987), and the use of interaction patterns commonly found in African-American churches (choral and responsive reading) in African-American classrooms (Hollins, 1982).

[35]One of the most frequently cited examples of the adjustment of instructional patterns to take account of culturally conditioned learning styles is the Kamehameha Early Education Program in Hawaii (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). In one aspect of this program, when reading instruction was changed to permit students to collaborate in discussing and interpreting texts, dramatic improvements in reading achievement were found (Au & Jordan, 1981).

[36]As Singer (1988) points out, this dual goal of maintaining ethnocultural identity and providing access to the codes of power require that the teacher use a combination of culturally congruent and consciously incongruent teaching and curriculum strategies. Although total cultural

congruence in the teacher's approach is not possible because of the multiple cultural identities present in every classroom (Bloch & Tabachnick, 1991), it is possible to incorporate practices into a classroom that are sensitive to the cultural and/or linguistic variations in that particular classroom and which result in all students in that classroom feeling that their own particular cultural identity is respected by the teacher (Nieto, 1992).

[37]Cazden and Mehan, 1990; Comer, 1988; Hodge, 1990; Lee, 1989; Nieto, 1986.

[38]One example of the general sociocultural knowledge that teachers need is the adoption of a situational as opposed to stable-trait view of intelligence (Mehan & Trujillo, 1989).

[39]Villegas's (1991) analysis of the literature on culturally responsive pedagogy emphasizes the fact that teaching practices found to be successful in one community may not be effective in other communities, even when these are similar in ethnic composition.

[40]According to many, this multicultural curriculum needs to involve more than adding material related to different groups and leaving the white Eurocentric norm unaltered (Asante, 1987).

[41]See Trueba (1988) and Boyd (1991) for a critical discussion of particular aspects of this theory which make a theoretical distinction between immigrant and caste-like minorities.

[42]There is a great deal of similarity between the ideas for the successful teaching of ethnic and language-minority students in the United States and in some other countries. One example of this similarity is found in the conclusions drawn from a recent study of secondary schools in Australia which facilitated academic success for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Kalantzis, Cope, Noble, & Poynting (1990) conclude, for example, that

> the challenge of making the school work has meant over a ten or twenty year period, a revolutionary change in teaching practices in which students' cultural and linguistic diversity has been incorporated into the curriculum rather than excluded as academically and socially inappropriate; in which strong attempts have been made to involve the community in the running of the school and their children's education; in which the classroom pedagogy is experiential, involving students in the active making of their own knowledge and relating learning to their linguistic and cultural background and in such a way that the curriculum is demonstrably relevant to their own experience of life, in which assessment doesn't condemn non-English speaking background students on the basis of culture or language biased standardized tests, but positively assesses individual development in relationship to a task and in which institutionally, the project of the school and its innovations are shaped through the process of collaborative decision making. (p. 217)

[43]It should be reemphasized that the use of the term "teacher education for diversity" in this report refers only to a particular definition of the term diversity (i.e., the teaching of poor students of color and of limited English proficiency by white, monolingual teachers). Other aspects of the term "diversity," such as the need to teach a multicultural curriculum in all classrooms, are not directly addressed in this report, although what is discussed here might have some relevance for other aspects of diversity.

[44]The integration of a concern for diversity throughout an entire teacher education curriculum is a specific case of the more general position that curriculum designs in teacher education should represent an outgrowth of shared conceptions of teaching, learning, and schooling among faculty who offer programs (Barnes, 1987).

[45]One example of this broader university-wide approach to the issue of cultural diversity is the requirement recently implemented at several major universities in the United States that all undergraduate students be required to complete a certain minimum number of credits in ethnic studies courses prior to their graduation.

[46]Most of the programs in which an integrated approach is used are externally funded programs which have a limited life such as the two recent examples of teacher education for diversity at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Gomez & Tabachnick, 1991; Grant, Zeichner, and Gillette, 1988). In my search of the literature and telephone interviews with experts across the United States it was very rare for me to locate a program which emphasized "teacher education for diversity" that had become institutionalized. One example of such a program is the Teachers for Rural Alaska program at the University of Alaska (Noordhoff & Kleinfeld, 1990, 1991, in press).

[47]e.g., Bennett, 1988; Grant and Koskella, 1986; Haberman and Post, in press; McDiarmid, 1990.

[48]Also cited in Grant and Secada, 1990, p. 411.

[49]It should be noted that in many studies which have attempted to assess the impact of particular approaches to "teacher education for diversity," the nature of the instructional strategies used by teacher educators is not sufficiently defined (Grant & Secada, 1990).

[50]Another interesting case is Kleifgen's (1988) sociolinguistic analysis of three lessons in which student teachers failed to use knowledge of children's prior knowledge and experiences in instruction.

[51]e.g., Heath, 1983; Tharp and Gallimore, 1988; Trueba, Moll, Dias, and Dilas, 1984.

[52]Nieto (1992) argues that becoming a multicultural teacher requires becoming a multicultural person and that, without this transformation of the person, any attempts to develop a multicultural perspective will be shallow and superficial.

[53]Many also argue that teachers need to have knowledge about the nature of prejudice and about specific strategies that can help reduce prejudice and racism among students (e.g., Banks, 1991).

[54]Also see Kleinfeld (1992) for an example of cases which are used in a teacher education program to promote intercultural understanding.

[55]Beyer, 1991; Fuller and Ahler, 1987; Haberman and Post, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1991b.

[56]Sometimes, as in the case of Wisconsin, state standards for teacher education require students to complete community field experiences as part of mandatory human relations training. The Wisconsin human relations requirement (PI4.11) mandates that teacher education programs include certain topics in their courses (e.g., study of the history, culture, customs, social institutions, values, lifestyles, and contributions of specific ethnic groups) and direct involvement with both adult and pupil members of ethnic groups different from that of a prospective teacher (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1988).

[57]California requires, for example, that all teacher education students experience a variety of culturally different classrooms and schools prior to certification (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1988). Scholars such as Ford (1992) stress that placements in culturally diverse schools should be in situations where teachers are succeeding with ethnic- and language-minority students, a reality which is often not provided for by requirements such as the one in California.

[58]Nelson-Barber and Mitchell (in press) argue for the use of portfolios in helping to stimulate teachers' reflections about their experience.

[59]Also see Adler's (1991) discussion of the use of literature to help correct teacher education students' distorted perspectives about the history of various ethnic groups.

[60]See Shade (1982), Gilbert and Gay (1985), Swisher and Deyhle, 1987, Anderson (1988), Little Soldier (1989), and the comprehensive review by Huber and Pewewardy (1990) for examples of the literature which discusses the cognitive styles and learning styles of specific ethnic- and language-minority groups. On the one hand, this literature identifies certain characteristics of the cognitive styles and learning styles of particular ethnic groups (e.g., relational and field-dependent learning styles) and argue that ethnic- and language-minority students will learn best under particular kinds of conditions such as in cooperative groups. On the other hand, this literature also cautions us about the dangers of generalizing about learning and cognitive styles when formulating pedagogical plans. Gilbert and Gay (1985) warn us, for example, about the variation within ethnic groups and argue that teachers should use a variety of teaching styles and learning environments that will address the diverse needs within every group of students.

[61]An important supplement to a teacher's examination of the cultural traditions brought to school by her students is her study of the culture of her particular classroom and of the degree of congruence between the classroom culture and the home and community cultures. Teachers must therefore be taught how to examine the particular traditions and rules that govern life in their own classrooms. This aspect of teacher research, although addressed in the literature on classroom action research, has received far less attention in the literature on cultural diversity and teacher education than efforts to teach teachers how to study home and community cultures. See Villegas (1991) for a discussion of the concept of classroom culture.

[62]One example of a culturally congruent instructional strategy is the Vygotskian-based methods of "assisted teaching" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). See Burstein and Cabello (1989) for an example of a teacher education program that systematically teaches prospective teachers how to use various instructional strategies which are sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences.

[63]Different terms exist in the literature for describing the belief systems which govern teachers practices. These include "personal practical knowledge" (Clandinin, 1985),

''practical theories'' (Handal & Lauvas, 1987), ''scripts'' (Gomez & Tabachnick, in press), and ''theories-in-use'' (Schon, 1987).

[64]Also see Fish's (1981) evaluation of the impact of a human relations field experience component at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in which prospective teachers' attitudes towards blacks significantly worsened after the completion of the field experience.

[65]See Ahlquist's (1991) very thoughtful analysis of power relations and student resistance in her multicultural foundations class at San Jose State University. This report underscores the difficulties associated with the preparation of culturally sensitive teachers in conventional preservice teacher education programs.

[66]''Women of Summer'' is a documentary film about a reunion of students from Bryn Mawr College's summer school for women workers, which served mainly working-class women in the 1920s and 1930s.

[67]Also see Burstein and Cabello (1989) and Larke (1990b) for additional evidence of the short-term positive impact of specific teacher education strategies (e.g., pairing prospective teachers with minority children over a two-year period) on the attitudes of teacher education students.

[68]The frameworks developed in this report will now be used to guide several case studies, sponsored by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, of exemplary efforts at teacher education for diversity across the United States. These studies, to be conducted in 1992-93, are intended to provide more detailed portraits than are now available of what various aspects of teacher education for diversity look like in practice.

References

Ada, A. F. (1986). Creative education for bilingual teachers. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 386-393.

Adler, S. (1991). Forming a critical pedagogy in the social studies methods class: The use of imaginative literature. In B.R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education* (pp. 77-90). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

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

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1987). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures, Research about a teacher education project*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1989). *Rate III--Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1990). *AACTE/Metropolitan Life survey of teacher education students*. Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, A. (1987). Cultural patterns affecting teacher and student expectations. In R. Dash (Ed.), *Round table report: The challenge--Preparing teachers for diverse student populations*. Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Anderson, J. (1988). Cognitive styles and multicultural populations. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 2-9.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education, 162*, 67-92.

Asante, M. K. (1987). *The Afrocentric idea*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1986). *Visions of reform: Implications for the education profession*. Reston, VA: Author.

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

Banks, J. (1991). Teaching multicultural literacy to teachers. *Teaching Education, 4*(1), 135-144.

Barnes, H. (1987). The conceptual basis for thematic teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(4), 13-18.

Bastian, A., Fruchter, N., Gittel, M., Greer, C., & Haskings, K. (1985). *Choosing equality: The case for democratic schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Baty, R. (1972). *Reeducating teachers for cultural awareness*. New York: Praeger.

Bennett, C. (1988, April). *The effects of a multicultural education course on preservice teachers' attitudes, knowledge and behavior*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Bennett, C. (1990). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Beyer, L. (1991). Teacher education, reflective inquiry and moral action. In B.R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education* (pp. 113-129). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Bloch, M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1991, April). *Learning out of school: Critical perspectives on the theory of cultural compatibility*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Bowen, E., & Salsman, F. (1979). Integrating multiculturalism into a teacher training program. *Journal of Negro Education, 48*, 390-395.

Bowers, C. A., & Flinders, D. (1990). *Responsive teaching: An ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture, and thought*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Boyd, W. (1991). What makes ghetto schools succeed or fail? *Teachers College Record, 92*, 331-362.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Brown, C. (in press). Restructuring for a new America. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burstein, N., & Cabello, B. (1989). Preparing teachers to work with culturally diverse students: A teacher education model. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(5), 9-16.

Burstein, N., Vaughn, K., Wilcoxen, A., & Brewer, V. (1992). Infusing multicultural perspectives across the curriculum. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Toward education that is multicultural: Proceedings of the first annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education* (pp. 161-170). New York: Silver Burdett.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1988). *Adopted standards of program evaluation and effectiveness*. Sacramento: Author.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Cazden, C., & Mehan, H. (1990). Principles from sociology and anthropology: Context, code, classroom, and culture. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 47-57). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Center for Education Statistics. (1987). *The condition of education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Children's Defense Fund. (1991). *The state of America's children*. Washington, DC: Author.

Clandinin, J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry, 15*, 361-385.

Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1987). *Contextual factors in education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Coleman, J. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American, 259*(5), 42-48.

Committee on Policy for Racial Justice. (1989). *Visions of a better way: A black appraisal of public schooling*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political Studies Press.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 18-36.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teachers and teaching: Signs of a changing profession. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 267-290). New York: Macmillan.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1991). Involving parents in the schools: A process of empowerment. *American Journal of Education, 100*, 20-46.

Delpit, L. (1986). Skills and other dilemmas of a progressive Black educator. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 379-385.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 280-298.

Diegmueller, K. (1990). New teachers say they are prepared to teach ethnically diverse students. *Education Week, 10*(4), 6.

Diez, M., & Murrell, P. (1992). *Assessing abilities of experienced teaching practices in diverse classrooms*. Unpublished manuscript, Alverno College, Milwaukee.

Ducharme, E., & Agne, R. (1989). Professors of education: Uneasy residents of academe. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching* (pp. 67-86). Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Eddy, E. (1969). *Becoming a teacher: The passage to professional status*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eller, R. (in press). Teaching for change in Appalachia. In E. Hollins (Ed.), *A knowledge base for culturally diverse learners*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Ellwood, C. (1990). The moral imperative of ethnic studies in urban teacher education programs. In M. Diez (Ed.), *Proceedings of the fourth national forum of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education* (pp. 1-6). Milwaukee: Alverno College.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan.

Ferdman, B. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*, 181-204.

Fine, M. (1987). Silencing in public schools. *Language Arts, 64*, 157-174.

First, J., Kellogg, J. B., Wiltshire-Carrera, J., Lewis, A., & Almeida, C. A. (1988). *New voices: Immigrant students in U.S. public schools*. Boston: National Coalition of Advocates for Students.

Fish, J. (1981). *The psychological impact of field work experiences and cognitive dissonance upon attitude change in a human relations program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Ford, B. (1992). Developing teachers with a multicultural perspective. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Toward education that is multicultural: Proceedings from the first annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education* (pp. 132-138). New York: Silver Burdett.

Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in Black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 54-84.

Fuller, M., & Ahler, J. (1987). Multicultural education and the monocultural student: A case study. *Action in Teacher Education, 9*, 33-40.

Garibaldi, A. M. (in press). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garcia, E. (1974). Chicano cultural diversity: Implications for Competency-Based Teacher Education. In W.A. Hunter (Ed.), *Multicultural education through Competency-Based Teacher Education* (pp. 146-157). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Garcia, E. (1990). Educating teachers for language minority students. In W. R. Houston (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 712-729). New York: Macmillan.

Gay, G. (1986). Multicultural teacher education. In J. Banks & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Multicultural education in Western societies* (pp. 154-177). New York: Praeger.

Gentile, J. R. (1988). *Instructional improvement: Summary and analysis of Madeline Hunter's essential elements of instruction and supervision*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Gibson, M. (1984). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 15*, 94-119.

Gilbert, S., & Gay, G. (1985). Improving the success in school of poor black children. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*, 133-137.

Ginsburg, M. (1988). *Contradictions in teacher education and society*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Gollnick, D. (in press). Race, class, and gender in teacher education. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1990). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. New York. Merrill.

Gomez, M. (1991). Teaching a language of opportunity in a language arts methods class: Teaching for David, Albert and Darlene. In B. R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education* (pp. 91-112). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

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

Gomez, M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (in press). Telling teaching stories. *Teaching Education*.

Good, T. (1990). Building the knowledge base of teaching. In D. Dill (Ed.), *What teachers need to know* (pp. 17-75). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, B. (1988). Implicit assumptions of the Holmes and Carnegie reports: A view from an African-American perspective. *Journal of Negro Education, 57*, 141-158.

Grant, C. (1978). Education that is multicultural: Isn't that what we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education, 29*, 45-48.

Grant, C. (1991, June). *Educational research and teacher training for successfully teaching limited English proficient students.* Paper presented at the second national research symposium, Office of Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.

Grant, C., & Gillette, M. (1987). The Holmes report and minorities in education. *Social Education, 51*, 517-521.

Grant, C., & Koskella, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 197-203.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

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

Grant, C., Zeichner, K., & Gillette, M. (1988). *Preparing teachers to work effectively with diverse students in multicultural settings: Final report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Grossman, P., & Richert, A. (1988). Unacknowledged knowledge growth: A reexamination of the effects of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*, 53-62.

Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Haberman, M. (1987). *Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools.* New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Institute for Urban and Minority Education.

Haberman, M. (1991a). Can culture awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teaching 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: SUNY Press.

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

Handal, G., & Lauvas, P. (1987). *Promoting reflective teaching.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hillard, A. (1974). Restructuring teacher education for multicultural imperatives. In W. A. Hunter (Ed.), *Multicultural education through Competency-Based Teacher Education* (pp. 40-55). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hixon, J. (1991, April). *Multicultural issues in teacher education: Meeting the challenge of student diversity.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Hixson, J. (1992). Multicultural issues in teacher education: Meeting the challenge of student diversity. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Toward education that is multicultural: Proceedings of the first annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education* (pp. 139-147). New York: Silver Burdett.

Hodge, C. (1990). Educators for a truly democratic system of schooling. In J. Goodlad & P. Keating (Eds.), *Access to knowledge: An agenda for our nation's schools* (pp. 259-272). New York: College Board.

Hodgkinson, H. L., Outtz, J. H., & Obarakpor, A. M. (1990). *The demographics of American Indians: One percent of the people, fifty percent of the diversity.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, Center for Demographic Policy.

Hollins, E. (1982). The Marva Collins story revisited: Implications for regular classroom instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(1), 37-40.

Hollins, E. (1990). Debunking the myth of a monolithic white American culture; or, moving toward cultural inclusion. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*, 201-209.

Hollins, E., & Spencer, K. (1990). Restructuring schools for cultural inclusion: Changing the schooling process for African-American youngsters. *Journal of Education, 172*, 89-100.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Howey, K., & Zimpher, N. (1990). Professors and deans of education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 349-370). New York: Macmillan.

Huber, T. (1992). Culturally responsible pedagogy: The wisdom of multicultural education. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Toward education that is multicultural: Proceedings from the first annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education* (pp. 28-35). New York: Silver Burdett.

Huber, T., & Pewewardy, C. (1990). *Maximizing learning for all students: A review of the literature on learning modalities, cognitive styles and approaches to meeting the needs*

of diverse learners. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324-289).

Hunter, W. (1974). *Multicultural Education through Competency-Based Teacher Education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Irvine, J. J. (1989, December). *Cultural responsiveness in teacher education: Strategies to prepare majority teachers for successful instruction of minority students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Project 30, Monterey, CA.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., Noble, G., & Poynting, S. (1990). *Cultures of schooling: Pedagogies for cultural difference and social access*. London: Falmer Press.

Kennedy, M. (1991). Some surprising findings on how teachers learn to teach. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 14-17.

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

Kleifgen, J. (1988). Learning from student teachers' cross-cultural communicative failures. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19*, 218-234.

Kleinfeld, J. (1992). Learning to think like a teacher: The study of cases. In J. Shulman (Ed.), *Case methods in teacher education* (pp. 33-49). New York: Teachers College Press.

Knapp, M., & Turnbull, B. (1991). Alternatives to conventional wisdom. In M. Knapp & P. Shields (Eds.), *Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom* (pp. 329-353). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1990). Culturally relevant teaching. *College Board Review, 155*, 20-25.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991a). Like lightning in a bottle: Attempting to capture the pedagogical excellence of successful teachers of black students. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 3*, 335-344.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991b, April). *When difference means disaster: Reflections on a teacher education strategy for countering student resistance to diversity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991c). *Who will teach our children? Preparing teachers to successfully teach African-American students*. Paper presented for California State University, Hayward, teleconference on cultural diversity.

LaFontaine, H. (1988). Educational challenges and opportunities in serving limited-English-proficient students. In Council of Chief State School Officers, *School success for students at risk: Analysis and recommendations* (pp. 120-153). Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Lanier, J., with Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Third handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Laosa, L. (1977). Cognitive styles and learning strategies research: Some of the areas in which psychology can contribute to personalized instruction in multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(3), 26-30.

Larke, P. (1990a, April). *Cultural awareness inventory. Assessing the sensitivity of preservice teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Larke, P. (1990b). *The impact of cross-cultural mentoring on the attitudinal changes of preservice teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas.

Law, S. G., & Lane, D. S. (1987). Multicultural acceptance by teacher education students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 14*, 3-9.

Lee, M. (1989). Making child development relevant for all children. Implications for teacher education. *Early-child development and care, 47*, 63-73.

Levin, H. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership, 44*, 19-21.

Liston, D., & Zeichner, K. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Little Soldier, L. (1989). Language and learning of Native American students. *Educational Leadership, 46*(5), 74-75.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*, 315-340.

Mahan, J. (1982). Native Americans as teacher trainers: Anatomy and outcomes of a cultural immersion project. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 2*(2), 100-110.

Mahan, J., & Boyle, V. (1981). Multicultural teacher preparation: An attitudinal survey. *Educational Research Quarterly, 6*, 97-104.

Maher, F., & Rathbone, C. (1986). Teacher education and feminist theory: Some implications for practice. *American Journal of Education, 94*, 214-235.

McCarthy, C. (1990). *Race and curriculum*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

McCormick, J. (1991, December 23). A class act for the ghetto. *Newsweek*, pp. 62-63.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1989). What teachers need to know about cultural diversity: Restoring subject matter to the picture. In *Competing visions of teacher knowledge: Proceedings from an NCRTE seminar for education policymakers: Vol. 2. Student diversity* (Conference Series 89-1, pp. 91-106). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). *What do about differences? A study of multicultural education for teacher trainees in the Los Angeles Unified School District* (Research Report 90-11). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

McDiarmid, G. W., & Price, J. (1990). *Prospective teachers' views of diverse learners: A study of the participants in the ABCD project* (Research Report 90-6). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Mehan, H., & Trujillo, T. (1989). *Teacher education issues* (Research & Policy Series No. 4). Santa Barbara: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Project.

Mills, J. (1984). Addressing the separate but equal predicament in teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(6), 18-23.

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

Moll, L., & Diaz, R. (1987). Teaching writing as communication: The use of ethnographic findings in classroom practice. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Literacy and schooling* (pp. 55-65). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Montero-Sieburth, M. (1989). Restructuring teachers' knowledge for urban settings. *Journal of Negro Education, 58*, 332-344.

Mungo, S. (1982). *Mental health and the intern*. Normal: Illinois State University School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240-121)

Murrell, P. (1990). Making uncommon sense: Critical revisioning professional knowledge about diverse cultural perspectives in teacher education. In M. Diez (Ed.), *Proceedings of the fourth national forum of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education* (pp. 47-54). Milwaukee: Alverno College.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1990). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (1989). *Competing visions of teacher knowledge: Proceedings from an NCRTE seminar for education policymakers. Vol 2. Student diversity* (Conference Series 89-1). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Author.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students. (1991). *The good common school: Making the vision work for all students*. Boston: Author.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). *A call for change in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Natriello, G., McDill, E., & Pallas, A. (1990). *Schooling disadvantaged children: Racing against catastrophe*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nelson-Barber, S., & Mitchell, J. (in press). Contributions of research on teacher assessment to culturally appropriate teacher education. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nicklin, J. (1991, November 27). Teacher education programs face pressure to provide multicultural training. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A1-A16.

Nieto, C. (1986). The California challenge: Preparing teachers for a growing Hispanic population. *Action in Teacher Education, 8*(1), 1-8.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1990). Shaping the rhetoric of reflection for multicultural settings. In R. Clift, W. R. Houston, & M. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education* (pp. 163-185). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1991, April). *Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms: A case study in rural Alaska*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (in press). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

Oakes, J. (1986). Tracking, inequality, and the rhetoric of school reform: Why schools don't change. *Journal of Education, 168*, 60-80.

O'Hare, W. (1988). *The rise of poverty in rural America*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Olsen, D., & Mullen, N. (1990). *Embracing diversity: Teachers' voices from California's classrooms*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow Project.

Ornstein, A., & Levine, D. (1989). Social class, race, and school achievement: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(5), 17-23.

Ortiz, F. I. (1988). Hispanic-American children's experiences in classrooms: A comparison between Hispanic and non-Hispanic children. In L. Weis (Ed.), *Class, race, and gender in education* (pp. 66-68). Albany: SUNY Press.

Paine, L. (1989). *Orientation towards diversity: What do prospective teachers bring?* (Research Report 89-9). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Paley, V. G. (1989). *White teacher*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pallas, A., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population. *Educational Researcher, 18*(5), 16-22.

Ptak, D. (1988). *Report on the achievement of black high school students in the Madison Metropolitan School District, 1987-1988*. Madison, WI: Urban League.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities*. Cambridge, MA: Author.

Quintanar-Sarellana, R. (1991, April). *Training teachers for a multicultural society*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Reed, D., & Simon, D. (1991). Preparing teachers for urban schools: Suggestions from historically black institutions. *Action in Teacher Education, 13*(2), 30-35.

Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*, 411-451.

Rivlin, H., & colleagues. (1974). A cross-cultural approach to multicultural teacher education. In W. Hunter (Ed.), *Multicultural education through competency-based teacher education* (pp. 243-251). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: An autobiography, the education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York: Bantam Books.

Rosewater, A. (1989). Child and family trends: Beyond the numbers. In F. Macchiarola & A. Gartner (Eds.), *Caring for America's children* (pp. 4-19). New York: American Academy of Political Science.

Ross, D., Johnson, M., & Smith, W. (1991, April). *Helping preservice teachers confront issues related to educational equity: Assessing revisions in coursework and fieldwork*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Ruiz, R. (1991). The empowerment of language-minority students. In C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education* (pp. 217-228). Albany: SUNY Press.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuhmann, A. M. (in press). Learning to teach Hispanic students. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shade, B. (1982). Afro-American cognitive style: A variable in school success. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 219-244.

Shields, P. (1991). School and community influences on effective academic instruction. In M. Knapp & P. Shields (Eds.), *Better schooling for the children of poverty* (pp. 313-328). San Francisco: McCutchan.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 1-22.

Singer, E. (1988). *What is cultural congruence and why are they saying such terrible things about it?* (Occasional Paper No. 120). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1989). What works for students at risk. *Educational Leadership, 46*(5), 4-13.

Sleeter, C. (1985). A need for research on preservice teacher education for mainstreaming and multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5*, 205-215.

Sleeter, C. (1988). *Preservice coursework and field experiences in multicultural education: Impact on teacher behavior*. Kenosha: University of Wisconsin-Parkside School of Education.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the U.S. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 421-444.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Smith, B. O. (1969). *Teachers for the real world*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Smith, W. (1980). The American Teacher Corps programme. In E. Hoyle & J. Megarry (Eds.), *World yearbook of education: Professional development of teachers* (pp. 204-218). New York: Nichols.

Swisher, K., & Deyhle, D. (1987). Styles of learning and learning of styles: Educational conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan native youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8*, 345-360.

Tabachnick, B.R. (1991, November). *Learning to teach social studies from multicultural perspectives in multicultural classrooms*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies, Washington, DC.

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). *Growing up literate: Learning from inner city families*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Teitelbaum, K., & Britzman, D. (1991). Reading and doing ethnography: Teacher education and reflective practice. In B. R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education* (pp. 166-185). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Tharp, R. (1989). Psychocultural variables and constants: Effects on teaching and learning in schools. *American Psychologist, 44*, 349-359.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life. Teaching, learning and schooling in social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tiedt, P., & Tiedt, I. (1990). *Multicultural teaching: A handbook of activities, information and resources*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tikunoff, W., & Ward, B. (1991). *Competencies of teachers of ethnolinguistically diverse student groups*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Tippeconnic, J. W. (1983). Training teachers of American Indian students. *Peabody Journal of Education, 61*(1), 6-15.

Trent, W. (1990). Race and ethnicity in the teacher education curriculum. *Teachers College Record, 91*, 361-369.

Trueba, H. (1988). Culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19*, 270-287.

Trueba, H. (1989a). Cultural embeddedness: The role of culture on minority students' acquisition of English literacy. In *Competing visions of teacher knowledge: Vol. 2. Student diversity* (Conference Series 89-1, pp. 77-90). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Trueba, H. (1989b). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century*. New York: Newbury.

Trueba, H. (1991). From failure to success: The roles of culture and cultural conflict in the academic achievement of Chicano students. In R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990's* (pp. 151-163). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Trueba, H., Jacobs, L., & Kirton, E. (1990). *Cultural conflict and adaptation: The case of Hmong children in American society*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Trueba, H., Moll, L., Dias, S., & Dias, R. (1984). *Improving the functional writing of bilingual secondary school students*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 240-862)

Valencia, R. (1991). *Chicano school failures and success: Research and policy agenda for the 1990's*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Villegas, A. M. (1988). School failures and cultural mismatch: Another view. *Urban Review, 20*, 253-265.

Villegas, A. M. (1991). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990's and beyond*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Villegas, A. M. (1992, February). *The competence needed by beginning teachers in a multicultural society*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando.

Wahab, Z. (1989). *The melting pot revisited*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Oregon Multicultural Association, Salem.

Watson, D., Northcutt, Z., & Rydell, L. (1989). Teaching bilingual students successfully. *Educational Leadership, 46*(5), 59-61.

Weiner, K. (1989). Asking the right questions: An analytic framework for reform of urban teacher education. *The Urban Review, 21*, 151-161.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1988). *Teacher education program approval rules*. Madison: Author

Zeichner, K. (1990a). Changing directions in the practicum: Looking to the 1990's. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16*, 105-132.

Zeichner, K. (1990b). Preparing teachers for democratic schools. *Action in Teacher Education, 11*(1), 5-10.

Zeichner, K. (1991a). Contradictions and tensions in the professionalization of teaching and the democratization of schools. *Teachers College Record, 92*, 363-379.

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

Zeichner, K. (1992). *Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice* (Issue Paper 92-1). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zimpher, N. (1989). The RATE project: A profile of teacher education students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(6), 27-30.

Zimpher, N., & Ashburn, E. (in press). Countering parochialism among teacher candidates. In M. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Key Elements in Effective Teaching for Ethnic and Language Minority Students

Teachers have a clear sense of their own ethnic and cultural identities.	Learning tasks are often seen as meaningful by students.
High expectations for the success of all students (and a belief that all students can succeed) are communicated to students.	The curriculum is inclusive of the contributions and perspectives of the different ethnocultural groups that make up the society.
Teachers are personally committed to achieving equity for all students and believe that they are capable of making a difference in their students' learning.	Scaffolding is provided by teachers that links the academically challenging and inclusive curriculum to the cultural resources that students bring to school.
Teachers have developed a personal bond with their students and cease seeing their students as "the other."	Teachers explicitly teach students the culture of the school *and* seek to maintain students' sense of ethnocultural pride and identity.
Students are provided with an academically challenging curriculum that includes attention to the development of higher level cognitive skills.	Parents and community members are encouraged to become involved in students' education and are given a significant voice in making important school decisions in relation to program, i.e., sources and staffing.
Instruction focuses on the creation of meaning about content by students in an interactive and collaborative learning environment.	Teachers are involved in political struggles outside of the classroom aimed at achieving a more just and humane society.

Table 2

Key Elements of Effective "Teacher Education for Diversity"

Admissions procedures screen students on the basis of cultural sensitivity and a commitment to the education of all students, especially poor students of color who frequently do not experience success in school.	Students are taught various procedures by which they can gain information about the communities represented in their classrooms.
Students are helped to develop a clearer sense of their own ethnic and cultural identities.	Students are taught how to assess the relationships between the methods they use in the classroom and the preferred learning and interaction styles in their students' homes and communities.
Students are helped to examine their attitudes toward other ethnocultural groups.	Students are taught how to used various instructional strategies and assessment procedures sensitive to cultural and linguistic variations and how to adapt classroom instruction an assessment to accommodate the cultural resources that their students bring to school.
Students are taught about the dynamics of prejudice and racism and about how to deal with them in the classroom.	Students are exposed to examples of the successful teaching of ethnic- and language-minority students.
Students are taught about the dynamics of privilege and economic oppression and about school practices that contribute to the reproduction of societal inequalities.	Students complete community field experiences with adults and/or children of another ethnocultural groups with guided refections.
The teacher education curriculum addresses the histories and contributions of various ethnocultural groups.	Students complete practicum and/or student teaching experiences in schools serving ethnic- and language-minority students.
Students are given information about the characteristics and learning styles of various groups *and* individuals and are taught about the limitations of this information.	Students live and teach in a minority community (immersion).
The teacher education curriculum gives much attention to sociocultural research knowledge about the relationships among language, culture, and learning.	Instruction is embedded in a group setting that provides both intellectual challenge and social support.

Adminstrative Staff

Director: Mary Kennedy

Associate Director: G. Williamson McDiarmid

Study Directors: Linda Anderson, Deborah Ball, Daniel Chazan, Helen Featherstone, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, G. Williamson McDiarmid, Susan Melnick, Barbara Neufeld, Kenneth Zeichner

Director of Dissemination: Cassandra Book

Project Manager: Steven Kirsner

Communication Specialist: Debra Peterson

Editor: Sandra Gross

Production Assistant: Tamara D. Hicks

NCRTL Special Report
September 1992

This *NCRTL Special Report* is published by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, College of Education, Michigan State University. The NCRTL is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department. Third-Class postage is paid at East Lansing, MI. ISSN 1054-7673.

Please send change of address notification to NCRTL Mailing List, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 4824-1034. Please include the address label from this issue. Phone (517) 355-9302. Fax (517) 336-2795.

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity institution.

Michigan State University
National Center for Research
on Teacher Learning
College of Education
116 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
East Lansing, Michigan
PERMIT NO. 21