THESIS

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION:
A CASE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

presented by

Gerald Scott Hopper

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Anthropology

Major professor

Date 4-9-96

O-7639

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAY 3 2 1 8 2 0 C 3		

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

THE DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

By

Gerald Scott Hopper

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Anthropology

1996

ABSTRACT

THE DISCOURSE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

By

Gerald Scott Hopper

In recent years, teacher educators have come to acknowledge the importance of multicultural education in the preparation of preservice teachers. While there has been much discussion regarding theoretical issues in the literature, there has been little emphasis on documenting practice at the local level. In this thesis, I conducted a case study examining how teacher educators practice multicultural education and use the concept of culture. The teacher education program at Michigan State University was selected as the study site, and I interviewed a total of twelve teacher educators who practice multicultural education; the goal of this thesis was to document the wide range of issues that teacher educators must address in their practice, to demonstrate the multiple ways multicultural education is practiced and how the culture concept is defined, and to call forth the building of interdisciplinary ties between anthropology and teacher education.

Copyright by
GERALD SCOTT HOPPER
1996

To Kathy: my wife, best friend, and soul mate.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Dr. Jacob Climo for serving as my advisor, mentor, and friend. Dr. Climo is a rarity among the faculty in the Department of Anthropology--a scholar and professor who is truly devoted to his students. He helped in the selection and sharpening of this topic, and provided insight into the ethnographic method that was used to approach this research question. Dr. Douglas R. Campbell provided to me an understanding of the research site, and many valuable comments that have been incorporated into the resulting thesis. The late Dr. Jerome A. Voss also provided many useful comments that ultimately resulted in the sharpening of my research focus. I am grateful to Dr. E.L. Cerroni-Long of Eastern Michigan University for serving on my graduate guidance committee, providing me with many valuable comments, and for turning me on to the challenging and rewarding world of cultural anthropology--she is a one of a kind professor, and a once in a life-time mentor. I would like to express my gratitude to all the teacher educators who allowed me to interview them for my study. Without their participation, this thesis would not be possible. Finally, special thanks go to Kathleen D. Hopper for her emotional support, editorial assistance, and just for being the wonderful person that she is, which helped me to endure and ultimately succeed in researching and writing my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Dilworth (1992:xi) reports that the current impetus for educational reform comes from segments of the educational community who acknowledge that racial and ethnic diversity in the student population is an issue that must be confronted and accommodated in educational practice. More importantly, she argues, that this new understanding is believed to be related to three social conditions; which, if they are not addressed by the educational community in the coming decades may threaten the global economic and political position of the United States: 1) students of color are performing poorly compared to Euro-American students; 2) there is an increasing need for a highly trained work force in this period of rapid change; and 3) there is a desire for providing resolution to domestic and international social problems.

The national advocacy for reforming the current approach to teacher preparation is led by various government bodies, political leaders, and the majority of educational organizations found in the United States. These groups, in part, are responsible for guiding the course and direction of this educational restructuring. Brown (1992:1-2) argues that unless this restructuring is addressed promptly by these groups, the nation will be subject to a substantial loss of economic and political power in the global community, due to our inability to bring all our human resources to bear in the global economy.

In order to counter this trend, many teacher educators have argued that there are two areas that must be addressed, during this period of rapid change in science, technology, and industry. First, Brown (1992:1) argues, the position of minorities in American universities must change. As the nation's population continues to diversify in the coming decades, he suggests, minorities can no longer accept the question of equity as simply an issue of

recruitment, as many believe Affirmative Action portrays it. Second, Kobus (1992:224) reports that educational leaders have recently come to recognize that preparing children and young adults for their role as citizens in a world, which now requires expanded participation and responsibility from its citizens, is a problematic proposition at best. Thus, it is no longer acceptable, he argues, for American educators to present our own democratic system as an idealized model, when so many of our own citizens, simply due to their cultural and ethnic minority status, are subject to social and economic dislocation and inequity.

To address the question of reform, many educators have begun to incorporate a multiculturalist perspective into their own home institutions' preservice teacher education curriculum; this is generally referred to as multicultural education. As Sleeter and Grant (1987:421) point out, "Multicultural education has been a reform movement aimed at changing the content and processes within schools. Originally linked only to concerns about racism in schooling, it has expanded to address sexism, classism, and handicappism." The ultimate goal of the reform discourse is to prepare prospective teachers to operate effectively in diverse classroom settings, which will provide benefits and expanded learning opportunities to students of color.

The reform movement in multicultural education as these scholars have shown is a national movement. However, what does this reform movement look like at the local level, in an actual teacher education program? Rosaldo (1993) argues that in order to understand more fully social actors and their motivations, they must be studied in their local context. This thesis involves such a case study of teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education: to demonstrate the importance of social agency and to document the diversity of approaches at the local level. In particular, I will document how teacher educators at the local level use the culture concept in their work and determine whether the definitions recorded are based on a Boas-Benedict construction, as Wax (1993) argues. By drawing upon Sleeter and Grant's (1987) typology of multicultural

education approaches, I will attempt to categorize the approaches found at the local level. The intent of this study is to inform teacher educators of the complex task that lies before them in restructuring their practice and to open a dialogue between teacher educators and anthropologists regarding these issues at the national level.

Chapter 1

THE CHALLENGE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

In recent years, teacher educators involved in the multicultural education movement have come to the realization that the typical preservice teacher, who is generally Euro-American and female, will be called to fill the vacancies in urban public schools. However, her preferred choice is to teach in a suburban school setting rather than in the central city (Ladson-Billings 1992b:107). The prospective teacher generally comes from a small-town or suburban community, with little intercultural or interracial experience. Overwhelmingly, the preservice teacher desires to teach children who are culturally like herself in a community that is similar to where she grew-up (Zeichner 1992:4).

She will be asked to teach students of color who have very different backgrounds and life experiences than her own. For her, teaching will require being able to have the necessary skills to communicate effectively interculturally. Essentially, she will encounter students who are different from her in social class, culture, ethnicity, and language (Zeichner 1992:1); in many cases she will be forced to operate in unfamiliar conditions. Zeichner notes, "These students of color are more likely to be poor, hungry, in poor health, and drop out of school than their white counterparts" (Ibid:3).

Recently, the recruitment of ethnic minorities into the ranks of the teaching profession has become even more difficult (see Chinn and Wong 1992 and Arends, Clemson, and Henkelman 1992). However, the question of whether students of color have a higher level of achievement with minority teachers is still open to debate. There is no empirical evidence that links the ethnic identity of teachers with student achievement levels (Ladson-Billings 1994:26). Yet with the small likelihood of recruiting large numbers of minorities

into the teaching profession, the question that must be answered is what kind of preparation will the typical educator need to be an effective teacher in culturally diverse settings?

The Teacher Educator's Mission

Multicultural education in teacher education has its origins in reforms mandated during the 1980s. Zeichner (1992) argues that these interventions, as currently conceived, do not adequately address the issue of diversity in education. They do not prepare preservice teachers to work in diverse cultural settings. Generally speaking, the teacher preparation programs as they are presently structured

> . . . are not powerful enough interventions in the lives of teacher candidates to help them to become effective and reflective practitioners. . . . Teacher education is simply too weak either to produce a paradigm shift for teacher candidates or to provide them with a sufficient repertoire to make serious departures from what they already know and can do well (Arends, Clemson, and Henkelman 1992:162-3).

This problem, in part, may be traced to a weak connection between the theory of multicultural education as advocated by practitioners and the application of those ideas in teacher preparation programs. It is generally perceived that the development of theory has outpaced the question of application in the field (see Banks 1993, Gay 1992, Sleeter and Grant 1987).

According to Sleeter and Grant (1987:437), there is generally a weak connection between theory and application in multicultural education, as advocated in the literature, which leaves the question of application unanswered. They argue,

> They [author of models] do not provide a thorough discussion of the theoretical frameworks supporting their goals. Statements concerning goals are often vague, and clear connections between what authors expect of the approach and what they recommend as practices for educators are either ambiguous or missing altogether.

A second problem facing teacher educators in their practice (see Ladson-Billings 1994 and Ahlquist 1992) has been documented. Many prospective teachers passively resist the

materials (generally historical information on Asian Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, and African Americans) introduced in multicultural education or human relations courses. There is the perception that multicultural education classes are designed to make them feel guilty. Many students find it difficult to believe that Euro-Americans have economically and politically gained from the prevailing political and economic status quo; consequently, they simply ignore the course content, which apparently hinders many preservice teachers from critically examining issues of cultural diversity.

The Discourse of Reform

The current multicultural education movement is set to address these problems: first, how can a stronger connection between the theoretical considerations of multicultural education and its application by practitioners be forged in the classroom? Second, how can preservice teachers be prepared to understand adequately issues of cultural diversity and to operate effectively in culturally diverse classrooms? Given this orientation of the reform movement, the question of linking theory with practice is closely tied to the issue of preparing preservice teachers to operate in culturally diverse classrooms. The actual preparation of prospective teachers becomes the application of theory for these practitioners.

In response, several scholars (Gollnick 1992a, Gollnick 1992b, Brown 1992, Garibaldi 1992, Irvine 1992, Winfield and Manning 1992) have offered a variety of perspectives on addressing the question of increasing preservice teachers' understanding of cultural diversity. Many educators are advocates for the restructuring of teacher education programs; restructuring is believed to be necessary to provide preservice teachers with adequate preparation. Before agreeing upon any course of action, virtually all teacher educators concur that a single course in multicultural education or human relations is insufficient to prepare prospective teachers, for the challenges of the profession (Garibaldi 1992:23).

Before the current reform movement can have a positive impact, specialists argue that

there are two important considerations that teacher educators must bring to the center of their practice. The first area is an understanding of cultural diversity issues (see Garibaldi 1992, Gollnick 1992a). To achieve this goal, teacher preparation programs will need to concentrate on the social and cultural context of learning throughout the teacher education curriculum. Central to this reform is that notions of culture, race, ethnicity, and gender need to be integrated into the curriculum and pedagogy. For example, prospective teachers will need to understand that culture plays an important role in producing multiple learning distinctions, and that these and other environmental factors can influence success in the classroom; having been instructed, prospective teachers will have to take these questions into consideration. According to Gollnick (1992a:67), "The goal should be that graduates of teacher education programs are actually able to transfer this knowledge and these skills to their classrooms when they begin to teach."

The second area is the clinical experience; a pedagogical method, which is believed to provide the most comprehensive means for reinforcing lessons upon preservice teachers. The purpose of the clinical experience can vary in intensity and duration, from volunteer work to a full year student teaching internship. The intent of the experience is to demonstrate to students that there are no ideal heterogeneous classrooms, and to provide preservice teachers with practice in learning how to transfer what they have learned in the program to actual classroom settings (Garibaldi 1992:33-4).

The Problem

Despite the recent pledge by educators to restructure teacher preparation programs, there appears to be no readily available answers to solve the problems underlying the need for reform. This prospect, I believe, raises the question of how the reform movement plays itself out in a local context and how this differs from the national discourse? In this thesis, I report on a case study of a teacher education program and document how the practice of

teacher educators is played out at the local level. Given the importance of the concept of culture to multicultural education, I document how the teacher educators that submitted to being interviewed use the concept in their work; I will determine whether this concept is based on a Boas-Benedict construct of culture, as argued by Wax (1993). Finally, I draw upon Sleeter and Grant's (1987) typology of multicultural education approaches as a means for classifying the approaches used by the teacher educators that I interviewed. It is hoped that by documenting how teacher educators both define the concept of culture and practice multicultural education in an actual program, this case study will provide a database of information that will facilitate a healthy dialogue between teacher educators and anthropologists over the questions addressed in this thesis.

It should be noted that even though the term multicultural education is being used in this study to refer to the work of teacher educators involved in the preparation of prospective teachers, there are other terms that are also applicable for identifying this type of work, but these terms encompass varied meanings depending on how they are employed. The best example that comes to mind is the notion of diversity, which is generally viewed as an idea that incorporates difference beyond the level of culture, such as disabilities and special needs. In this study, I am more concerned with examining the cultural aspect of this practice; thus I believe multicultural education is a more appropriate term.

The Case Study

Drawing upon the work of Rosaldo (1993), I conducted a case study of teacher educators who practice multicultural education in Michigan State University's (MSU) teacher education program. By examining a local setting, this provides an actual documented case of how a group of teacher educators practices multicultural education. Rosaldo (1993:21) argues that to understand social actors (teacher educators) more fully, it is necessary for cultural analysis to embed them within the context they inhabit (the teacher education program), since participants are shaped by local interests and their

actions and perceptions are colored by surrounding events. To understand the interplay between human action and their built-environment, Rosaldo (1993:102-3) observed, it is important to take into account subjectivity and how it influences behavior. He stated,

> In this context, the study of consciousness becomes central because people always act (however imperfectly) relative to their desires, plans, whims, strategies, moods, goals, fantasies, intentions, impulses, purposes, visions, or gut feelings. No analysis of human action is complete unless it attends to people's own notions of what they are doing. Even when they appear most subjective, thought and feelings are always culturally shaped and influenced by one's biography, social situation, and historical context (Ibid).

Thus, one part of this study is to survey the context in which teacher educators are embedded and examine how their intersubjectivity and experience impacts upon their professional interactions, centered on the practice of educating prospective teachers. This survey provided an opportunity for glimpsing a view of the actual subjectivity of teacher educators and their academic practice through studying their intersubjective and narrative experiences, which allows an examination of how these educators respond, both as professionals and individuals, to the issues that comprise their profession.

In recent years, many anthropologists have observed that educators who are involved in multicultural education have appropriated a distorted concept of culture into their intellectual discourse, without developing more than a superficial understanding of the concept (see Turner 1993, Greenbaum 1992, and Perry 1992). In particular, Wax (1993) attempts to demonstrate how anachronistic the prevailing notion of culture in multiculturalism is compared to recent anthropological notions of culture. Wax (1993) proposes that the model currently being used in the national multicultural education discourse is based on a Boas-Benedict notion of culture, which he believes is no longer a useful framework for educators.

In this thesis, I will assess whether a Boas-Benedict notion of culture is, in fact, employed in MSU's teacher education program by the teacher educators that I have interviewed, and I will determine whether Wax's hypothesis is a feasible premise given the

lack of empirical evidence supporting his claim. Wax (1993:108) observes, that the notion of culture being used most closely approximates one offered by the Boas-Benedict legacy in anthropology. That is, this notion of culture is one that characterizes cultures as ". . . plural, separate, distinct, historically homogeneous. . . ." Regarding the multiculturalism discourse, Wax (1993:105-6) argues, the following cultural themes can be observed. First, every person is a participant of culture and a product of culture. Second, since individuals' are participants in culture and are a product of the same, schooling should begin at the point of reaching toward the student in his or her native culture, and the school curriculum must be designed to reflect this goal. It cannot be assumed that since a student is unfamiliar with certain aspects of the mainstream dominant culture, that he or she is culturally deficient. Finally, the school culture should reflect the population of the institution; rather, than reflecting the larger dominant culture. The benefit derived from this arrangement is that ethnocentrism will be avoided and minority students will be given a sense of belonging and models of achievement.

The Boas-Benedict notion of culture when embodied into multicultural curricular rhetoric, Wax (1993:108) argues, generally translates into ". . . a struggle for political empowerment or dominance, but it has no relevance to the historical realities of the development of world civilization." He suggests that such a portrayal of the dynamics of culture in multicultural education is inaccurate since human growth and innovation are found not in separate or isolated cultures, but at the crossroads where cultures come into contact. Given that the world is becoming more globally interconnected through communication technologies, commerce, and political-military relationships, Wax (1993:109) believes that it is no longer feasible for educators to rely upon the Boas-Benedict model of culture, since it fails to recognize the growing interdependency of the "global village." Wax calls on teacher educators to reconfigure the notion of culture that is being used in their practice.

A second purpose of this thesis is to determine what approaches to multicultural

education are being used by the teacher educators that I interviewed in MSU's teacher education program. To accomplish this task, I will draw upon the multicultural education typology offered by Sleeter and Grant (1987) as the means for classifying the approaches I documented at the local level. I will discuss Sleeter and Grant's typology in Chapter 2.

Chapter 2

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: THE NATIONAL DISCOURSE

In this chapter, I will highlight some of the relevant issues in the national multicultural education discourse that are being advocated by educators across the nation. This survey will attempt to accomplish the following tasks. First, I will discuss the marginalized relationship of multicultural education within the context of teacher education. Second, I will trace the historical development of the multicultural education discourse. Third, I will discuss the various approaches to multicultural education that are currently being used.

Multicultural Education: A Marginal Discourse

Grant and Miller (1992) have argued that while many teacher educators have acknowledged the importance of multicultural education, it is still largely an issue assigned a marginal status within the teacher education literature. Zeichner (1992:2) has observed that a substantial corpus of works has recently appeared, addressing such issues as: 1) the growing disparity between the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of our nation's teaching force and that of the student populations in public schools; 2) the problematic nature of recruiting and retaining more minority teachers; and 3) the glaring problem of inequity in schools and society. Yet, he suggests, a majority of teacher educators have shown little interest to the question of reforming teacher education, by incorporating a multicultural perspective. In particular, Zeichner states that "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" (Ibid).

The antecedents of multicultural education are found in the civil rights movement of the 1960s. The result was revolutionary change to the American educational system; schools were desegregated and several new educational programs addressing cultural diversity were born. Ethnic studies, women's studies, multiethnic education, intergroup relations, citizenship education, bilingual education, and special needs education all have their origins in this era (Kobus 1992:225).

The contemporary multicultural education discourse is similar to previous reform movements, since it represents a projection of historical tension, centered on societal issues in education; consequently, educational historians argue that the current movement should be seen as an extension of earlier reform movements. In the past, the advocacy for these movements has frequently culminated in a call for reform, which have effected change in both the educational curricula and pedagogy (Brown 1992:2).

Banks (1993) provides an excellent historical account tracing the course and direction of the previous reform movements; he demonstrates how their influences can be gauged in the current multicultural education movement. He identifies four historical periods, with the final period extending into the current discourse of multicultural education. The first phase, which began during the civil rights movement, is characterized with the emergence of ethnic studies. Ethnic studies developed when scholars, who specialized in the history and culture of minority groups, sought to incorporate concepts, theories, and information about ethnic groups into the teacher education curricula. The development of multiethnic education characterized the second phase of the multicultural education movement. These same educational pioneers realized that the incorporation of information about ethnic groups into the curricula was insufficient to address the needs of minority students, nor to build democratic racial and ethnic attitudes among all students. By responding to the unique needs of minority students, the advocates of multiethnic education intended to bring systematic and structural change to schools, which, it was hoped, would encourage all

students to develop more tolerant attitudes toward racial and ethnic differences--the aim was to increase educational equality for all students. The third period emerged when other groups, who viewed themselves as victimized by society and educational institutions, expressed their dissatisfaction over how the school curriculum was organized and structured. Women and people with disabilities, among others, demanded that their histories, cultures, and voices be incorporated into the school curricula, both in secondary and higher education. They believed themselves to be "invisible," or misrecognized by the prevailing curricula of the time. The current period in multicultural education is characterized by practitioners focusing on the development of theory, practice, and research that centers on the integration of such variables as race, class, and gender, which are now considered important. It is important to realize that contributions from each period in the evolution of multicultural education are observable today, with the more recent developments being more prominent than earlier ones (Banks 1993:19-20).

Multicultural Education: A Period of Transformation

Commentators have observed that there is no one specific approach available to multicultural education--multiple approaches have been advocated in recent years. Brown (1992:7) describes the current period of educational reform as a formative period; the agenda transforming teacher education programs is still emerging, which has resulted in many different interpretations being offered on how multicultural education should be implemented, as will be discussed in detail below. Banks (1993:4) echoes this sentiment; he argues that the emergent status of the current reform movement has spawned numerous typologies and conceptual schemes, which, often time, disagree over goals and aims.

Several scholars have developed typologies (see Sleeter & Grant 1987, Gibson 1984, and Prattle 1983) to distinguish between the multiple multicultural education approaches that have been advocated in the literature. There is overlap in the configuration of the

typologies, since scholars do not agree on the specifics of each multicultural education approach; yet each approach within a typology is discernible by its stated aims, goals, and methodologies.

Sleeter and Grant (1987) have identified five approaches to multicultural education in their review of the literature. I will provide expanded coverage of the final two approaches in Sleeter and Grant's typology, since they will play an important role in our understanding of the approaches used by scholars consulted in MSU's teacher education program. The first approach is the "Teaching of the Culturally Different" perspective, which advocates the assimilation of students of color into the cultural mainstream, and the current social structure. A basic tenet of this approach is advocating the development of positive group identity. This is accomplished by adapting existing school programs to build bridges between societal institutions and minorities, which, it is hoped, will provide these groups opportunities for social mobility and achievement.

Second, the "Human Relations" approach is designed to encourage students from different backgrounds to understand and appreciate cultural differences. Advocates believe improved relations can be achieved by facilitating more communications between people of different cultural backgrounds.

The third approach, "Single Group Studies," can be characterized as a pedagogical orientation that uses lessons to focus on cultural experiences of one single gender or ethnic group. The primary aim of this type of ethnic education is to foster acceptance, appreciation, and an understanding of cultural diversity in our society. Practitioners emphasize prescription and application over goals and theory to achieve their aims.

Fourth, the "Multicultural Education" approach is the perspective that much of the current school reform movement is centered upon; it appears to be the most widely accepted form of multicultural education. The primary aims of this approach are the following: 1) valuation of cultural diversity; 2) respect for human rights and for cultural diversity; 3) tolerance for alternate lifestyles; 4) advocacy for social justice and equal

opportunity for all; 5) equitable distribution of power among the membership of all ethnic groups.

Sleeter and Grant (1987:431) have observed that the advocates of this approach, in their writings, are interested in addressing a wide-range of issues, which include language, culture, social stratification, and so forth. The issues that receive the most attention are: "institutional racism in society and schools, unequal power relationships among racial groups, and economic stratification and social class." To address the question of inequity, advocates believe it is necessary to understand the importance of race and ethnicity. Despite the shared consensus regarding the goals of "multicultural education," however, the development of curriculum and instruction is in a dismal state and the instructional process has been significantly overlooked in the literature (Ibid:435).

The final multicultural education approach, "Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist" (EMSC), which places an emphasis on social action, is an outgrowth of the "multicultural education" approach discussed above (Sleeter and Grant 1987:434-5). Advocates of the EMSC approach characterized it as "an approach to education that prepares young people to take social action against social structural inequality", which, it is hoped, will reduce racism and construct a society that is more socially just. To achieve these goals, teacher educators and educators have to address two considerations. First, students need to develop a better understanding of the causes of oppression and inequality, and how to address or eliminate these social afflictions. They argue that "Students should learn to use power for collective betterment, rather than learning mainly obedience" (Sleeter and Grant 1987:435). Second, educators need to change their teaching practices in ways that will make classrooms more democratic.

Even though the EMSC approach is related to "multicultural education," it is less developed than the latter approach; rather than concentrating on the goals of incorporating social action, advocates spend more energy criticizing "multicultural education." Yet despite an interest in social action, there has been little treatment of the question of

curriculum and instruction in the literature; therefore, practice and application in this approach are dismally developed, as well (Sleeter and Grant 1987:436).

In this chapter, I have tried to demonstrate how the national discourse of multicultural education is marginalized within the field of teacher education. Multicultural education has a long history in education, but the current discourse has only recently begun, incorporating larger issues like the transformation of the institutions themselves. Despite all the recent change, there are five primary approaches to multicultural education (Sleeter and Grant 1987). It is the "multicultural education" approach that characterizes the current reform movement. In this thesis, I will attempt to determine which approach to multicultural education is the most commonly used by teacher educators in MSU's education program. In the following chapter, I will survey the setting where teacher educators work.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND THE RESEARCH SETTING

In this chapter, I will discuss the research methodology employed in this thesis, and I will address how recent organizational change has transformed the college's mission toward multicultural education. This will involve identifying and surveying the key beliefs held by teacher educators regarding their intellectual and professional environment, and how they believe the changes have effected their research and educational practice.

Selection of Participants and Field Research

In this section, I will discuss the methodology employed in this study. Specifically, I will discuss why MSU's College of Education was chosen as the research site; how the research participants were chosen; the development of data gathering methods; and the methods used in data analysis.

Since the College of Education's teacher preparation program has publicly committed to incorporating multicultural education into the curriculum, Michigan State University's (MSU) was chosen as the research site (see MSU College of Education 1988). The decision for choosing this program was strongly influenced by the national ranking of the college, which is ranked seventh in the nation among peer programs (U.S. News & World Reports 1995); I believe the institutional course charted by MSU regarding multicultural education is likely to influence the direction of other teacher education programs across the nation.

By documenting the work of teacher educators at MSU, this may provide an

opportunity for gauging the future direction of the multicultural education discourse, as documented by this local example. The findings in this study should prove valuable for teacher educators who are interested in understanding the dynamics of social change associated with the implementation of multicultural education, and how it might impact their own institution.

My task was to interview individuals who are currently researching and teaching about multicultural education. The participants were selected in consultation with Douglas Campbell, a teacher educator in the Department of Teacher Education, and a member of my graduate guidance committee. He furnished a list of 31 individuals who expressed an interest in multicultural education, ranging from professors to graduate students; these individuals have taught introductory multicultural education courses for undergraduate education students.

To limit the potential bias of the list, I held informal discussions with two faculty members from the teacher education program, to gather additional input regarding potential interview candidates. Following these procedures a total of 22 names were collected. By collecting my candidate list in this manner, I believe I was able to create a reasonably unbiased pool of interview candidates, from which to make my selection. The final method employed in selecting research candidates was participant referral; this procedure was added in order to obtain additional names and to periodically check the validity of the candidate list.

The initial contact with participants was made by a letter; I introduced myself and announced my interest in seeking teacher educators to interview, to discuss their views on the practice of multicultural education, the concept of culture, and the discipline of anthropology. If an individual responded positively to my solicitation, I would contact him or her by the medium of their choosing (telephone or electronic mail) to arrange an interview. In most cases, the teacher educators that I solicited expressed an interest in my research, and most agreed to be interviewed. In a few cases, participants who showed an

interest in my topic were unable to schedule an interview, due to time constraints.

After a series of informal talks regarding multicultural education with teacher educators, I developed an interest to explore further this issue; subsequently, I decided to pursue this project, assessing how teacher educators define multicultural education, the culture concept, and perceive the discipline of anthropology in their work. The original problem under investigation envisioned conducting a comparative study of how multicultural education is practiced in one faculty team in the program (see team system discussion below); this team was thought to have a higher proportion of teacher educators interested in multicultural education. Through a later series of discussions with teacher educators, this was determined to be a false assumption. Consequently, the decision was made to expand the research focus, to survey teacher educators in each of the three teams.

To collect data for this study, I used the ethnographic method, which is the traditional anthropological procedure for data gathering. However, my use of ethnography in this study was not in the traditional anthropological sense, since the participants (teacher educators) that I interviewed do not reside in a single, naturally existing community with a shared identity; rather, teacher educators are members of a complex society, and reside in a community of their own choosing, and generally only associate with colleagues in their shared professional setting--Michigan State University.

I decided to interview teacher educators who are currently teaching and researching about multicultural education. Data collection lasted from the Summer through the Fall of 1994. A total of eight women and four men were interviewed. The ethnic breakdown of the participants is as follows: 8 Euro-Americans, 3 African Americans, and 1 Hispanic. In every case, these individuals have employment as teacher educators in the College of Education; ten participants are affiliated with the Department of Teacher Education, while two individuals are associated with the Department of Counseling Education, Psychology, and Special Education.

The typical interview lasted for approximately two hours, and focused on the question

of how the participant practices multicultural education. Each interview was tape-recorded and no participant refused my request. The questionnaire was formulated to ascertain how teacher educators theorize and practice multicultural education. It was divided into five areas, which included the following topics: 1) biographical data, 2) definitions of multicultural education, 3) views on culture and ethnicity, 4) multicultural education and the curriculum, and 5) anthropological perspectives on diversity and multicultural education.

The original protocol contained sixteen questions; but it was subsequently modified after the initial pilot study, which comprised the first three interviews. After analyzing the responses from the pilot study, the protocol was revised; irrelevant questions were removed and more focused questions were added. The revised protocol (See Appendix A) contained seventeen questions and was used in the nine remaining interviews.

On recommendation from my graduate guidance committee, a total of eight interviews were transcribed. This decision was made since it was believed that eight interviews would provide a reasonable sample of opinion among the participants interviewed. The interviews chosen for transcription were selected only after a review of my field notes and an audio replay of each interview to determine its suitability for transcription. Each participant was assigned a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality.

After each interview was transcribed, a narrative report was written to summarize the positions taken by each teacher educator on each of the questions. Upon the completion of the narrative reports, I attempted to assess the major issues that repeatedly reoccurred; on this basis, I determined the topics that I would address in this study. Specifically, 1) how do they define the intellectual currency of their practice; 2) who are the prospective teachers that will be prepared; 3) what multicultural education approaches are used by teacher educators; and 4) what are the constraints that teacher educators encounter in their practice.

To address these questions, I will address the following themes: how teacher

educators perceive the work of their colleagues (Chapter 3); the characteristics of the typical prospective teacher in the program (Chapter 4); the intellectual currency used by teacher educators in the program (Chapter 5); the approaches to multicultural education and the concepts of culture used by individual practitioners (Chapter 6-7) (in these chapters, the teacher educators consulted have been assigned pseudonyms to maintain their confidentiality.); and finally, the constraints that teacher educators encounter in their practice (Chapter 8).

Overview

Given the nature of the academic enterprise, the fostering of intellectual ideas, the most noteworthy characteristic distinguishable among the practitioners involved in multicultural education is the sheer multiplicity of perspectives on multiculturalism and diversity. A female teacher educator explained,

> We have one program within our college that attends to several principles. I mean they [teacher educators] are looking at ways in which our students can teach and learn challenging subject matter. For example, we are very much interested in pedagogical content and knowledge or ways in which the subject matter and the pedagogy come together in its more powerful forms. We are very much interested in having this available and offer it to every child. We are interested in our own students becoming lifelong learners. I mean those are sort of some of the kinds of themes that we attend to across the teams. Now, how we attend to them is going to vary because each of us is an individual, and when we come together, we make these unique couplings.

There are a variety of attributes that make up the individuals involved in multicultural education, in the teacher education program; they account for the multiplicity of perspectives, beliefs, and approaches to the issue. The teacher educators, within the college, come from various socioeconomic, ethnic, gender, cultural, regional, and religious backgrounds. Yet most tend to be Euro-American, professional, and middle class. Added to this milieu are the various academic disciplines and intellectual specialties that are

claimed, which further adds to the diversity.

Since the publication of the College of Education's *Report of the Task Force for Reform of Teacher Education at Michigan State University* in September 1988, the college has undergone a series of structural and organizational changes designed to reform the teacher education program. In this report, a number of goals were identified as necessary for achieving the desired reforms. My discussion will only focus on factors relevant to the diversity and multicultural education curriculum reforms.

Educational Reform

An important goal of the document centered on the development and expansion of a viable multiculturalism component in the teacher education program at MSU. According to the report, "Our program should inculcate a deep commitment to equitable access for all children to valuable, empowering knowledge. Furthermore, our graduates should be equipped to ensure that all their students achieve this high standard of learning" (p. 8). A second statement says, "The professional studies program should assure the development of the teacher candidates' ability to promote equity and social justice in their classrooms and schools" (p. 18). These pronouncements are the basic guidelines for teacher educators in the newly expanded multicultural education component of the teacher education program.

Before the reforms of the early 1990s, the teacher education program was organized into one "standard program" (a series of course requirements that students fulfilled), which enrolled the majority of students, and four alternative curriculum tracks that specialized in various professional and pedagogical issues relevant to teaching. The alternate tracks were designed to provide a select group of preservice teachers with more thematically focused preparation in a particular area of teaching. Many in the faculty who shared similar interests were placed in the alternative tracks; this arrangement resulted in the construction of learning communities for both faculty and students, which provided a degree of intellectual support and encouragement within each group. Teacher educators, who were

interested in diversity and equity issues, were placed in the "heterogeneous classrooms" or the "learning community" tracks.

Team System

Through my discussions with several teacher educators, I have been able to piece together the details of the transition from the learning communities to the teams. An important element of the current system has been the development of three college-wide faculty teams. Originally, each team drew its leadership, intellectual inspiration, and faculty from the aforementioned alternative programs. The purpose of the faculty teams was to create learning communities of individuals, who are interested in working in the same geographical area (e.g., Flint, Michigan), and to spread the faculty's expertise across the program, so that the entire teacher education program can benefit from their knowledge.

Despite the implementation of the team system, there are mixed feelings among the teacher educators that I consulted as to whether the new organizational arrangement is a successful alternative to the learning communities. The comments of one female teacher educator, I believe, capture the current state of the team system. She said,

> Currently, there is no intellectual difference among the three teams. We have three teams because we wanted to find a way to develop the student and faculty cohorts. We wanted to build on the strengths of the alternative programs. One of the strengths was the fact that students went through as a cohort, and I think another strength was that faculty who taught in the program knew one another and they were all working together toward the same goal. So that in part is what we tried to do with the teams. The teams originally came together based on the geographical location of our affiliated school districts. Some faculty prior to this transition had been working in Flint, East Lansing, and so forth. And then people elected to join a team by virtue of what districts were represented. Now we have extended from that initial go around. That is initially how the faculty teams came together.

The chief concern expressed by two teacher educators, who are displeased with the team system, is that each team has failed to produce an educational mission statement, which they believe has weakened the commitment to the field; this concern is coupled with the perceived negative impact of the break up of the learning communities, such as

"heterogeneous classrooms," which provided academic support for teacher educators involved in multicultural education--no such support is now available. For example, one female teacher educator expressed the feeling that the commitment to multicultural education, within the college, has weakened since the implementation of the teams. According to her, in the previous alternative track program most of the faculty involved in multicultural education, diversity, and equity issues were located in the heterogeneous classrooms track. Currently, they are now split up among the teams, with two or three teacher educators who are interested in these issues out of about thirty persons in each team. She indicated that there is a sense that they are now a minority voice within the college, and in each of the respective teams. She said,

> What they have done is deliberately try to sprinkle people across teams. So that Lisa is in team three, I am in team one, Carrie Harper is in team one, Lauri Gellasch is in team two, Michelle Hillis is in team two. So they were trying, I think, to infuse the idea somewhere, so that all teams would benefit from hearing it. But what has happened is that those two or three little voices in this pool of thirty people get drowned out.

She felt the waning commitment to multicultural education has resulted in increased competition with other educational issues for scarce faculty time and resources, without the benefits of a centralized learning community, which in the past provided a locus of support and encouragement among teacher educators. A second female teacher educator, who believes the teams have had more of a negative impact on multicultural education than positive, said, "When the learning communities were in existence, the college was better able to offer a multiculturalism perspective than the current faculty teams."

However, not all teacher educators interviewed agree with the above assessment of multicultural education in the college; three teacher educators believe that the implementation of the team system has further centered and strengthened multicultural education, and has in no way weakened it, given that it was already considered an important issue in the program. A male professor indicated that the team system is central

to multicultural education, and that multicultural education is at the core of the program, with people from each team working on this problem. Unlike many other programs across the nation, multicultural education is not ancillary or an afterthought. He said,

> I mean it is not just an important issue: it is the issue. That is why despite all the problems we have had with this new program; despite the sort of cloud of resource shortages that is pretty frightening; despite all that stuff, I still think this program is one of the most promising in the country because of that commitment and because we don't think we have a formula. It is the kind of issue that you have to work out on a day by day basis and every faculty member has to be involved in this. And it has to consciously be a part of not just what is going on in courses with students, but it has to be going on with faculty as they work on these courses together.

At least two of the interviewed teacher educators believe it is unfair to judge the team system harshly, since they were only recently implemented, in Fall 1993. They believe that too little time has passed for the program to have worked out the normal organizational bugs associated with such a momentous undertaking. In particular, one female teacher educator commented that too much time has been devoted to comparing it with the previous program, which had ten years worth of experience behind it. She explained,

> What I am saying is it is very difficult to develop and run a program at the same time. We have one year behind us. I know that next year we will be a lot stronger than we were last year. It is growing pains. Sometimes there are comparisons done between the old program, but we are just now starting our second year in the new program and we are comparing it to the old programs which were at least ten years old.

They also expressed the belief that the current period is a transitional phase that will be followed by a more established and organized team system--each team having its own mission statement. One female teacher educator indicated that she is confident that each team will develop a mission statement, provided that people work toward that goal. She explained, "I think so, over time. It is hard to say what that will be. But I would think that a group of people who work together over time will develop some kind of intellectual coherence."

Diversity and Multiculturalism in the Program

Similar to the national trend (Grant and Miller 1992 and Zeichner 1992), the actual numbers of teacher educators involved with multicultural education teaching and research in the teacher education program at MSU are quite small; they represent a minority within the college. One female teacher educator commented on her professional minority status. She said, "I think all faculty members would emphasize obviously that it is important. But when you give them rating sheets that have diversity as a choice and ask them to pick their top three interests, it wouldn't come up very often." In assessing the perception of other teacher educators interviewed regarding this issue, most observed that the majority of their colleagues would agree that multicultural education is a positive and necessary pursuit for the college to undertake; but many noted that not everyone has taken a personal interest in the topic, given the wide range of pursuits that fall under education.

Among teacher educators involved with multicultural education, there are mixed views on how supportive their colleagues are to their work. While most acknowledge that only a minority of the faculty is involved in this type of research, there is disagreement over the perceived level of support among their colleagues. One female teacher educator expressed concern that there is little interest in doing multicultural education beyond the level of discussion and theory; there is little desire for preparing preservice teachers for urban education, where educators will work with diverse children. Rather, the program's energies are concentrated on what she labeled suburban education; i.e., preparing preservice teachers to work in homogenous settings with people like themselves.

During the interview, she discussed a multicultural education typology (see Sleeter and Grant 1987) to situate her work and the work of her colleagues. For the purpose of understanding her perspective, she interpreted this typology as having five levels; with level one through four being theory and level five as application. She described the work of her

colleagues as falling within the first four levels, while her own work is characteristic of level five. She explained,

> So people might stay in theory that works, but I have thirty kids in my class what do I do for all of them? You know that tug back to being fair and being manageable, viewing the constraints as being immovable that may be physical or mental. So I have talked to several people; they are exhausted after I talk with them because we have a healthy banter--a few banters with people here, who keep continually saying, "yeah, you will never get published with that stuff. Or, teachers just won't listen to you because you are so far removed from where they are." I used to worry about it and now I don't worry about it, thinking their must be plenty of work that needs to be done and plenty of people who feel comfortable working within the one to four range. [five tier model for practicing multicultural education in (Sleeter and Grant 1987)] Those teachers working in the one to four range will get some help. What I am worried about is the teachers who are at the four and half and are ready to do this blast of true multicultural enactment, and nobody is talking to them. My colleagues presume teachers aren't ready for the fifth level and they are working vigorously at the beginning of the continuum. . . . There are people here talking about the fifth position, but they are not practicing the fifth position. We are preparing teachers for the mainstream.

Despite this teacher educator's grim perspective on the state of multicultural education in the teacher education program, it appears a majority of teacher educators that I consulted do not share this assessment. In fact, ten teacher educators expressed the opinion that while their colleagues may not be directly interested in those issues, they are supportive of the goals of multicultural education. The opinion of one female teacher educator that captures this sentiment is quoted below; she explained, "I am primarily more involved with the development of case studies and interviewing and these kinds of things with my students. But I think the themes and the bottom-line issues of equity, most of my colleagues would be very supportive of."

Two teacher educators expressed critical views of how their colleagues actually go about doing multicultural education. The chief criticism centered on a concern that their colleagues were primarily interested in fixing attitudes. A male professor explained,

> There is also a kind of orientation in the program that I am not fond of. That is, it is only a tendency, but it is a strong tendency to think of teacher preparation as primarily a process of attitude adjustment and what we are trying to do is

> adjust the attitudes of preservice teachers so that they will be able to think that diversity is good and that inequality is bad and that a good teacher is one who can function successfully in a diversified setting and treat everyone equitable and believe that all kids can learn equally. It is not an unworthy goal, my concern is the program is more concerned about changing attitudes than changing practices. The key is to prepare people with the kinds of technical, subject matter, and analytical skills that will allow them to carry out very complex tasks like teaching and in the course of doing that, think about issues of inequality and diversity in intelligent ways and incorporate that into the logic. That is a much bigger and more involved task than simply convincing people that diversity is good and inequality is bad. I am concerned sometimes that students think that is all they should be getting out of the program; and that is all they are getting out of it.

A second male teacher educator expressed a similar concern that the teacher preparation program is mainly concerned with fixing the attitudes of preservice teachers. He said, "Are we just using them [examples of cultural diversity] to just fix an attitude. Like, 'See people are culturally different so you better be sensitive.' It is a threat."

Minority Perspectives on Multicultural Education

A topic that dominated several interviews with minority teacher educators was the level of diversity among the faculty within the teacher preparation program; specifically, minority teacher educators are concerned that, for the most part, mainstream, Euro-American, and middle-class teacher educators may not have the appropriate experiences and training to sensitize their own students to issues of cultural diversity.

There is a concern among minority teacher educators that since many of their colleagues have not been subjected to racism and discrimination, which many minorities take for granted as a normal part of their existence, they may not be able to understand fully these issues beyond an intellectual level. A female teacher educator, who expressed frustration over her colleague's ignorance on this question, explained, "I am not upset anymore. I was. But now I realize a lot of people who teach here are from the Midwest, so they themselves can't draw upon their own experiences beyond the cognitive level."

There is one minority female teacher educator, who is a literacy specialist, that favors using the "phonics" or skills approach over the "whole" language method in teaching African American children to read. She believes that these children who learn to read through the skills approach are more successful than with the whole language method. She faults her Euro-American colleagues' lack of first hand experience with diversity in their endorsement of the latter perspective. She indicated that her colleagues may be making incorrect judgments about situations and people since they may not understand the intricacies of a situation, because they have not been exposed to diverse people and environments. She explained,

> Like I was in a discussion just yesterday and people wanted to do whole language. And I said that whole language is fine, but you also have to teach them skills, which is part of whole language. Whole language is a method of how you teach reading, which long ago used skill and drill. They are making the assumption that our kids come to school with a certain level of education. But when some kids come to school they don't have a clue or a set of alphabetic principles, which means they don't know how to read the letters in front of them. So how can you sit there and read a book, when you can't even enunciate syllables in a word?

She indicated that when she discusses her feelings with Euro-American teacher educators they give her strange looks. She responded, ". . . which to me means don't hire diversity, if you don't want to listen to it."

Among the minority teacher educators that I interviewed, it is not universally held that Euro-American teacher educators are at a disadvantage in their practice as scholars and educators; given the proper preparation and a commitment to helping disadvantaged children, many believe that Euro-American teacher educators would be effective scholars and educators of multicultural education. A female teacher educator indicated that even though her Euro-American colleagues have not experienced inequity themselves, as she personally has, they still are excellent teachers in helping prepare preservice teachers to cope with cultural diversity. She said, "Experiencing discrimination isn't a requirement for teaching about it."

In this chapter, I have discussed the methodology used for data gathering, and surveyed various views about the importance of multicultural education in the teacher preparation program. The recent implementation of the team system has been received with mixed feelings by many of the teacher educators that I consulted, regarding how it effects their practice. Even though a minority of the faculty are actually involved in multicultural education, it is generally positively perceived by fellow colleagues in the program. Among minority teacher educators, there appears to be mixed feelings as to whether their Euro-American colleagues are adequately conditioned to prepare prospective teachers to work in multicultural settings.

Chapter 4

THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER

In this chapter, I will examine beliefs and attitudes held by teacher educators about prospective teachers, and the current and near-term employment opportunities for preservice teachers. In particular, I will look at teacher educators views and impressions concerning their preservice teachers' ability to understand cultural issues, and how they might evaluate their students' understanding of such knowledge.

Teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education believe they are responsible for providing preservice teachers with the necessary tools to operate in classrooms with culturally diverse students. Teacher educators, through their own experiences as instructors, have come to an understanding of whom they will be instructing and what limitations their students face in the learning process. More importantly, through previous instructional experience, they have come to the realize that many of their students lack an understanding of the culture concept and how it is applied to their everyday life, let alone to their profession. The task of the teacher educator, before attempting to do anything else, is to convince their students that they have culture and are, in fact, cultural beings.

The Preservice Teacher: Who Is She?

Nationally, Ladson-Billings (1992b:107) suggests that the typical preservice teacher is generally a Euro-American female from a small town or suburban community with little intercultural or interracial experience; she will be called upon to fill the vacancies in the

urban school districts. Zeichner (1992:1-4) argues that the typical preservice teacher desires to teach children who are culturally like herself and in a community not unlike her own community of origins. However, she will be asked to teach students of color who will have very different cultural backgrounds and life experiences than her own, in an urban setting.

When examining the demographic data of prospective teachers in MSU's College of Education, the trend is similar to the national picture. In Fall 1995, there were 1,023 undergraduate students enrolled who declared either elementary education, secondary education, or K-12 education as their primary majors. When taking this student cohort and breaking down the numbers by ethnicity, there were 916 whites or Euro-Americans, which accounts for approximately 90% of the total student enrollment, and 107 minority (i.e., African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific American) students in the teacher preparation program (MSU Office of the Registrar 1995). Clearly, Euro-Americans are in the majority in the program. When looking at the gender breakdown of the student cohort, there, again, is also a similarity to the national trend. There are 738 females enrolled compared to only 285 males (MSU Office of the Registrar 1995); thus, 72% of the primary education majors are female, which is clearly a majority.

Many of the teacher educators that I interviewed strongly agree with Ladson-Billings and Zeichner's characterization of prospective teachers, regarding their subjectivity and professional standing. It appears they generally perceive the majority of prospective teachers in the program as fitting this characterization; they are overwhelmingly Euro-American, female, middle class, suburban or rural in origin, and the first in their family to go to college. A female teacher educator, whose statement best captures this commonly accepted belief, explained, "The portion is humongously white, female, rural or suburban, like 90% of all preservice teachers in the country. Our students here are no different. Our students might be even more white, female, rural or suburban because of where we are located."

It is noteworthy that the teacher educators I interviewed found other characteristics of their students worthy of mention. For instance, a majority of teacher educators characterized the age of the average preservice teacher as being very young. A male teacher educator explained, "When I was teaching the introductory courses for elementary teachers they were almost all females; they were almost all white; and, they were almost all young. They were almost all 19 or 20 years old. Occasionally, you would have an older women, somebody in their 30's."

Another interesting offering was a contrast in the level of diversity found among students enrolled in the different educational tracks. The students in the elementary education program tend to more homogenous, with the majority being female, young, and Euro-American, than students in the secondary education program. A male professor characterized the type of student who studies elementary education; he explained, "Well, certainly the undergraduates are predominantly young white women. That is who goes into elementary ed." It appears that secondary education students in the teacher preparation program tend to have more diversity in gender, but are still predominantly female. One male teacher educator commented, "I have been teaching secondary students and they tend to be gender wise, more diverse. I tend to get more men at the secondary level."

The majority of teacher educators consulted agree with Ladson-Billings and Zeichner's assessment of the current and near-term job market for educators trained in the U.S. and in Michigan. A male teacher educator explained,

> I mean that is one reason why I think we have a responsibility to prepare them to teach in a variety of situations because Michigan is a major exporter of teachers since there are just not jobs here for all the teachers we have. I mean Eastern [Michigan University] produces: what 1,800 to 2,000 teachers every year. That is an incredible number of teachers. So, what we got is this huge surplus of teachers, so, you know, where they are more likely to get a job is where the country is expanding and it is expanding in those places where there is the most diversity. South Florida, Southern California. I mean you just start looking around at the growth places and the growth places are the ones that are most diverse. I mean it is interesting--

> somebody just came back from Miami--and they were saying that they were in a conference in Miami, and they were in the conference hotels and they were constantly frustrated because they didn't speak Spanish.

Yet not all agree with this pessimistic assessment concerning future employment prospects for teachers. One male teacher educator, in particular, explained, "That is the ideology of this particular college and I don't think that it is quite true. Students want to return to the same kind of school that they were taught in and I think that is quite fairly likely."

He believes that this ideological framework concerning the future of preservice teachers serves as a method to promote the college's views on education. He explained,

> I think they hope that our program here would be in fact preparing small town and suburban white middle class students to rush out and make them teach in Flint and Detroit. That is where the key problems are and this programs tries to orient toward those problems, thinking that their is a real possibility in courses like mine that they will have the exact opposite effect and say: "No way am I going to do that. That is a terrible situation and I really feel sorry for those kids and I am not sure what I can do for them. It is too big of a problem; it is too difficult. I will do what I can . . . ."

He indicated that racist reasons are not the motivating factor that propels educators to desire to return home at the beginning of their teaching careers. He explained,

> It is easier to teach students who are like yourself. It is less stressful and it is less problematic. It is nice to teach students who are more likely to be successful and it will make you feel more competent as a teacher. It is also easier to be successful when you are dealing with people you know.

It appears that three other teacher educators that I interviewed, while they agree that their preservice teachers do not desire to teach in urban settings with students of color, they also view this set of circumstances negatively. A female teacher educator reported, "About half of our students come from the suburbs of Detroit, but they don't plan on teaching in Detroit." Given the homogenization of the teaching force, another female teacher educator observed that with fewer minorities entering teaching, the current batch of preservice teachers will have no choice but to teach in these areas, since jobs in suburban and rural areas may be hard to find. She suggested that the number of minorities

entering teaching will be few, at least through the year 2000, while the numbers of minority students in the educational system will be increasing.

Even though many preservice teachers may desire to return to home, the realities of the job market could prevent them. A male teacher educator explains that this is not an uncommon feeling among preservice teachers. He pointed out that it is the responsibility of teacher educators to train their students to work in a variety of multicultural settings, since many of them will have to relocate. He said, "Their chances of getting a job in their home towns is very slim. They should consider getting a job in Miami, Texas, or Southern California."

Culture Is What Other People Have

During my interviews with teacher educators, I heard professors repeatedly voice the belief that the majority of their preservice teachers lack knowledge about themselves as cultural beings, or that they have had little experience in interacting with individuals unlike themselves. A female teacher educator explained that the current cohort of preservice teachers grew up in settings where they have had little experience with a wide range of children, nor have they had friends or classmates that are racially diverse. A second female teacher educator explained,

> So what I am saying is that most of the students that I have encountered in class here come from rather sheltered environments in a certain sense. In their own communities they pretty much have interacted with people who pretty much look, and in certain kinds of ways, think like they do.

For another female teacher educator, she finds that the majority of her students have very little cultural awareness or experience. She commented,

> Because what we are doing in a sense is preparing teachers, who are going to work in diverse schools in a very diverse society, they themselves don't come from particularly diverse corners of our society; that is, they grew up in settings where they haven't had a lot of experience with a wide range of children. For example, to the extent that they

> are white, they have probably known extremely few minority children That is, they didn't have friends who were racial minorities, they weren't in the classrooms. But even the racial minority students didn't necessarily come from multicultural contexts, so their experience with sort of a multiple range of people isn't very great.

Many of the teacher educators I interviewed have determined that their preservice teachers have very little understanding of themselves as cultural beings, or of the culture concept. One male teacher educator expressed the opinion that his Euro-American students view themselves to be culturally neutral. He recounted a discussion with a female student who refused to believe that she had culture,

> I actually had one of my students say that in class to me one time. We were having a discussion about an article that talked about culture and power. It was written by an African American women. And, I asked the student what do you think about the argument that the woman is making. She said that she is really uncomfortable with this. I said, "Why?" She said, "Well, because I really don't have a culture." Well, then I said, "What do you mean you don't have a culture?" She said, "Well, you know, I don't really have any culture." She was a very smart white women who grew up in a farming family somewhere up north, around Gaylord. And, her perception was that everyone had a culture, but she didn't have a culture.

To many preservice teachers, only ethnic minorities have culture, not Euro-Americans. A female teacher educator indicated that she found it interesting that many of her students, who are juniors and seniors, were just now learning that their values and world views are, in fact, a product of their upbringing. She said, "I think the students sometimes feel that they were just sort of beamed here. Beamed here in full-force with all the values, etc." A male teacher educator commented that many of his Euro-American students believe that they do not have culture; minorities are the ones with culture. He said, "That is back to the point I said about exoticizing others. It is other people that have culture, you know, and it is exotic to have a culture, but I don't have a culture. White middle class people who come from farms don't have a culture."

A problem that many teacher educators face that challenges their work is that some well meaning preservice teachers, who genuinely want to go into teaching, are interested in doing "missionary" work to help less fortunate children. As a group of students, they tend

to prove problematic for teacher educators, since they are less receptive to the message they are trying to get across to them. A female teacher educator observed, "They really want to go into teaching because they want to work, but they are naive about it." This translates into a strong desire to help children less fortunate than themselves, but they tend not to know how to do that, which she believes translates into a patronizing attitude toward diverse students.

One minority teacher educator expressed a concern that her Euro-American preservice teachers, due to their majority status, have never had the minority experience; thus, putting them at a disadvantage to developing an empathy and understanding of cultural issues, since they lack direct experience with many of these issues. She noted, "It is really hard to feel passionate about something if it doesn't come up in your daily life." Even though some minority teacher educators believe that Euro-American preservice teachers cannot bring in personal, subjective experiences to relate to their students of color, they can bring in a cognitive understanding to the issues of cultural diversity.

Educating Prospective Teachers

Overcoming ignorance about culture and cultural diversity is viewed as one of the most important issues that has to be confronted in their work, since many believe these future teachers will be working in diverse settings. A female teacher educator said, "Yet, that is a central thing that they [preservice teachers] are going to be doing [interacting with diverse children] as teachers working in multicultural contexts, and in a society in of itself that is multicultural."

A male teacher educator expressed the need for preservice teachers to develop a sense of awareness, be it their cultural system, belief system, or value system, so that they can be more effective teachers. To illustrate the complexity of educating prospective teachers about cultural identity, he talked about an experience he had when he first came to Michigan. He said,

> They just don't see it. They don't recognize that the stuff they do is just as exotic in some ways, you know. When I first moved here from Alaska and we were living in Cherry Lane, and we went out bike riding on a Saturday morning and we came across at 9 AM in the morning all these vans parked outside, and people had their grills out, and they were all dressed in green: they were tailgating. I was ga ga. I had never seen anything like this before and I was sorry that I didn't have a video camera; I would have loved to tape that and send it to my Eskimo friends because they would have thought that it was the weirdest ritual they had ever seen in their life. I mean it is; stop and think about it. Here are people--all dressed in green--with green drinks, and everyone is getting drunk at 9 AM in the morning. They set their grills up in a field, and all of this is a prelude to a game! You know, then they are going to go in. . . . Guys with lots of pads on and stuff are going to go run together around this ball for a couple of hours. . . . But I mean that is an example of something that people . . . my student's would not call that a cultural phenomena. Do you see what I am saying? She wouldn't see that as a cultural phenomena because she is so accustomed to it.

The same teacher educator stated, "How do you do that? How do you get people to see that they are in water?"

A second male teacher educator observed that at times it can be very difficult to convince Euro-American prospective teachers that they do have a cultural identity. He explained,

> I think it would be wonderful if students had a real understanding of cultures in a plural sense. In particular, it would be wonderful if they could see themselves as having culture as opposed of thinking of culture as only existing in people who are different than themselves. I had a very unsuccessful experience last year trying to get a group of students to think about whiteness as an ethnicity. And it was impossible for them to conceive that, since ethnicity is the other. They thought whiteness doesn't exist; that it is generic; it is invisible. It is very difficult to break through that mindset that students have.

In this chapter, I examined how teacher educators perceive the attributes of the preservice teachers that they are preparing to become educators. This survey included a discussion of how the teacher educators understand the economic reality of job availability for educators, which appears to be a central consideration in their educational philosophy. In the following chapter, I will examine the intellectual and analytical tools used by teacher educators to prepare prospective teachers to work in diverse settings.

Chapter 5

CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS: THE INTELLECTUAL CURRENCY

In this chapter, I will examine how teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education conceive, define, and operationalize the intellectual concepts that form the foundations of their practice. I will look at how the polemical nature of the intellectual concepts affects their viewpoints on issues, the fluid nature of the concepts, and the general intellectual framework that teacher educators use to understand and apply their intellectual currency.

Teacher educators are a product of their own socialization and education. Their life stages have played an important role in shaping how these individuals view the intellectual landscape in which they inhabit. Teacher educators work in an intellectual and professional environment where it is absolutely necessary to develop a feasible intellectual perspective that provides a framework in which research problems are examined and studied. Consequently, there are numerous concepts and definitions that have been advanced by teacher educators, which have been constructed to assist in the selection, identification, and examination of the issues that make up their intellectual enterprise.

In this early period of the intellectual enterprise, as many teacher educators believe the current period represents, there are large numbers of definitions available for practitioners to choose from, as the profession attempts to discard concepts that fail to be useful. It can be argued that there are virtually as many viewpoints on conceiving and defining the terminology, and how they are used, as there are practitioners. These circumstances, in part, are due to the nature of the academic enterprise, which is concerned with the production of competent researchers and the construction and manufacturing of

knowledge.

Added to this milieu are the intellectual traditions of the various disciplinary backgrounds of individual practitioners, which plays an important role in how scholars and researchers frame questions. Consequently, scholars find themselves in a very complex environment in which they have to cope. With the recent implementation of the team system, many teacher educators feel confused and frustrated over what concepts and meanings are most appropriate for their own work; many believe they are grappling with several different concepts in their practice.

Despite the chaotic nature of the intellectual discourse, there are generalizations that can be made about the work of teacher educators and the intellectual concepts that are used. Teacher educators are interested in both the theoretical and the practical side of the research questions, and there are several intellectual frameworks that are in use, which are used to position the issues. These frameworks, which will be discussed below, provide them with a method for understanding the theoretical issues that underpin their practice; that is, the application of their ideas in the context of the classroom, in the preparation of preservice teachers.

Visions of Multicultural Education and Diversity

Many practitioners expressed the opinion that they are only at the beginning, in their own work, in understanding the issues that make up the multicultural education enterprise. Nationally, there is a belief among teacher educators that there is a long way to go before a satisfactory understanding of many of the issues that make up multicultural education will be achieved (Brown 1992); this belief also appears to be widely held among the teacher educators that I interviewed, who see themselves as trying to discern the issues of multicultural education. One teacher educator commented that the current period can be characterized as a time where most attention is being focused on unpacking the various

issues of multicultural education, and applying theory to practice. He said, "I probably have done as much research in this area as anyone in the country, and yet, it is not easy to move, from what I have learned in my research, over to figuring out what it is that you do with students." He indicated that this question has become a central pursuit of his work.

While the majority of teacher educators I consulted appear optimistic about the future of their profession, there is one female teacher educator who believes that there are no models of multicultural education that are unrefutable in one form or another. She has made the decision to devote much of her research energies to addressing this important issue. She explained,

> This is, I think, if you would substitute multicultural ed. with any other kind of educational reform issue, is a time of great challenge for everyone because we have no models. I mean we have models to learn from but none of the models have been fruitful enough to bear to say that this is the model.

The Multiplicity of Terms: The Problematic Nature of Definitions

In this relatively early period of the multicultural education movement, three teacher educators that I consulted have observed that across the intellectual landscape, there is an overabundance of intellectual concepts available to practitioners, which has left them somewhat confused. A female teacher educator, in expressing her frustration with the lack of clarity among definitions, explained, "I don't quite know what multicultural education is because different people define it in different ways." A second female educator observed that concepts such as diversity have multiple meanings that vary from discipline to discipline. She explained, "Ah, this [defining diversity] is so eclectic among people that there are issues in science education that I never dreamed of."

The multiple definitions represents a challenge for at least two teacher educators in their attempt to understand their colleagues' work, since often times they may be using similar concepts with subtle differences in meaning. This may lead to problems in clearly communicating ideas. One female teacher educator indicated that everyone has their own "set of jargon" that they use in their work. A second female teacher educator described the

intellectual landscape as "a loaded terrain of language." In her own work, she is still "groping" for the best terms that most clearly express her ideas to others in a politically charged environment.

Several teacher educators observed that many of the concepts and definitions are fraught with problems over meaning and are subject to being overused and misused. A male teacher educator indicated that most of his colleagues use the concepts of diversity and multiculturalism interchangeably, and do not understand the difference between the two in most cases. He attributed this condition to the psychological orientation of education. He said,

> I think they pretty much see them interchangeably. I mean if you press the more knowledgeable ones, they will recognize that culture is only one form of diversity. Usually, the two terms are used interchangeably. And the interest is in issues of diversity, I think more. I think there is actually a fear of culture and the inherent sharedness and the potential that you are somehow stereotyping people when you talk about people sharing a culture. Sharing is something of a dirty word in education. It comes out of individual psychology . . . that has always been its tradition. I don't think most people really have a sensitivity toward a notion that a group of people at some level may somehow be similar.

A second male teacher educator observed that his colleagues have a tendency to overemphasize the similarities and differences among people, and fail to devote enough attention to particular subject matter and particular groups of children that preservice teachers will teach. He stated,

> On one level there is too much [multiculturalism] with a focus on similarities and differences and not enough on the particular subjects and the particular groups of kids that are effected. Keep in mind that those kids might be different from the teacher, but that is not the ultimate issue.

Concepts and Critical Views

There are teacher educators within the college that are critical of how they see multicultural education being defined. Even though definitions are fraught with ideational fluidity, there are still discernible characteristics that are observable in the concepts offered by teacher educators in the college. A female minority teacher educator criticized her

colleagues for using a definition of multicultural education that defined it as people of color, excluding Euro-Americans. She indicated that the United States is made up of people coming from a wide range of countries, including peoples of European descent; therefore, Euro-Americans are culturally diverse, too. She explained, "You see I think multicultural education is being defined as people of color, but even white people can be multicultural."

The problem of excluding Euro-Americans is not the only inadequacy observed by minority teacher educators. There is a female minority teacher educator who is critical of her colleagues' definitions, since she believes they only assume an African American population, due to the college's proximity to Detroit, Michigan, which excludes other minority groups. She explained,

> Diversity here assumes an African American population and I think that some of that is valid, given the proximity of the geographical area and the population we are working with, but I think it is very short sighted. There might be individuals in the college at large beyond teacher education, that might have an interest in diversity, such as in special education and diversity or religious diversity, but that doesn't get heard because the most physical and apparent form of diversity is skin color, and the most contrasting skin color is black or African American.

Another belief held by critical teacher educators is that the terms tend to obscure the issues. A male teacher educator indicated that both the concepts of diversity and multicultural education are what he calls "bumper sticker" labels; they highlight the issues, but as they are currently used tend to be content-free. As a result, they shed little light on the issues that he is most concerned about. He said,

> I don't find either term [diversity or multicultural education] to be all that interesting or useful in my line of work. They seem to be code words or almost content free words. The most interesting issues seem to be masked by the terms themselves. . . . I think both terms are ones that when operationalized tend to shut off thought and provide answers, rather than questions. In that sense they tend to become more of a marker of trade and less of a window into something that they are actually exploring. As a teacher, the key thing for me is to try to make these issues problematic and available for analysis and not simply . . . as a banner that you wave, which happens all too often.

> Diversity is presented either as a problem that needs a solution, which doesn't make any sense to me, or as a positive, which simply means celebration. Neither approach provides much help to me. The interesting thing to me is the connection between diversity and inequity. That is diversity is not an educational problem; it becomes an educational problem only when different varieties of social differences among people become the basis for unequal treatment for those people or unequal outcomes for those people. It is the way in which diversity translates into inequality through various social structures that makes the problem interesting. But, that is a very problematic process and there is nothing on that which is simple. In fact, I try to focus it.

The confusion and ambiguity over definitions of diversity and multicultural education has led one female teacher educator to call for a clarification of the specific goals that scholars are aiming to achieve in their practice. She suggested that the various disciplinary approaches of practitioners are, in part, responsible for this lack of clarity. She indicated that if goals can be agreed upon as worthwhile, they have to be both philosophical in nature and grounded in issues of practice. She said,

> Given that diversity can take on so many shapes, that is why I think it is such a loose term that is not productive in the end product, being some kind of educative, ah, reform effort, something in practice. Not that I don't think theory is important, because that is where we start. Because diversity can mean one thing to science educators, which is different to literacy educators, I don't see it in their work, but they probably do; they probably don't see it in our work. . . . Ok, how are we going to have a multicultural education? Let's come up with five goals of multicultural education. Say two are philosophical and three are grounded in issues you see in the classroom. Then, I think, you might get into lots of more arguments, but you would probably get more clarification of what the science guy thinks about what multiculturalism is.

The Construction of Multicultural Education and Diversity

Many of the teacher educators that I interviewed view the concepts of diversity and multicultural education from multiple perspectives. Three teacher educators that I consulted used concepts in their practice other than diversity or multicultural education. I will identify and discuss a few examples.

A female teacher educator described the concepts of diversity and multicultural

education in her own work, which involves a dualistic perspective. The first perspective is that each concept has a geographical component. Diversity, she suggested, is both global and local in nature, while multicultural education is based only in the local context. She explained, "I think of diversity in both the global and local sense. We are part of a world where we really need to know each other because we are becoming so interdependent." The local component of diversity, she indicated, would be the cultural diversity found at MSU. Regarding the concept of multicultural education, she said, "The way I refer to multicultural education is from a local perspective."

The second approach, she described, is that diversity in its most basic form is essentially theory, which represents the theoretical foundations that guide the work of teacher educators. Multicultural education in her work becomes the application of theory (diversity). Together, they become an educational intervention program designed to effect change. While she acknowledged that multicultural education has a theoretical basis, its application is by far its most predominant characteristic in her own work. She explained,

> Well, I think, people could talk about diversity. Multicultural education requires action, going beyond talk. People can intuitively agree that diversity is favorable, and, ah, and the current issue, and so on. So I guess you can pontificate about diversity, and theorize about it, and argue about it. Multicultural education, I see that having that dimension but also some practice, some action, and there has to be a program. There has to be some education in the multicultural education.

A male teacher educator uses the concept of diversity as a descriptive term. He commented, "Diversity to me describes the existing situation that we have in the world. In other words, we have diverse people; we have a diversity in ideas." For this teacher educator, the concept provides a descriptive analysis of the social world we inhabit. He also defines multicultural education as the following, "Multicultural education, on the other hand, I would say it is an attempt to get students of various types to understand what diversity is, and the impact that diversity has on their lives and has on the world in which they live." He also hopes to impart upon his students that diversity should be valued and

not seen as a problem.

A second male teacher educator draws a comparison between diversity and multicultural education in the following way: he simply views diversity as the recognition of diversity among people; within an educational setting, it means discerning the differences among students. For him, multicultural education requires prospective teachers to understand that the culture concept and cultural difference, which is one type of difference, are both central ideas. He believes multicultural education is the following type of practice: "I want to provide people with a knowledge base on what the cultural difference possibilities are and not simply that there are cultural differences."

A female teacher educator indicated that she views the concept of diversity as simply a term that describes difference and variability in humanity--it is an idea that includes more than just cultural difference. To her, multicultural education involves the "explicit infusion of curriculum or educational process with rather explicit attention to different cultures in the curriculum, both teaching about cultures and having the materials and context."

One female teacher educator indicated that she found the concept of diversity to be a more encompassing term than multiculturalism; she said, "I see diversity as a more encompassing term than multiculturalism; diversity incorporates notions of gender and disability." She prefers to use diversity over multiculturalism. Despite her preference, she has found that multiculturalism can have an American focus, encapsulating cultural diversity in the U.S., or an international orientation, which incorporates international examples of diversity. She prefers multiculturalism from an international perspective over the American version. She said,

> I have debates with my colleagues about this because I see multiculturalism from an international perspective. A colleague I teach with says there isn't an international multiculturalism. So I see diversity and multiculturalism in a little different perspective from that. I draw from my intercultural and international backgrounds when I think about multiculturalism.

In this chapter, I have surveyed how the teacher educators that I interviewed define

the intellectual concepts that make up their practice. The most characteristic feature of the local discourse of multicultural education is the multiple definitions available for the notions of culture, multicultural education, and diversity, which has produced much confusion among practitioners. In the following chapter, I will discuss the various approaches to multicultural education and the concepts of culture used by the teacher educators that I interviewed.

Chapter 6

APPROACHES TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND CULTURE

In the previous chapter, I discussed how the teacher educators that I consulted define the concepts that are the central analytical tools in their work. In this chapter, I will examine the intellectual approaches and the concepts of culture that are used by teacher educators to frame the issues, which, are also used as a vehicle for educating preservice teachers.

The individual approach is the vehicle that the individual teacher educator, who is grappling with multiple theoretical and application issues, uses to position the problems and questions of his or her practice; the concept of culture, or some other construct, appears to be the underlying foundation of the individual approach, as I will attempt to demonstrate. By documenting the individual approaches of the teacher educators who were consulted, I will demonstrate how these teacher educators perceive and understand the issues that make up their enterprise.

I will identify the commonalties among the individual approaches and categorize them into larger approach categories based on shared intellectual, theoretical, and methodological themes. I will discuss each of the documented approach categories, by assessing how they are defined, constructed, and put into practice. In examining the categories, I will identify and discuss the following issues: 1) the underlying theoretical assumptions of each category; 2) the goals of each approach; 3) the theoretical and pedagogical framework employed to accomplish the stated goals; and 4) the underlying concept of culture, or another analytical construct, that is used to understand and convey a notion of diversity.

It appears that teacher educators in constructing their individual approach to multicultural education draw upon the intellectual tools and concepts from their disciplines. In addition, the graduate school experience plays an important role in grounding these scholars into the theory and methodology of their respective disciplines. This socialization process proves instrumental in laying the intellectual foundations of their analytical tool kit; it will become the intellectual lens that they bring to bear on the issues that comprise multicultural education. For example, a male professor, who was trained in sociology, uses his disciplinary orientation to frame the problems and questions in his research; he defines multicultural education as an intersection between class differences and educational institutions. A second example is a male teacher educator, who is trained in anthropology. Thus, he takes a decidedly anthropological perspective in his work, which emphasizes cultural factors in the education of at-risk children.

Scholars are a product of their own personal and intellectual socialization; personal subjective experiences of individual scholars play a significant role in molding how they will view the issues that are central to multicultural education. It appears that the individual experiences of a teacher educator become an important tool that can be useful in their work; they provide opportunities for students to gain insight into ethnic relations. Teacher educators often times will use these experiences as learning aids in the classroom, which can be used to help their students understand issues of cultural diversity. For example, the notion of cultural relativism became important for one male teacher educator. He moved to Michigan after spending several years in Alaska, where he conducted research for his doctoral dissertation. Upon his return, he observed that many customs, such as tailgating, which is a commonly practiced ritual at American college football games, baffled him--he had no first hand experience with tailgating. The dissonance, he indicated, was due to being immersed in a cultural lifestyle and rhythm--living in an Eskimo village, in rural Alaska--that significantly differed from his own cultural upbringing, which, for him, made the familiar strange, and the strange familiar.

A second example that spells out the importance of personal experience came much earlier in the life of a female teacher educator; she grew up in the turbulent 1960s during the civil rights movement, in Georgia. She was one of only six black students in an all-white high school, which had just recently become desegregated; her struggle to gain acceptance among her Euro-American peers proved instrumental in developing many of her present-day views on multicultural education. For many teacher educators, it is these types of personal experiences that prove pivotal in shaping their views toward their work.

Individual Approaches to Multicultural Education

A teacher educator's individual approach serves to embody their amassed theoretical knowledge, with an accompanying pedagogy, of multicultural education; this represents a set of beliefs and practices regarding how to educate preservice teachers about issues of cultural diversity. As often is the case, within an approach category, an individual approach will vary in content and form, but shared thematic and practical similarities warrants an individual approach to be classified as part of a larger class of approaches.

I have identified six categories for practicing multicultural education among the individual approaches surveyed: 1) the celebration of diversity approach, 2) the social knowledge and power approach, 3) the service-learning approach, 4) the cultural difference approach, 5) the ideology deconstruction and reconstruction approach, and 6) the social construction and ecology approach. In my discussion below, I will survey the individual approaches that best illustrate the properties of the categorical approaches that I have identified as being used by the teacher educators that I interviewed.

The Celebration of Diversity Approach

This approach, which appears to be rapidly falling out of favor among the teacher educators that I interviewed, is concerned with exposing preservice teachers to cultural forms and artifacts that are associated with specific cultural and ethnic groups. Nationally,

the approach has recently come under criticism for its simplistic conception of cultural diversity; the once dominant approach proposed to educate preservice teachers about diversity merely by demonstrating a link between a cultural group and their associated cultural artifacts or forms. For example, in order to educate preservice teachers about Hispanic culture, expose them to various cultural objects, such as foods, clothing, or festivals.

A concern many teacher educators both locally and nationally hold is this approach may reinforce cultural stereotypes about certain minority and ethnic groups. After preservice teachers enter the profession and begin evaluating their minority students on the basis of stereotyped knowledge, many teacher educators believe this will only do a disservice to minority students. A male teacher educator explained,

> It is a critical part of it that gets overlooked. I am a little worried about the view that diversity is merely learning about other people. Because, I think, what that tends to mean for white middle class students, it tends to exoticize other people. "Isn't it interesting that in the typical Chicano family these kinds of relations exist and people should pay deference to the man and da...da....da....da." To me that is one kind of knowledge that people identify as knowledge of diversity. I think that kind of knowledge of diversity, while it may have some use, is also dangerous because what it really does is that it really encourages people to stereotype.

No teacher educators that I consulted claim to practice this form of multicultural education. Yet, however, one female teacher educator was concerned that the majority of her colleagues still advocate this approach, especially in their practice. She explained,

> I think MSU [the teacher education program] has done quite a bit of thinking about including it in theory. However, in practice, our teaching is pretty mainstream; it's pretty much in school; it's pretty much let's celebrate diversity, with no pedagogy. And nobody is doing it. I've tried and it has been pretty much an uphill battle because of the various positions I take. I am not tenured, I am only an assistant professor.

A male teacher educator held an opposing opinion on this matter; it was his belief that only a few of his colleagues use the celebration of diversity approach. He explained,

> Well, I think that there is more emphasis now on thinking about diversity in

> relationship to knowledge and power issues than about the celebration of diversity. I am not saying that this is universal, but I think that is reflective of the kinds of activities that we have students do, and what we have students read.

The Social Knowledge and Power Approach

The social knowledge and power approach to multicultural education, which appears to be the most commonly used approach among the teacher educators that I interviewed, emphasizes the relationship between the internalization of a discourse by social agents, associated with Euro-American, male, professional, and middle class attributes, and the acquisition and maintenance of social and political power. This discourse becomes exclusionary for those who lack access to it, such as cultural minorities and the poor.

It is through the possession of the exclusionary discourse of knowledge that people from the cultural mainstream are accorded a privileged place in our society, which gives them access to higher education, the best professions, and places to live. The advocates of this approach believe that by raising awareness about the discourse among preservice teachers, and how it impacts teaching, they hope to prepare teachers for the various circumstances and situations that they will confront as educators. In describing how the discourse of exclusion privileges some over others, a male teacher educator discussed a school-based example to illustrate the importance of the social knowledge and power approach. He said,

> For a lot of working class kids, in particular, coming into the schools they often feel they are coming to a place where you have to learn a new language, and you are being evaluated on the basis of what you can do with that language. Where as other people are being taught in the native tongue and evaluated by the same punitive and objective criteria that results in working class kids having linguistic disadvantages and are related to the larger kind of cultural disadvantages that they have. . . . Well, I mean schools value analytical and theoretical skills over practical ones and cognitive skills are valued over manual types of skills. They focus on competitive over cooperative activities and all those are class related types of characteristics and the upper middle class kind of kids that are raised in an environment where analytical and theoretical knowledge is the way in which their parents make a living, so it seems like a natural way of understanding the world, where theory is practical and where cognitive skills, particularly, language and verbal skills are everything, and where manual kinds of skills are what the working class kids are familiar with since they have a different

> orientation. The same is true of cooperation and competition. All of this works to make a cultural salience in schools that tends to be more conducive to familiarity, comfort, and swimming in familiar waters for middle class kids.

Each approach that I have documented represents a variation on the social knowledge and power theme; there are two areas where the variation is most pronounced. First, each teacher educator places an emphasis on a particular set of problems that appear to be chosen based on prior existing research interests. Second, each teacher educator depending on the problem focus will attempt to achieve a specific set of goals that may differ from their colleague's pursuits. Three teacher educators that I interviewed use an approach that falls within this category. I will discuss two examples of this approach.

One variation of the social knowledge and power approach, advocated by Professor Clark, a male teacher educator, argues that American society is racist in nature; this ideology manifests itself through stereotypes and generalizations about minority groups. The discourse of racism allows the cultural mainstream in our society to maintain its power and the status quo. He explained,

> It doesn't mean we don't, but what it does means is that at least we aren't suppose to admit that we . . . I mean it is like this study they did after the mayoral elections in New York and the governor's election in Virginia, I guess, back in 1990 when Dinkins was elected in New York, and Wilder was elected. What they did was they asked people who came out of the polling places who they voted for. There was a big variance between what people said they did and what they really did. And part of this is that people don't want to admit that they are racist. They don't want to admit that they will make a decision based on race. You know, it doesn't fit with middle class norms--it is not cool to be a racist. Well, we grow up in a racist society . . . I mean this is a very, you know, racist society. I mean it is sort of embedded in things; particularly in things like school curricula.
>
> So, you have teachers who, you know, know these generalizations. They know the ones they are suppose to act on and the ones they are not suppose to act on. But the fact of the matter remains, whether or not it serves the interests of children to be treated on the basis of a generalization about a group that they accidentally happen to belong too.

Professor Clark believes that the discourse of racism is embedded in the school curriculum; and teachers, who are political actors in political institutions, will often use these generalizations and stereotypes to simplify their task, which could have detrimental

effects. For example, one such generalization that is frequently used about Native Eskimo children is that they are shy and are quiet and seldom participate in classroom activities. Professor Clark explained,

> The danger is that with prospective teachers, if their program consists primarily of generalizations about groups of people, it sort of conforms in their mind that what they can do is use those generalizations when it comes time to teach. Now, certainly some of those have value. For example, I'm not saying it's bad that teachers know that in Eskimo society when children don't look you in the eye it is a sign of respect, as it is among other Asian cultures. All-right, white teachers are likely to misinterpret that as disrespect given what the cultural norms are and mainstream WASP culture. At the same time, however, I think there is a real danger that what teachers may end up doing is, and I have seen this in interviews with teachers in culturally diverse situations, is that they take a generalization and that becomes an explanation and an excuse for certain types of student behavior.
>
> So for example, teachers will say about Native Alaskan students is: "that Peter doesn't talk much in class, but then Native students don't." The fact of the matter is that there is a much--as you might expect--variability within Alaskan Natives, as there is with any other group of people. You have people who are very gregarious and talk a lot and you have people who don't talk very much.

Professor Clark believes his most important task as a teacher educator is to show his preservice teachers the relationship between knowledge, power, and control in society, and how they benefit from this relationship, while others are excluded. Professor Clark explained,

> . . . it is difficult at a place like Michigan State to get teachers to understand that because they don't see that they themselves live in a particular kind of culture that has a particular set of relationships, and a particular relations of power, and they don't see themselves to be the beneficiaries of this relationship. I am talking about the typical MSU student who tends to be white, middle class, and comes from a small town or rural area. They don't see these kinds of power relations since they live in them; they are like fish in water so they don't see them, and they don't see the relationship between that kind of knowledge and power.

To show his students the link between power and knowledge, Professor Clark has them read about different cultural groups, with the hope, that they will develop some kind of cultural understanding of the groups sampled. The development of cultural awareness, Professor Clark described, is a conscious process that involves several steps, which he

attempts to repeat in his own instructional practice. First, he hopes his students will develop an awareness of themselves as cultural beings. He said,

> I think it is absolutely critical; that is where you got to start. You got to understand what your own values and norms are. Where you stand; why you stand where you stand; why is it that what you want to do on Sunday morning, get up late, have a cup of coffee, and go off to church. Everybody else around is doing that; you don't even notice that is what you are doing. That in itself is an incredibly important cultural ritual.

Second, he strives to encourage an awareness of how the cultural "other" views their own cultural system. Finally, he fosters the development of an awareness of their own value system, and how it is embedded into everyday life. He said,

> Well, I think some of the things that I have mentioned, getting them to see through the eyes of people who are on the outside of a culture that they are very much a part of, and how they see it. Getting them to be more aware of the values, and so forth, that are embedded in their everyday activities and things that are around them. So, you end up getting them to do the kinds of things, you know, the sort of cultural artifacts exercise, where they have to collect these things and write about them and think about what they mean and what they represent.

The notion of culture that guides the work of Professor Clark is configured around his perspective toward multicultural education, which closely correlates knowledge and the possession of power. He explained,

> But there is another view that says that a teacher is to understand the ways in which different groups have contributed to knowledge in different fields, and to understand that there is a very close relationship between knowledge and power. What we come to call knowledge has a lot to do with who is in control of things. To me that seems like a fairly fundamental understanding, and it is difficult at a place like Michigan State to get teachers to understand that because they don't see that they themselves live in a particular kind of culture that has a particular set of relationships, and particular relations of power, and they don't see themselves to be the beneficiaries of the relationship. I am talking about the typical MSU student who tends to be white, middle class, and comes from a small town or rural area. They don't see these kinds of power relations since they live in them; they are like fish in water so they don't see them, and they don't see the relationship between that kind of knowledge and power, so getting them to understand more of the discipline is, in part, getting them to understand this relationship between power and knowledge.

Through his teaching, he attempts to encourage students to explore and develop an

awareness of culture, and the power and knowledge question that is embedded in relationships. Professor Clark explained,

> I guess my perspective is always a cultural perspective. There is nothing that I don't do with students in which I don't try to highlight the cultural context in which any kind of knowledge that we have is related to a cultural context, and that we need to understand what the cultural context is.

A second example of the social knowledge and power approach is offered by Professor Johnson, a female teacher educator, who is interested in the cultural dimensions of mathematics. Professor Johnson argues that mathematics in American society has a cultural dimension, which only a few can master, due to the exclusive nature of the current discourse of mathematics. She explained,

> Within mathematics teaching for me, the field is sort of a big mess on this issue now. I think that what matters a great deal are issues that deal with the curriculum; mathematics is usually thought to be a neutral subject as mathematics is mathematics, is mathematics, which is clearly not the case. There have been some impulses that peoples from different times and different places have had about quantifying their world or about talking about space or about time or whose quantification. So these are issues that have to do with whose mathematics; that is curricular. And then there are issues that have to do with what are really more pedagogical and discourse related. Like around the pedagogy that I try to create in my class, I am searching, thinking, and worrying a lot about how the discourse, on the one hand that I might see as valuable, because, as an educator, I have the responsibility to think carefully about what is valuable for my kids; how those discourses privilege some kids and don't privilege others, or exclude others. . . . I am concerned with changing the way mathematics gets taught in schools.

In our society, she indicated, that the discourse of mathematics privileges Euro-American males, who are middle and upper middle class, while excluding women from all backgrounds. She explained,

> It is privileged, but it is a funny thing to call it privileged because again it only privileges a few, small fraction of our population. It is very narrow and it is very exclusive. On the other hand, it is also very clear, as to what you have to do to succeed. Now it may be something that is so out of the mode that isn't part of your cultural discourse, or your norm that you can't succeed. White middle class and upper middle class males are the ones who generally succeed. In our society, there is fairly strong evidence that women are systematically disengaged with

mathematics.

From the passage above, Professor Johnson defines culture as a form of cultural capital or discourse that provides specific social actors with certain advantages, over others; in this notion of culture, power goes hand in hand with the possession of knowledge.

In her work, Professor Johnson desires to transform the discourse of mathematics. She envisions the creation of an alternative discourse of mathematics that will allow people to be successful at math. She explained,

> So an alternative could be a discourse in which there would be a lot more student talk; a lot more encouragement of multiple ways to frame problems, accept problems, pursue them, solve them, and talk about them. Like it would be legitimate to use pictures to represent the way you were thinking to bring objects; to act something out; to use language to use symbols. Symbols wouldn't be privileged over other things, but symbols wouldn't be bad either. So you would open up the discourse to a wide range of modes for representing thinking. You would also open it up to a wide range of interpretations. Math is extremely interpretative, so you would open it up in order to make it more acceptable and encourage it. That sounds great, so if you have students of different cultural backgrounds, who in their cultures have acquired or developed different modes of interacting, different norms for interaction, different modes for engaging with adults, with peers, make use of that knowledge. It sounds like what you might be trying to create a classroom in which a wider range of things are legitimate; therefore, more of those kids can have access and can engage and can find things interesting.

In order for Professor Johnson to demonstrate to her students how the discourse operates in mathematics, she has to reorient them to math since many of them, especially the women, have had negative experiences with it. She explained,

> One has to do with them becoming more self-conscious. . . . It is what I was saying . . . more self-conscious of who they are, and a concrete example of that has to do with gender. Probably ninety five percent of the students in my class are women and this is a class about mathematics. In our society, there is fairly strong evidence that women are systematically disengaged with mathematics. I am trying to figure out what verb I want to use here. You would easily say that the system excludes women. It just depends on how you want to put it. By the time you get to college, the students that I have mostly stopped taking math some time in high school, and a large proportion of them think that they aren't good at math. They see this as an individual matter; they think that they--one-by-one--without having talked to anybody else they are not good at math. Patricia doesn't think that she is any good at math. Kyle is not good at math. They think they are not good at math. They don't see it as having

> anything that has to do with structural issues. . . . So one thing that I want them do is to come to understand that it is not like happenstance that they happen to be in class with a lot of other people who don't think they are good at math. It is not that they aren't good at math, there is something about how schools work, and the experiences that they have had, that have left them feeling that way. They are not uniquely bad at math, and I want them to consider the way that our school and society work to construct their identity; that their identity is constructed out of the social situations that they have been through, over time, and that is a really new idea for them. They really take this on as a really individual weakness. It is sort of an individual psychological view of themselves. A concrete example that relates to my course is that I want them to come to understand that: A) one thing that I want them to understand is that they are competent and the reason that they don't think that they are good at something isn't unique to them.

After having convinced her students that they are not individually bad at mathematics, but rather that their negative experiences are a product of cultural forces, Professor Johnson describes how a classroom would be oriented under the new discourse. She said,

> But one thing that would be happening is that you would be in a class where you would be doing things that would seem to you to be very different than what you are used to math being, and that would be troubling and exciting. Probably some of that would be very disconcerting because it is not what you are use to. Some of it might be interesting and exciting and you might find that you like some of that, and you might be surprised by that, maybe. You might find that as you do things that you don't think are mathematics, I would say that is really clever, what you just did. Because it would be and you would be very surprised because that is not mathematics, just what I did. Because I did such and such. I did, and I would say, "But, why aren't you saying that is mathematics?" As you would listen to what other people in the classroom did and what you did, I would be trying to help you stretch to see that what you are, in fact, doing is mathematics, because it would be and I would already know that it would be. Another thing . . . and so that is about you. So one thing is that you might be engaged in things that where mathematical. . . . I would want you to understand the larger social, cultural, and historical parts of this. To me, it is not just a matter of having you feel . . . it is partly having you feel more competent; that is not irrelevant to me, it is that it just doesn't stop at that, and I think a lot of math educators who are concerned with issues would be mostly trying to get you to understand that you are more competent than you are and that math is viable. But, it would be about you as an individual, it wouldn't be systematic or cultural.

After having developed an awareness of the cultural dimensions of mathematics, it is Professor Johnson's desire that her students do not reproduce the prevailing discourse of mathematics, once they enter the teaching profession.

The Service-Learning Approach

This approach to multicultural education is used by one female teacher educator, Professor Tangers, that I interviewed; the approach is centered on the method of instruction. The first instructional tool is an in-class component that involves lectures, audio-visual presentations, and class assignments and discussions, and outside clinical experiences. The clinical experience, which is the second instructional tool, differentiates the service-learning approach from other types, since it strongly stresses the out-of-classroom experience as a central component in the educational process.

For preservice teachers, the service-learning approach requires attending a classroom-based program that provides them with first-hand experience in working with minority students in a context that equalizes the power arrangement between the teacher and students. The preservice teacher is given support and feedback to promote a positive learning experience. Professor Tangers described this approach as a form of social action that attempts to prepare the prospective teacher to be successful in a diverse classroom.

Professor Tangers, who is a specialist in literacy education, prefers to use the notion of multiple literacies over the concept of culture, which she believes is less useful in her work. Multiple literacies is a concept that is used to demonstrate the type of information that social actors need to adapt to their social environment; she indicated that multiple literacies can be subdivided to include ideas such as personal literacy (the knowledge base of the individual subject), school literacy (the knowledge you need to be successful in school), and community literacy (the knowledge of a shared community). She explained,

> I would interchange at this point the terminology we used here: literacies/multiple literacies. You have to realize to be literate occurs during all the stages of your life. So we just come up with a heuristic school literacy, being the things you most closely associate with the conventional school environment. Personal literacy is how you as an individual understand things. You have knowledge based on your own life experiences. The community literacy being a person in a larger community. The community literacy might be the "Latina perspective" or Latino issues. As a Latina, as an individual in that community, you may or may not agree totally with those issues. Sometimes associations are aligned with personal issues, sometimes they

> aren't. So that is how I think of culture; it is not ethnicity bound; it is not religious bound; it is not gender bound, which puts it into that same predicament of being either marginalized as: this is culture, oh, I know that; American culture. You know, this marginalization of surface features because that is the only way you can categorize people is by surfaces features to the continuum on the other side where it is so complex that if you have to safe guard against it being too diluted, where everything and anything is culture.

According to Professor Tangers, she started an after-school program in a local school, where preservice teachers work with minority students, who are in grade school; this program was established to accomplish two goals. First, to reconfigure what she refers to as the inequitable power relations in the classroom between students and the teacher (the preservice teacher in this case). In her after-school program, the children are more familiar with the workings of the program due to past involvement. In addition, the preservice teachers and school children eat lunch together, and address one another on a first name basis. This, she suggested, serves as a leveling mechanism between students and the teacher. She explained,

> So the [teacher education] students that I had experienced a graded experience through my after school program, which was my attempt to provide both preservice teachers and kids from third to fifth grade--but often times they bring their older and younger siblings with them--with an alternative learning environment after school, twice a week. My idea was two-fold. My first thought was even these thirty preservice teachers, who have managed to make it into this cohort, are in schools right off the bat, so they gain exposure to kids. In this program there are no mentor teachers, just them [preservice teachers], just kids. Ah, volunteer kids. The ratio is much lower, maybe three kids to each TE [teacher education] student. We have snacks and call each other by our first name; we try to make it so unschool-like that they could say, "Wow, they look the same as those kids but they act really different." Toward what end? So that they can deal with their cultural relativism, both their ethnicity and background, and their upbringing, and sort of bundling that into personal histories by themselves, and their academic histories.
>
> So when the students go over there, often times, the first thing that they are struck by is just how dynamic the place is, and they are also struck by the fact that kids know much more about what is going on than they do. So the hierarchical teacher/student authority, or presumed authority, that the teacher knows all is changed, and in this anything goes. In fact, it sort of flattens the hierarchy because kids know the program, but obviously to these students, they come with some strategies, and prior learned experiences, and background that can aid kids. It is not like they are pretending they know nothing, or that they are fifth graders.

> We tape-recorded these sessions to see whether it is actually causing them to think about classrooms differently, or their role as a teacher; it has been very helpful. Themes that keep coming up is the role ambiguity. Prospective teachers will say, "It is real clear who I am in the classroom, and what I am suppose to do, but it is not clear in the after school program." I think that is an advance. I don't think you want to come to clear resolution about who you are because I think it is fluid, depending on the activity you are involved in and the composition of who you are involved with. I think that is multicultural education. My little bit in my course work is multicultural education for social change.
>
> I think I have been somewhat successful in that with documentation of some pondering of these topics by young people; they are barely 21 or 22, so they haven't been in a classroom and they haven't really caught on to the politics of school, although, they do touch upon that in a naive way. They kind of say, "Well, my classroom teacher would never let me do this." That really hints upon the imbalance of power in the classroom.

Second, the experience provides preservice teachers with what she calls "a deliberate opportunity to take them off of the beaten path on to one that is uncharted." The impetus, she explained, for setting up this program is that many Euro-American preservice teachers are in a problematic situation, when it comes to understanding cultural diversity, given their culturally dominant position in the American society. She said, "It is not that they can't be sensitive or interested in issues of cultural diversity; rather, if they have been happily going along in life, they can't use their lived experiences as part of the curriculum."

It is precisely the lack of this type of experience among her students that prompted Professor Tangers to set up a program, which will supply these encounters to students. She explained,

> The after-school program places the preservice teacher into a multicultural classroom, which is characterized by cultural and ethnic diversity. The project is beneficial for them since they are exposed to children who are different. The pedagogy is applied in this alternative context so that all students seem the same, and have the same chances. The alternative setting is designed to move away from the "strict" relations of power found in the classrooms. Three students are assigned to each preservice teacher. They have snacks together and address one another on a first name basis.

Professor Tangers argues that this approach to doing multicultural education, a clinical experience combined with the classroom component, provides a powerful teaching tool in educating preservice teachers about issues of cultural diversity, since it forces them

to examine their views in a relatively safe environment, while they are receiving support from the teacher education program.

The Ideology Deconstruction and Reconstruction Approach

The basic assumption of this approach is that America is an inherently racist society, and many preservice teachers have been socialized by the ideology during their sheltered upbringing, and it is unlikely they are aware of how their perceptions are colored. Consequently, the lone proponent of this approach, Professor Rogers, a female teacher educator, argues that these preservice teachers, who will shortly be entering the teaching profession, will continue to reproduce the dominant ideology of racism in the classroom, by having diminished expectations of achievement for students of color.

Professor Rogers argues that racism in this society is a reality; it will continue to exist until we collectively confront it. She indicated that her goals are the following, "My interests are, in particular, ways in which we can provide better, expanded, and more substantive opportunities for poor children, particularly children of color within this country." Before a teacher can be effective in the classroom, she argues, he or she must have a strong understanding of the social, historical, political, and philosophical foundations of education, and the role that institutions have on the growth and development of children.

Professor Rogers indicated that she is not trying to make her students understand the core of what it means to be African American or Hispanic; such an endeavor, she feared, would be fraught with problems, since further stereotypes may be created. In addition, she has no desire to teach her students the "correct" behavior they should follow in their teaching practice; rather, Professor Rogers explained that she is interested in the following,

> So if I am trying to get my students to be really thoughtful, reflective thinkers, then I want them to be able to interact with children that they will encounter in their classrooms, who it is increasingly likely that those children will not have experienced childhood in the way that they did; they might not look like they do, so I want my students to be able to make judgments based upon what those children bring to the

> learning environment, and not based upon judgments that my students have of what they think these children bring to the learning environment.

Since teaching requires making multiple judgments over time, she sees her mission as helping her students make sound judgments, and understand the basis of those decisions. Professor Rogers advocates that before students can deconstruct the racist ideology they have internalized, and before they can be effective decision makers in the classroom, it is necessary for them to be aware that their own world-views are a product of socialization; they need to understand that their beliefs are not universal. She explained,

> Despite the fact that most of the students in teacher education that I have taught are juniors and seniors, they seem rather surprised to find out that their own values and ways of seeing the world were developed and they were developed and influenced by the virtue of the community in which they were raised.

Professor Rogers apparently has no interest in exploring or using a concept of culture in her work; while she recognizes the importance of culture, she believes that this concept has limitations that make it less relevant to her work of deconstructing racism. She said,

> Let me begin by saying that multicultural education is a narrow but an important part of what it would take to improve opportunities for all children. And the reason that I think it is a narrow part is because I think the focus I mean I look at it as being a focus being centered around cultural definitions and trying to find ways in which children by their membership in a particular culture get respect and get respect across cultures. I think that even if we did that it would not solve all the problems or dilemmas that a number of children face in this country. I think what the term omits are the structural and the political influences on institutions and communities that the cultural parts don't even begin to interface. So, I don't know . . . my background is not in anthropology, and my background is not in the study or the examination of culture. The lenses that I would bring more strongly center around ways in which the "isms" influence what happens within schools and institutions. For example, I guess I see racism as being something different from culture and whereas we might help our students--preservice teachers--learn to quote and unquote respect different cultures. I think that until they and we all kind of confront the racism that exists, it will continue to exist until someone confronts it, I think. So, for me there is a distinction between culture, racism, or sexism.

Professor Rogers is interested in having her students explore the origins of certain beliefs and dispositions that they hold. She explained,

> That through the exploration they no longer take certain kinds of beliefs for

> granted. That kind of experience can be a bridge by which they can begin to explore whatever beliefs and dispositions that someone else holds, rather than just kind of saying: I see you, and by virtue of certain cues, I then would think that you would do certain things.

Professor Rogers hopes to accomplish this goal within the context of the classroom, by using traditional pedagogical techniques, such as lectures, readings, and classroom discussions.

The Cultural Difference Approach

The lone practitioner of this approach, Professor Thompson, a male teacher educator who received his graduate training in anthropology, sets off his approach to multicultural education from his fellow teacher educators in several ways. First, since he is trained in anthropology, he believes this has provided him with a more solid understanding of the concept of culture than many of his colleagues, who generally lack any formal training in the anthropology. He explained,

> I myself see that there is an incredible strong difference between diversity and multicultural education. I am constantly fighting battles to get cultural differences to be seen as a central issue. I think most people have a very superficial knowledge of what diversity or multicultural education means. I think that I have infinitely more sophisticated knowledge about what other cultures are about than other people in education, with the exception of a couple of people, because I am trained as an anthropologist. I studied at the feet of people like Ward Goodenough, on what culture meant. I think there is a real superficiality. I think they take the term culture and throw it around without any sense of what the history of the struggle for definitions of culture have been about. It is sort of used as this meaningless global term. For somebody who has written about the concept of culture, I have studied with some of the leading thinkers about it, I find this superficial, to say the least.

He views the concept of culture as a central analytical tool in multicultural education. Second, he contrasts his own practice in multicultural education from his colleagues. He believes they are often motivated by the desire to fix attitudes and preach tolerance to preservice teachers. He refers to this as the "You better be sensitive" approach. Professor Thompson argues that he is interested in training his students to be competent teachers who can successfully deal with students from different cultural backgrounds.

Professor Thompson argues that before a teacher can work successfully with diverse kids in the classroom, she or he has to develop an awareness of herself or himself as a cultural being. While staying away from fixing attitudes, Professor Thompson indicates that he assumes his students are going to be sensitive about these issues. He shows students real and in-depth examples, from an analytical perspective, that will attempt to demonstrate the kinds of ways that people can be culturally different. He explained,

> I assume you are going to be sensitive; let's look in real depth at these particular examples. Let's understand the kinds of way that people can be culturally different, so that you can start generating, if you go into a situation if you don't have this specific example, you can start thinking about what there might be.

It is his belief that this approach will provide prospective teachers with the necessary analytical tools to go into new situations where they do not have specific examples to guide them; this process will prepare them to start thinking about these issues. He explained, "I want to provide people with a knowledge base on what the cultural difference possibilities are, and not simply that there are cultural differences. In order to do that you have to have a pretty damn good sense of yourself and that is where having a real anthropological background comes in."

To provide his students with these analytical tools, he indicated that he uses many varied examples of cultural difference that his students can explore at a fairly intense level. According to Professor Thompson, one of the more powerful tools for educating about cultural differences is the use of folklore examples. He explained,

> For undergraduates, I do try to use educational examples. Some of the most powerful stuff I use comes from my folklore. Because developing a sense of the cultural differences in the construction of literary texts is a very powerful thing. One of the most powerful pieces of teaching that I do is to take children's book versions that have been rewritten for white audience and show them the differences. "Here is a picture book. Here is how the story was told originally. Look at the difference."

Professor Thompson indicated that many children's story books have their origins in folklore tales that were passed on through oral tradition. By taking the original tale and

contrasting it with the Euro-American version, a powerful educational tool is created for showing cultural differences, since you can compare the American version with the original version. On this basis, he indicated, you can compare your own cultural values with the value system of the group where the story originated. He said,

> One of my favorites examples is a Cherokee story that James Loony collected back in the 19th century. A few years ago, a children book's author created a picture book of this story about in which--I forget the title--a daughter of the sun gets killed. It is kind of a horrible death and basically the sun is shining too bright and killing off people. The sun needs to be killed, and by mistake the sun's daughter ends up being killed by snakes. The sun then disappears, you know, he's weeping . . . he doesn't come out anymore, and in order to get him to come out, they go and try to rescue the daughter. So they go to the underworld to bring her back. This is where they do the Pandora's box thing, and open the lid and she escapes and become the red bird or the Cardinal. But because they failed to bring her back successfully, and opened the box, death has come to creation. That is sort of your basic story line. Well, in the original native version there are a lot of differences, but one of the really neat ones is everything in the Loony version involves the community as a whole, or a large number of people. Like seven people go to the underworld; you know, a tribal council makes decisions. It is all groups, you know. In the white people's version everything gets turned into a single hero doing it. That is a nice example of cultural difference that can be fairly dramatic for teaching little kids and adults.

This technique, he indicated, is the foundations for how he educates preservice teachers about cultural diversity.

The Social Construction of Reality and Ecological Approach

This scholarly approach is advanced by a female teacher educator, Professor Partridge, who uses a dualistic notion of multicultural education to frame the problems and questions she examines in her research, which represents an intersection between the social construction of reality and a notion of ecology. First, she uses the social construction model to understand how people, as social actors, are constructed. Professor Partridge explained, "So the meaning we attribute to multiculturalism, to students of diverse backgrounds, that meaning is constructed through social interaction." She indicated that she uses this approach to illustrate how people hold different beliefs on similar issues, which provides a basis for comparing cultural values. Second, the ecological approach,

she indicated, is used to understand the environmental context in which people (students) are socialized. She explained,

> An ecological model basically says that how everything about a student can be understood in terms of the interaction between the environment and the student. So that when you look at a student--I am teaching teachers, prospective teachers. Then, I ask them not to look at the characteristics of the students alone, but within an environmental context--that is the ecological approach. Social construction is similar to that but it talks about meaning as being socially constructed. So the meaning we attribute to multiculturalism, to students of diverse background, that meaning is constructed through social interactions between people. In the classes that I teach, I am always encouraging a multicultural perspective. We look at a student and then one person says, "Well, I see this," and then another persons says, "I see this," and then we talk about that. And, how they could come to have these very different perspectives on about the same phenomena and the same student. That is basically a social constructionist perspective.

While the social construction and ecological approach attempts to provide a picture of the problems and issues that are to be examined, Professor Partridge indicated that she overlays a process model template to analyze and understand intercultural relationships. She explained,

> This is a model for analyzing intercultural interaction. It is a way of understanding intercultural relationships. So it is more of a process model. As a person, how do you process cultural differences? It is divided into three areas: emotional areas, knowledge areas, behavioral areas. So it is cognitive and affective in behavior.

It appears that intersections between the social constructionist and ecological approach becomes the notion of culture that Professor Partridge uses in her work; that is, social actors are a product of their social reality and environment. It is this framework that she uses to convey to her students a notion of cultural diversity.

Professor Partridge believes that it is important for her students to take multiculturalism as a serious issue. In effect, she wants her students to value multiculturalism and be able to view issues from a multicultural perspective, and act accordingly. She explained,

> We try to approach diverse learners and multicultural education not only at a cognitive level, but at an affective level. You can give them all sorts of information on

> definitions of multicultural education, definitions on diversity; they can pass a test with flying colors; you know the definition of diversity is a, b, c, d. But, if their behavior, emotions, and feelings haven't changed, then there has been no change.

To achieve her goals, Professor Partridge uses a two-fold pedagogy. The first incorporates a contact component, which exposes her students to diverse people, while the second is the more traditional academic approach that is based in the classroom, which includes role playing, and intellectual assignments that challenge beliefs and understandings.

A basic assumption that guides her work, which she draws from Gordon Alport's book *Prejudice,* is that people's attitudes are not going to change unless they come into direct contact with people who are different from themselves. She explained the importance of Alport's ideas to her own work, "Alport's idea is that you don't change unless you have a number of personal experiences. You can't just have one because you will stereotype people on the basis of that one experience." Therefore, Professor Partridge arranges for speakers from various minority communities to come and give talks about how they view issues. She explained how the speakers affect her students,

> We invited a panel of gay/lesbian folks to talk to them about their experiences and perspectives. In addition, we had a panel of community activists from the Hispanic, Black, and other minority communities. So contact and experience from this basis--hands-on and face-to-face experiences--forms the basis of how I try to make people have a little more acceptance.

The traditional academic component of Professor Partridge's program of study involves students examining case studies, role playing (putting themselves into situations as if they were a member of a minority group), and written critical analysis of children's books; in this latter activity, students attempt to address the question of how realistically does a particular children's book treat the issue of diversity.

In this chapter, I have surveyed and identified the individual approaches to multicultural education, and the notions of culture, that the teacher educators I interviewed use in their practice, and I have highlighted the theoretical assumptions, goals, and

pedagogies of these approaches. After having surveyed the individual approaches at the local level, it will then be possible to juxtapose the local level with the national discourse, and determine how each level of the discourse differs in terms of theory and practice.

Chapter 7

THE LOCAL DISCOURSE

In this chapter, I will address the questions posed at the outset of this thesis. First, how do the teacher educators that I interviewed define the concept of culture in their work, and do they draw upon a Boas-Benedict notion of the culture concept? In addition, I will test Wax's hypothesis and determine whether his premise is valid--that all teacher educators use a Boas-Benedict notion of the culture concept. Second, how do the approaches to multicultural education of these teacher educators compare to the approaches documented nationally in Sleeter and Grant's typology?

Multicultural Education and the Concept of Culture

In this section, I will document the concepts of culture or alternative analytical frameworks that are being used by the teacher educators that were interviewed for this study. Before I turn my discussion to the concept of culture, I will briefly treat the use of culture in anthropology to demonstrate how the concept has been addressed recently within the discipline, which will provide a reference point to compare the work of the teacher educators that I interviewed.

The Concept of Culture in Anthropology

Given the long and complex history of anthropology, it is beyond the scope of this survey to trace the development of the culture concept; therefore, my survey of culture will only attempt to highlight important intellectual issues relevant to the focus of this study. Peacock (1986:10) observes that culture is the primary analytical tool used by

anthropologists in studying humankind, and it is the attempt to connect the material world we inhabit with cultural meaning, which ultimately distinguishes the discipline from other social sciences.

Despite the enormous value of the culture concept, it is a term that has proven elusive to define, since the term has multiple meanings. The classic definition offered by E.B. Tylor (1871) defines culture as the following: "Culture . . . taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." E.B. Tylor's definition has set the stage for a controversy in anthropology over the configuration of the concept that has lasted over one hundred years.

Many anthropologists throughout this century have offered definitions of culture. In fact, around the middle of the century Krober and Kluckhohn (1952) published a volume that represented an inventory of definitions of culture offered until that time. Yet since that period, numerous definitions of the culture concept have been offered by anthropologists and other scholars; there is little agreement over these definitions. The debate over the configuration of culture used by anthropologists generally is dependent upon the school-of-thought or the branch of the subdiscipline the practitioner belongs too; thus, there is a wide-range of definitions that exist across the discipline.

It appears to be impossible to formulate a definition of culture that satisfies all requirements; it is beyond the aim of this study to attempt such an endeavor. However, I believe, it is more useful to survey some of the generally agreed upon principles of the culture concept within the anthropological community, and to highlight characteristics of the debate within sociocultural anthropology over the configuration of the culture concept, since, I believe, that sociocultural anthropology is able to inform and enhance the work of teacher educators given the current thinking on culture within this subdiscipline. Such a comparison will hopefully lay the foundation of a dialogue between anthropologists and teacher educators regarding the configuration of the culture concept, which is one intent of

this study.

Peacock (1986:7), in discussing the principles of culture within anthropology, defines it as the following: "Culture, then, is a name anthropologists give to the taken-for-granted but powerfully influential understandings and codes that are learned and shared by members of a group."

Below, I will briefly survey how I understand that the concept of culture has been defined within sociocultural anthropology in the United States during the past 25 years, to illustrate the diachronic change in how this analytical concept has been configured. While the notion of culture to be discussed is not the only approach that is currently in use, it does represent an important movement within the discipline. Since the late 1960s in sociocultural anthropology, the dominant configuration of the culture concept has moved away from the materialist or political economy conception to definitions that approximate culture as a shared system of meaning, otherwise known as symbolic anthropology (see Ortner 1984, Sahlins 1976, and Geertz 1973). Most recently, the interpretative anthropology perspective has become an important approach to cultural analysis (see Fox 1991, Clifford 1988, Marcus and Fischer 1986) in sociocultural anthropology, which is similar to symbolic anthropology, but differs in that there is an effort to include historical context and political economy into the analysis, topics often neglected in earlier anthropological works.

Marcus and Fischer (1986:16) observed that during this current period in anthropology, through the influences of interpretative anthropology, the discipline has moved away from attempting "to construct a general theory of culture to a reflection on ethnographic fieldwork and writing." In turn, the configuration of the concept of culture has altered to reflect this trend. According to Rosaldo (1993:92-3), anthropology is currently in the process of adopting a case history approach called *processual analysis*, which was pioneered by Geertz and Turner. This approach ". . . shows how ideas, events, and institutions interact and change through time." The perceived benefit of processual

analysis, Rosaldo (1993:93) observed, is "It emphasizes that culture requires study from a number of perspectives, and that these perspectives cannot necessarily be added together into a unified summation." This study is an attempt at studying the work of teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education from the standpoint of how they understand and practice multicultural education. While I am the researcher, the author of this study, I have attempted to let the participants I consulted speak their voice about multicultural education and culture in their professional practice.

The Use of Culture by Teacher Educators

In this section, I will determine whether the teacher educators that I interviewed use a Boas-Benedict notion of culture, as was proposed by Wax (1993); yet, he has made this argument without providing any empirical evidence to support this claim. I will test his hypothesis. As was discussed in Chapter 1, Wax (1993) proposed that teacher educators who practice multicultural education define culture as a concept that is based on a Boas-Benedict understanding of culture, which is a school-of-thought that has been referred to as "salvage" anthropology. This notion of culture that can be characterized as being "plural, separate, distinct, and historically homogenous. . . ." Wax postulated that the culture concept found in multicultural education is operationalized into practice as having three qualities, which represents the basis of a model of culture that currently guides the work of teacher educators in the national discourse. First, every individual is a cultural being and participates in culture. Second, since people are a product of culture, schooling must attempt to reach the student in his or her native culture and the curriculum must reflect this goal. Finally, the culture of the school must reflect the school and not the society at large. This will result in the avoidance of ethnocentrism and provide positive role models stressing both belonging and achievement for minority children.

Wax proposes that once this notion of culture is infused into the curriculum, it translates into a struggle for political power and dominance among different cultural groups. He argues that this notion of culture does not reflect the dynamics of culture,

which is a product of intercultural contact; thus, he believes teacher educators need to reconfigure their definitions to reflect this process. By documenting the definitions of culture used by the teacher educators I have interviewed, it provides an opportunity to test Wax's hypothesis, and to determine at what points anthropologists can make a contribution to the work of teacher educators.

A wide range of conceptions of culture can be found among the teacher educators whose views on culture I have recorded, including those who do not use culture. In assessing Wax's hypothesis, it does appear that the Boas-Benedict configuration of culture is to be found in use among the teacher educators that I consulted; it is one of many competing notions of culture, but it is manifested in its own particular form at the local level. In my review below, I begin with a discussion of analytical frameworks other than culture, this will be followed by a treatment of the definitions of culture, including the Boas-Benedict framework, documented in use among the teacher educators that I interviewed.

There are teacher educators that I interviewed who do not use culture. For example, Professors Rogers and Tangers do not use culture as a central concept in their work, even though they do recognize it as a legitimate concept. As was discussed in Chapter 6, Professor Rogers, who advocates what I refer to as the ideology deconstruction and reconstruction approach, believes that the concept is too limited for her own work, since she is interested in deconstructing the racist ideology that many of her preservice teachers appear to possess unknowingly. For her, culture represents the generalizations or stereotypes that can be made about a group of people. Professor Tangers, who subscribes to the service-learning approach, prefers to use the notion of literacies/multiple literacies over culture (see Chapter 6) as the intellectual framework that guides her work. I believe she has chosen this concept over culture since her focus is on literacy education.

There are two examples of culture being used by teacher educators that I interviewed, and I believe they represent a version of culture as identified in Wax's model. They are

offered by Professors Clark and Johnson, who use an approach to multicultural education that I have identified as the social knowledge and power approach. As was discussed in Chapter 6, this approach perceives American society as inherently racist or discriminatory in nature; they attempt to show the relationship between the possession of a certain discourse of knowledge among social agents, associated with Euro-American, male, professional, and middle class attributes, and the acquisition and maintenance of power by a dominant group in society, which possesses the above characteristics. It is through the internalization of this specialized and exclusive discourse of knowledge that people from the cultural mainstream are accorded a privileged place in our society, which provides access to higher education, the best professions, and places to live. Generally speaking, the poor and cultural minorities who lack access to this discourse are excluded from many opportunities.

The two proponents of this approach (Professors Clark and Johnson) appear to advocate the need to raise and develop an awareness of cultural identity among their mostly Euro-American preservice teachers. For example, in Professor Clark's approach, he is concerned with raising his students' awareness that they have benefited in numerous ways by virtue of being Euro-American. He attempts to demonstrate how they are different from cultural minorities that they will end up teaching. Professor Johnson's approach centers on the teaching of mathematics, and how women are excluded from this discourse; she is concerned with how to make her students aware of the exclusive nature of mathematics.

In each case Professors Clark and Johnson, use culture as the central concept in their desire to raise cultural awareness among students. It appears that the notion of culture being used operates as a descriptive identifier that allows people to distinguish and identify differences, such as economic, political, and social found among groups of people. Thus, I believe that culture in this framework is a means for identifying the condition and relationship among different cultural groups; culture is distinct--since these qualities are

separate--and plural, since there are numerous examples available; it is not that Professors Clark and Johnson just use culture, but the concept embodies social actors with cultural traits, which are a product of culture. This use of culture reflects the first characteristic as postulated in Wax's model; that people have culture and are a product of the same, and must be understood from that vantage point.

However, from the standpoint of this study, I believe it is difficult to assess whether these teacher educators in question employ the second and third qualities of culture in their educational practice, which were discussed in Wax's model. My vantage point in this study is an examination of the preparation of preservice teachers, and not a study of the educator in the field--in the classroom--where these issues would be subject to study.

The final two approaches to the concept of culture that I documented represent definitions correlated to the multicultural education approach, but do not represent examples of the Boas-Benedict model of culture. As was discussed in Chapter 6, one approach to culture is offered by Professor Thompson, an advocate of what I labeled the cultural difference approach to multicultural education. Professor Thompson, who is trained in anthropology, proclaims that an understanding of culture is central in his work. Unlike his colleagues who he believes are interested in correcting attitudes, which he labels "The You Better be Sensitive Approach," Professor Thompson assumes his students are going to be sensitive about cultural difference. By looking at examples, Professor Thompson is interested in teaching his students about cultural differences; not only that there are differences, but the range of differences one may expect to encounter as a teacher. He draws upon his anthropological training by using examples from folklore to accomplish this aim.

A final example of culture being used by a teacher educator that I consulted was offered by Professor Partridge, who uses the social construction and ecology approach to multicultural education, which was discussed in Chapter 6. Professor Partridge hopes to encourage students to value multiculturalism and perceives issues from a multiculturalist

perspective. To achieve this goal, Professor Partridge uses a social constructionist and an ecological framework for understanding cultural diversity; the social constructionist leg of the model interprets reality as being constructed through social interaction, while the ecological perspective demonstrates that meaning must be understood within the environment, where social interaction occurs. Through this framework, for understanding culture, Professor Partridge attempts to demonstrate to her students that social actors are a product of their social reality and environment.

Approaches to Multicultural Education at the Local Level

At the beginning of this thesis, I proposed to conduct a case study of teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education. An important aspect of this study was to document the approaches that the teacher educators I interviewed use in their practice to educate preservice teachers. I attempt to address this question by drawing upon Sleeter and Grant's (1987) multicultural education typology as the means for categorizing the approaches found at the local level, which will allow for a comparative contrast between the approaches recorded in the national discourse, with the approaches I have documented in MSU's teacher education program. It will then be possible to determine how much variation exists among the approaches between the national and local discourse. By studying the practice of teacher educators at the local level, the intent is to provide actual documented examples of teacher educators involved in multicultural education, which will broaden our understanding of the discourse.

In the teacher education program at MSU, I would argue that the majority of the approaches to multicultural education used by the teacher educators that were consulted appear to fall within Sleeter and Grant's typology of approaches (see Chapter 6 for discussion of approaches at local level). I have documented three examples that fall under the approach that Sleeter and Grant refer to as "multicultural education." They are the 1)

the social knowledge and power approach, 2) the cultural difference approach, and 3) the social construction of reality and ecological approach. Despite the majority falling under this category, there are two approaches I documented that are not classifiable under this heading. It is my contention that the service-learning approach represents a version of what Sleeter and Grant call "education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist" (EMSC), and the ideology deconstruction and reconstruction approach represents a perspective that does not appear to be classifiable in Sleeter and Grant's typology; therefore, its configuration appears to be unique.

The criteria used to categorize the approaches that I documented were made with two factors under consideration. The first consideration was the stated goals of these approaches, while the second factor was based on the range and types of issues addressed by each approach. While similarities in both the goals and the coverage of issues in the approaches documented at the local level warrant classifying into Sleeter and Grant's typology, there are observable differences that distinguish approaches from each level of the discourse. It is my belief that the variation between the approaches I observed at the local level contrasts with the approaches that Sleeter and Grant have documented are a result of the setting and mode of expression. For example, in my discussions with teacher educators, they often responded to questions with actual examples that centered on pragmatic goals. The format taken in Sleeter and Grant's article uses a more abstract mode of expression, in a decontextualized setting, which, I believe, gives a more generalized interpretation of their positions.

In discussing the multicultural education approaches documented in MSU's teacher education program, I will treat the goals, main issues, and instructional practices, which became the basis for categorizing the respective approaches into Sleeter and Grant's typology. The examples used to illustrate this discussion will be drawn from Chapter 6, where they were discussed at length.

In examining the goals of the social knowledge and power, the cultural difference, and

the social construction of reality and ecological approaches, I believe there are enough similarities with the stated goals of the multicultural education approach documented by Sleeter and Grant to justify classifying the local examples into this category. As was discussed in Chapter 2, Sleeter and Grant argue that practitioners who use the multicultural education approach are interested in advocating the valuation, respect, and tolerance for cultural diversity, and they are in favor of social justice and equity among the members of all ethnic groups. I will discuss one example from each of the approaches to demonstrate the relationship.

The first example of goals is from the social knowledge and power approach, offered by Professor Clark (see Chapter 6). He is interested in showing students how they benefit from the present societal arrangement. Since the majority of his students are Euro-American, he believes, they are privileged because they have access to an exclusive discourse of knowledge that neither cultural minorities nor the poor can gain access too. Professor Clark attempts to demonstrate to students how they benefit by making them aware of the relationship between knowledge, power, and control in society; he wants his students to become aware of this arrangement, so that they do not reproduce inequity in their classrooms.

A second example of the multicultural education approach is the cultural difference approach used by Professor Thompson. He argues that in his practice, he is interested in helping prospective teachers develop an awareness of themselves as cultural beings, and provides them with a set of analytical tools that they can use in their own practice. It is through the acquisition of these skills that he hopes students will be sensitive to cultural differences, and not act in a politically correct manner.

A third example drawn from the social construction of reality and ecological approach, which is advocated by Professor Partridge, centers her goals around having students value multiculturalism, and to view issues from a multiculturalist perspective. Professor Partridge encourages students to understand that people may hold beliefs and

values on topics that differ from their own.

When turning to the question of what are the main issues that receive the most attention by the teacher educators who advocate the aforementioned multicultural education approaches, there is a strong similarity in coverage between the local discourse and the issues documented as important by Sleeter and Grant. As was discussed in Chapter 2, Sleeter and Grant observe that in the literature a majority of teacher educators using this approach are interested in addressing institutional racism in both schools and society, inequity among racial groups, and class and social stratification. They pointed out that it is primarily through the ideas of race and ethnicity that the above issues are addressed in the literature.

At the local level, I would argue that these issues are also recognized as being central questions that must be addressed by the teacher educators that I consulted. For example, as was discussed in Chapter 6, Professor Johnson is interested in studying the cultural dimensions of mathematics; she believes the way mathematics is currently defined excludes females of all backgrounds, and males outside the middle and upper middle class. It is the institutionalized nature of discrimination in mathematics that Professor Johnson addresses in her work. A second example is offered by Professor Clark, who is primarily concerned with the relationship between power and knowledge, and how the possession of certain types of knowledge can give some people social and economic advantages over people denied access to that knowledge. In his own profession, Professor Clark addresses the question of how to raise awareness about this set of circumstances among preservice teachers.

As I indicated previously, I would argue that the service-learning approach, advocated by Professor Tangers, can be classified as an example of the "education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist" (EMSC) approach; the fifth approach identified by Sleeter and Grant (1987). Generally speaking, the goals and objectives in Professor Tangers' practice, which were discussed in Chapter 6, are similar to the EMSC approach (see Chapter 2);

there, however, appears to be differences that are unique to her approach.

Nationally, Sleeter and Grant observe that proponents of the EMSC approach are primarily concerned with education that is social action oriented, which prepares teachers to take action against social inequity in classrooms. While Professor Tangers stresses that social action is a central component to her approach, she is more concerned with raising awareness of cultural diversity than directly tackling the question of eliminating oppression. Nevertheless, she does agree with the objective of equalizing power relations within the classroom between students and teachers.

Professor Tangers' service-learning approach appears to place an emphasis on social action, namely through the institution of the clinical experience. Not unlike the EMSC approach as documented by Sleeter and Grant, the goal of her approach is to combat power inequalities found in classrooms, especially where diverse students are found. To address this question, and the general lack of cultural experience she perceives among her students, Professor Tangers has incorporated a clinical experience to accomplish two aims. That is, first, to supply her students with a series of experiences with diverse children, which, it is hoped, will provide them with an opportunity to develop a higher degree of cultural awareness; second, to place prospective teachers and children into a more democratic classroom setting, through a series of leveling mechanisms, which will lessen the inequity between teachers and students. Professor Tangers stressed that through the fostering of cultural awareness among preservice teachers, they will be in a better position to understand cultural diversity after they have entered the teaching profession.

As I observed above, I believe the ideology reconstruction and deconstruction approach used by Professor Rogers fails to be classifiable within Sleeter and Grant's typology. As was discussed in Chapter 6, Professor Rogers is primarily concerned with having students, who she believes have been socialized in the prevailing racist ideology of American culture, become aware of how racist ideas may color their perceptions; she then encourages students to consider what the implications of this new understanding will be for

their own teaching practice. As Professor Rogers pointed out, she has no interest in examining these issues from a cultural standpoint, since the concept has too many limitations for her work; rather, she desires to examine "isms" and how they limit learning opportunities for diverse students. She is interested in showing students how to uncover the racist ideology that colors their vision, and to discard it.

In this section, I have attempted to document the approaches to multicultural education that are used by the teacher educators that I interviewed in MSU's teacher education program. In all but one case, the approaches that were documented are classifiable into Sleeter and Grant's typology. In this case study, I have attempted to demonstrate that despite the similarities found in the goal statements and issue coverage between the local and the national discourse, there are significant observable differences between each level. The most important contrast appears to be the practice orientation found among the approaches used by the teacher educators that I interviewed at MSU.

As was discussed in Chapter 1, many teacher educators nationally have proposed that one of the most significant problems they face is a lack of development in the practice oriented-teaching; thus, many observers have noted the application side of multicultural education suffers in many of the models proposed. It is not the purview of this thesis to assess the successfulness of the teacher educators that I consulted in linking theory with practice; rather, I hope to suggest that at this local level, it appears that many teacher educators are involved in the pursuit of linking theory with practice in their work, as the data demonstrates. These circumstances, I believe, are in part a result of the application oriented enterprise of educating preservice teachers, compared to the theoretical orientation of the multicultural education literature, which fails to uncover the practiced-based work of practitioners at the local level. Making empirical evidence available demonstrates the importance of the case study method, which this study has attempted to replicate, by providing teacher educators with a locally-based picture of themselves at work, through the anthropological method.

In this chapter, I have attempted to bring closure to this case study of a teacher education program, by examining the two central themes of this thesis. That is, documenting how culture is used among the teacher educators that I consulted, and to determining whether, in fact, a Boas-Benedict inspired model is in use, as suggested by Wax (1993). The second central theme of this thesis was to document the approaches to multicultural education being used among this group of teacher educators, and by using a nationally recognized typology, to classify these approaches. The intent of this study was to demonstrate how a local example of multicultural education contrasts with the national discourse.

Chapter 8

THE DILEMMA OF TEACHING

In this chapter, I will examine how teacher educators assess the overall effectiveness of their individual approaches in regard to preparing prospective teachers to work in diverse classroom settings. I will identify and survey the constraints that the teacher educators I consulted face in their educational practice. When teacher educators set about educating students regarding issues of cultural diversity, in general, each practitioner has his or her own specific goals that he or she hope to achieve during the limited contact time with students; the constraints these teacher educators encounter serve only to complicate an already complex task.

During the course of the interviews, it was not uncommon for teacher educators to recount the barriers they face in their educational practice. For example, a female teacher educator indicated that many of her students are--as she put it--"sick and tired" of multicultural education and diversity because these terms have become buzzwords that they are relentlessly bombarded with. She explained,

> I think students are sick and tired of hearing diversity as a buzzword. I think the word and the concept of diversity may have been over used. If it hadn't been misused I don't think students would feel like there was too much. I can't tell you how it has been misused, but I have the feeling that it has been misused.

Another female teacher educator indicated that preservice teachers find culture as a classroom topic that is covered far too often in a number of their courses. Prospective teachers, it appears, are puzzled why culture is repeatedly reintroduced during their studies. To them, it becomes a topic that has no closure. She explained,

> One of the problems that we are facing . . . is that our students get impatient when talking about culture. They think that it should be a topic that gets finished. "It is kind of like we did that." "You know, we talked about culture in the junior level courses." That makes a certain amount of sense to me. I think there is a resistance from majority culture people to keep thinking about culture issues. It feels to them that it is something that doesn't need to be repeatedly brought up.

Another problem observed by one male teacher educator is the students' own private lives, and how they intersect with the educational process. He believes that he competes with other aspects of students' personal and private lives, such as friends, television, parties, and so forth, which serve to complicate the learning process. Often, these distractions frequently discourage the individual questioning process that is necessary for developing an awareness and understanding of cultural differences. He said,

> You know, I can't possibly in a semester's time get them to understand who they are, and why they are, and where their values are coming from, and so forth. But if I can get them started on that, I feel like for some of them I get them started. The problem is that it is very difficult to support that effort once they leave me. Because they are going to go to other courses and they go back into that mode where it is all on the outside, it's all external, it is all about other people. There is nothing in people's private lives to do it. Again, our private lives tend to be full of distractions that are about the outside. It is full of TV and friends, parties, and so forth. Some of that stuff, I mean you could argue, in fact, is more likely to get into the way of them understanding more about themselves.

Another problem one male teacher educator observed is that during the process of developing an understanding about cultural diversity--which in several cases involves students applying both critical and analytical lenses to their own lives for the very first time--many students experience confusion and consternation. He explained,

> Here you are asking them to do something they are not use to doing. That is, to take a look at their own lives and to do that in an analytical way. It is not like, well, write me a journal. It is like, we are not only going to look at your life, we are going to take it apart a little. I am asking them to be analytical about their life. At first, they are usually puzzled, skeptical, or a little fearful.

A final problem observed by a male teacher educator, which is universal for most educators, is the propensity of students to perform in a way that they believe will please their teacher, and lead to good grades. This behavior is frequently chosen by students,

rather than concentrating their energy on exploring intellectual concepts and ideas. For example, when students are evaluated they will provide responses that approximate what they believe the teacher is looking for, rather than engaging in thoughtful intellectual debate that challenges ideas. He explained,

> Students know how to tell you the things that you want to hear. Right, because they want to please you and they want to get a good grade. So, any time you get stuff back from students, you always have to look at it with skeptical eyes.

The Measurability of Success

In this section, I will examine the question of how successful teacher educators believe they are in effecting the intellectual development of students, and how accurately they believe this issue can be assessed. For many of the teacher educators that I consulted this is an important question; they devote much time and effort to reconfiguring their own approaches, so that as many students as possible can benefit.

Teacher educators widely hold two beliefs regarding the assessment of student performance. First, many refer to the assessment process of preservice teachers as a speculative enterprise, which is fraught with many uncertainties. One male teacher educator discussed the problematic nature of student assessment. He explained,

> A fundamental condition of teaching is the uncertainty of whether you made one iota of difference in a student or not because most of the means that we have for finding out what students think are very unreliable. Often, you are going to be uncertain about the impact you have had on students. If you are interested in getting students to understand who they are and the values that underline who they are and the sociocultural configuration out of which they come, then, anytime you try to do that it is going to be hard to know whether you helped them to do that. You can have students, at the time, who don't seem to be clicking to it, but three years down the road it starts to make sense for them.

A female teacher educator agrees with this position; however, she believes it is possible to assess the comprehension levels of preservice teachers in the short-term, during

the contact-time period and up to six months afterward. During this period, she suggested, that a positive impact from multicultural education courses can be observed in prospective teachers; at the time of the interview, she was involved in her own study to attempt and determine the answer to this vexing question. However, she pointed out that beyond this time period pressures are strong on new teachers, after entrance into the professional-educators' culture, to conform to prevailing beliefs in schools; this leaves future measurement and success in doubt. She explained,

> It is very difficult to measure, but I am in the midst of a research project right now that is really trying to take a close look at this. That is why if we had this conversation about three months from now, I could tell you whether or not any of this stuff makes a difference. I at least know that it makes a difference in the short-term--at least for the first six months or so. But one of the big questions is: how these ideas can be supported in the reality of first year teaching.

Second, teacher educators are generally pessimistic about their own success in influencing preservice teachers' beliefs and ideas about cultural difference. Despite their pessimism, most seem to be optimistic about increasing their prospects for success in the future. A male teacher educator explained, "We never succeed very well in our teaching. Not only is this [educating preservice teachers] a challenge, but any attempt at measurement is a challenge." Despite his fears, he believes some students are successful at developing an understanding of the issues of multicultural education. He explained,

> I think that certainly the intellectual depth in which I have aimed is better in showing difference than other people [teacher educators], and I think that I can certainly point to numerous examples of my students who I am very pleased with where they are intellectually. I can't say that is true for all of them.

A second male teacher educator, who is pessimistic about the potential for success, characterizes his own success as "not very well." He explained, "It is a struggle to prevent preservice teachers from viewing the culturally different as the culturally 'other,' with a capital O." He indicated that he does not want his students to view cultural minorities as exotic, such as an exotic creature viewed from a distance, similar to taking a trip to the

zoo, to see exotic animals. He noted that this is a very common reaction among preservice teachers. He explained,

> The danger of simply introducing people [prospective teachers] to other cultures is that it is kind of a classic and logical problem; that they kind of approach it as a trip to the zoo. They sort of say, "Wow, look at this; this is what it is like living in a housing project in New York City. There are shootings all the time and drug dealers are roaming the streets. It is exciting; it is scary; it plucks your heart's strings; it makes you feel like it is terrible that these kids have to grow up like that and that I want to be able to do something for them. That is not a bad response, but it doesn't necessarily lead anywhere and it may, in fact, have the exact opposite affect that you want. In other words, to erect an enormous barrier between them and the others. Then they very easily start to slide into a them vs. us discussion. It is like two different worlds, and all I have done is visited this world and made it as strange as possible.

However, he is optimistic that he will be able to prepare as many students as possible to work in diverse settings.

The Long-Term: The Maintenance of Cultural Awareness

I will examine beliefs held by teacher educators about the long-term effectiveness of their instruction of preservice teachers, and how significantly this will impact the future development of these educators. In addition to the difficulties teacher educators face in the educational process in the short-term, there is concern that the message they are attempting to impart to students will, in fact, make any significant impact on the professional development of these educators in the long-run; after they have entered the teaching profession and have become integrated into the professional-educator culture.

A male teacher educator came to the conclusion that the responsibility falls squarely on the shoulders of the prospective teacher to do the necessary maintenance work for not only retaining an awareness, but also increasing their understanding of the issues. As he explained, it is up to them ". . . to keep the ball rolling." A female teacher educator who shares these concerns explained, "It is hard for them. I mean because they are at the same

time trying to create their own practice. They are trying to be successful, and they are trying to be successful in an environment that might not hold the same kind of principles that they do." She indicated that newly trained teachers face the task of trying to maintain their views on multicultural education in a professional educator culture that places heavy pressure on them to conform to the prevailing instructional ideology, which, she believes, may be detrimental to increasing learning opportunities for students of color.

Often times, newly trained teachers are discouraged from practicing what they have learned about multicultural education. A female teacher educator indicated that many of her former students have reported back to her about the difficulties they have encountered in their first year of teaching. A common complaint, which frustrates many newly trained educators, she indicated, was that they were not allowed to use their training, since many of the practices fall outside the ideology of the professional educator culture. For example, a former student who tried to give diverse learners specialized instruction ran into problems. She said,

> When other white teachers say, "There is no problem in my classroom, I teach all kids the same way," and they almost wear that as a badge of honor, "that I am not being prejudiced." Well, there is this new kid who came out of MSU who says, "Well, you should treat them differently." That puts their [newly trained teacher's] head up against the wall. They are in schools, so given those constraints beyond the physical constraints of a curricula, of 30 kids, of testing, of doing right by your mentor teacher.

Teacher educators face many difficulties in their practice as educators. In this chapter, I have surveyed the constraints that they identified in their practice, the difficulties in measuring success as teachers, and the prospect of knowing that their influence on students may be short-lived after they enter the teaching profession.

Chapter 9

ANTHROPOLOGY AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

In this thesis, I conducted an anthropological case study of teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education in MSU's teacher education program. One purpose of this study was to survey the forces that shape and influence these social actors; the intent of this study was to inform the practitioners about the complexity of the reform discourse at the local level, and to encourage a dialogue between teacher educators and anthropologists regarding how the concept of culture is constructed and used in multicultural education.

Through the ethnographic method, I have documented the interactions of these teacher educators who, through their behavior, produce a complex local context, which is subject to analysis. By examining their narrative statements, I have attempted to illustrate and document the issues that they confront in their practice. I have described the setting where they work, the students they teach, the intellectual concepts that guide their work, and the constraints they face. In addition to surveying the local context, this study addressed two questions. First, how is the concept of culture defined by the teacher educators that I consulted? Second, what approaches to multicultural education do these teacher educators use?

In regard to the first question, I have recorded how culture is used among these teacher educators, and I have determined whether these definitions are a Boas-Benedict notion of culture, as Wax (1993) has argued; another question implicit to this study is the validity of Wax's hypothesis. Is Wax correct to assert, without empirical evidence, that teacher educators use this particular notion of culture? As my research demonstrates,

there are teacher educators who use this perspective on culture, but it only represents one of many competing definitions. There appears to be a wide range of available approaches to culture, but the majority do not seem to be based on the Boas-Benedict model of culture. In fact, some of the teacher educators that I consulted do not use the concept of culture; they have chosen to use other intellectual concepts that more closely match the purpose of their work. Thus, I argue that Wax's assertion is an invalid position.

The culture concept or alternate concepts chosen by teacher educators, as I have demonstrated, become the core of the multicultural education approach they use in their practice. That is, culture becomes the teacher educator's world-view, and it positions his or her educational practice.

My findings are also of value to the discipline of anthropology. In recent years, several anthropologists have argued that anthropology has been systematically excluded from the current multiculturalism discourse; many of these papers, such as Wax's, raise awareness of this problem, but do not attempt to address it. This study, I believe, is just such an attempt: to take the anthropological lens and apply it to the multiculturalism discourse. My research represents an effort to move beyond the reaction papers cited in this study, and to ethnographically address the question of how teacher educators practice multicultural education, and define culture.

The absence of an anthropological understanding of culture from this local discourse seems to agree with the commonly held belief that anthropologists are being ignored in the current multiculturalism discourse, since only one of the teacher educators that I consulted is, in fact, trained in anthropology. However, my study demonstrates that teacher educators do, in fact, hold more sophisticated notions of culture than many anthropologists realize. These circumstances raise the question of whether other teacher education programs mirror this one under study; if so, there appears to be fertile ground for anthropologists to get involved in addressing the research issues that teacher educators already confront in their work. Not only will anthropologists be in the position to apply

the unique anthropological perspective to the research agenda, they can directly participate in reformulating the culture concept, as Wax clearly indicates is necessary.

The second question this thesis addressed was to survey and classify the approaches to multicultural education that the teacher educators I interviewed use in their practice. Multicultural education, and predecessor reform movements, have a long history in teacher education. Until now no systematic information on an actual response to the current multicultural education discourse at the local level has been available to the educational community; my study represents an effort to make such information available to teacher educators.

It is through this empirical study that I have documented the wide range of approaches that teacher educators can bring to bear in addressing this increasingly important question. By having this information available to teacher educators, I believe, they will be in a much better position to understand the wider range of issues they must address in their own work, which will provide opportunities for new insights in the practice of multicultural education.

As was discussed in Chapter 6, the individual multicultural education approach is the vehicle by which the teacher educator positions the issues and problems that are central to his or her practice. The approach embodies the amassed theoretical and pedagogical positions held by the teacher educator, which represents a set of beliefs and methods used to prepare prospective teachers to work in diverse classrooms. In this study, I have documented six approaches that are used among the teacher educators that I consulted. They are: 1) the celebration of diversity approach, 2) the social knowledge and power approach, 3) the service-learning approach, 4) the cultural difference approach, 5) the ideology deconstruction and reconstruction approach, 6) the social construction and ecology approach. Each of the above approaches are distinguishable in terms of their theoretical assumptions and instructional method.

By taking an anthropological approach in studying this group of teacher educators, an

important benefit of this study is that it allows for teacher educators to see themselves at the local level; this view would be not available without the ethnographic-based case study approach, which this study represents. This provides an opportunity to contrast between assumptions between the local and the national discourse. Second, this study has provided a glimpse of who the typical preservice teacher is that teacher educators will be encountering in their practice.

One significant conclusion of this study is that at the local level a majority of the teacher educators that I interviewed are very much concerned with the practice of multicultural education; this differs from the national discourse, where there is much greater interest in the theoretical aspect of multicultural education. This local case study seems to differ with the commonly held belief that theory far out weighs the practice of multicultural education, since the teacher educators that I consulted appear to be very concerned with this issue. One can only speculate whether this trend observed in MSU's teacher education program is at the forefront of a national trend.

While there has been much discussion about the attributes of the typical preservice teacher in the literature, this study represents an actual documented case study of a group of teacher educators, and their beliefs about the preservice teachers that they are preparing to enter the teaching profession. Virtually every one of the teacher educators that I consulted held similar views regarding the challenges they face in preparing their students. That is, these preservice teachers who are white, female, and middle class generally do not realize they are cultural beings--only minorities possess culture. To teach preservice teachers that they are, in fact, cultural beings is a formidable task that teacher educators must overcome.

Having conducted this case study of teacher educators who are involved in multicultural education an important question is raised by the findings of this study. After having documented the approaches to multicultural education at the local level, one possible avenue for further research would be to expand this analysis of cultural

perceptions/definitions by tracing the historical background of these approaches. That is, what is the milieu giving rise to the characteristics of these approaches? This is a fruitful question. By documenting the intellectual schools-of-thought that teacher educators have acquired, it will provide answers to why anthropology has been marginalized in the multiculturalism discourse.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Biographical Data

1. Please tell me about your professional background. May I have a copy of your CV?

Multicultural Education: An Overview

1. How do you define the concept of multiculturalism or diversity?

2. In your view, do you see a difference between the concept of diversity and multicultural education?

3. How do you define multicultural education? What model do you use in your work?

4. What cultural and ethnic background do your students generally have?

5. How important is it to understand your own cultural background in trying to understand another's? What characteristics of your own background are important?

Views on Culture and Ethnicity:

1. How do you conceive the concept of culture? What does it mean for you in your work?

2. How do you conceive of ethnicity? What does it mean for you in your work?

Multicultural Education and the Curriculum:

1. What is your own educational model, describing the process, of an individual moving from a state of cultural intolerance to a final stage of accepting cultural diversity? What characteristics does a multicultural person possess?

2. Is there too much multiculturalism in the curriculum or not enough? Why?

3. Could you describe the level of diversity v. the level of homogeneity found in the

program. How do you think this effects the credibility of the program?

4. How relatively successful were you in teaching the component on diversity in your course? Give an example. What assignments did you design and implement to teach about cultural diversity? How successful have you been in disseminating ideas of cultural tolerance to your students? Give an example.

Anthropological Perspectives on Diversity and Multicultural Education

1. What contribution do you believe anthropology can make to your work?

2. What anthropological ideas or methods do you use in your research or teaching?

3. Do you have a background in anthropology?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlquist, Roberta

1992 "Manifestations of Inequality: Overcoming Resistance in Multicultural Foundation Course," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Arends, Richard I., Shelly Clemson, and James Henkelman

1992 "Tapping Nontraditional Sources of Minority Teaching Talent," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Banks, James A.

1993 "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," in *Review of Research in Education* 19. Edited by Linda Darling-Hammond. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Brown, Carlton E.

1992 "Restructuring for a New America," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chinn, Philip C. and Gay Yuen Wong

1992 "Recruiting and Retaining Asian/Pacific American Teachers," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clifford, James

1988 *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dilworth, Mary E.

1992 "Preface," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fox, Richard G., ed.

1991 *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present.* Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Garibaldi, Antoine M.
1992 "Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Classrooms," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gay, G.
1992 "The State of Multicultural Education in the United States," in *Education in Plural Societies: International Perspectives.* Edited by K. Adam-Moodley. Calgary: Detselig.

Geertz, Clifford
1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gibson, Margaret Alison
1984 "Approaches to Multicultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumptions." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 15(1):94-119.

Gollnick, Donna M.
1992a "Understanding the Dynamics of Race, Class, and Gender," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
1992b "Multicultural Education: Policies and Practice in Teacher Education," in *Research and Multicultural Education: From the Margins to the Mainstream.* Edited by Carl A. Grant. London: The Falmer Press.

Grant, Carl A. and Susan Miller
1992 "Research and Multicultural Education: Barriers, Needs, and Boundaries," in *Research and Multicultural Education: From the Margins to the Mainstream.* Edited by Carl A. Grant. London: The Falmer Press.

Greenbaum, Susan D.
1992 "Multiculturalism and Political Correctness: The Challenge of Applied Anthropology in Curricular Politics." *Human Organization* 51(4):408-12.

Irvine, Jacqueline Jordon
1992 "Making Teacher Education Culturally Responsive," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kobus, Doni Kwolek
1992 "Multicultural/Global Education: An Educational Agenda for the Rights of the Child." *Social Education* 56(4):224-27.

Kroeber, Alfred and Clyde Kluckhohm
1952 *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria
1994 "What we can Learn from Multicultural Education Research." *Educational Leadership* 51(8):22-26.
1992a "The Multicultural Mission: Unity and Diversity." *Social Education* 56(5): 308-11.
1992b "Culturally Relevant Teaching: The Key to Making Multicultural Education Work," in *Research and Multicultural Education: From the Margins to the Mainstream.* Edited by Carl A. Grant. London: The Falmer Press.

Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer
1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Michigan State University, College of Education
1988 *Report of the Task Force for Reform of Teacher Education at Michigan State University.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Michigan State University, Office of the Registrar
1995 *Student Profile.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Ortner, Sherry
1984 "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126-66.

Peacock, James L.
1986 *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perry, Richard J.
1992 "Why do Multiculturalists Ignore Anthropologists?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 4:A52.

Prattle, R.
1983 "Multicultural Education: Four Normative Arguments." *Educational Theory* 33:21-32.

Rosaldo, Renato
1993 *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Sahlins, Marshall
1976 *Culture and Practical Reason.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sleeter, Christine E. and Carl A. Grant
1987 "An Analysis of Multicultural Education in the United States." *Harvard Educational Review* 57(4):421-444.

Turner, Terence
1993 "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology that Multiculturalists Should be Mindful of it?" *Cultural Anthropology* 8(4):411-429.

Tylor, Edward B.
1871 "Primitive Culture." London: J. Murray. Quoted in Paul Bohannan and Mark Glazer, *High Points in Anthropology.* New York: Knopf, 1973.

Wax, Murray L.
1993 "How Culture Misdirects Multiculturalism." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 24(2):99-115.

Winfield, Linda F. and JoAnn B. Manning
1992 "Changing School Culture to Accommodate Student Diversity," in *Diversity in Teacher Education: New Expectations.* Edited by Mary Dilworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

U.S. News and World Reports
1995 "Education Schools." *America's Best Graduate Schools.*

Zeichner, Kenneth
1992 *Educating Teachers for Cultural Diversity.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, Michigan State University.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV
3129301405