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ABSTRACT

NICHOLAS J. SHUDAK: What Does Diversity Mean? Analyzing for the Meaning of Diversity within the Teacher Education Discourse
(Under the direction of Dr. Lynda Stone)

This dissertation is an analytical exploration and evaluation of the concept of diversity. It springs from the author’s concern that within the teacher education discourse there is an apparent deficiency regarding analytical effort toward challenging ordinary terms, their strong convictions, and categorical statements stemming from them. In particular, what is of concern is the lack of attention paid toward exploring the assumptions that underlie the bold proclamations involving the ordinary yet powerful and arguably loosely defined term, diversity. Specifically speaking, it is a three step attempt toward conceptually clarifying diversity’s meaning within the teacher education discourse.

In doing so, this dissertation accomplishes three things: 1) it develops a common sense understanding of diversity; 2) provides a thematic review of the teacher education literature; and, 3) develops an original hybridized form of philosophical conceptual analysis referred to as a net-type analysis. The analysis is then applied to a purposefully selected set of artifacts culled from the literature review.

In the least, this dissertation procures two interesting finds. The first find is that diversity’s meaning can be understood in two dimensions. The first dimension is a reference to demographic considerations pertaining to race and culture. This is diversity’s descriptive dimension. And second, diversity is a reference to some action that should be
taken in light of the demographic considerations. This is diversity’s *normative* dimension.

These two dimensions are inseparably bound. Metaphorically speaking, diversity is a double helix having as its helices the two aforementioned dimensions. The second find, and analytically speaking, diversity as used in teacher education is really a reference to a body of knowledge and a set of skills that help reduce any “cultural mismatch” that might occur when White teachers teach students of color.
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In his attempt to introduce a new metaphor – craft – into the teaching profession, Alan Tom begins by commenting on the literature pertaining to teaching. Throughout his career, he has come to see that “much of the literature on teaching and related topics is replete with undefined terms, dogmatic in nature, and inattentive to assumptions” (7).

These three concerns are quite related. Many terms go undefined, or carelessly so, because they are simply part of the daily professional language. Any need for clarity goes unrecognized. Dogmatism occurs when the literature is insular and new ideas are really new ways of stating old ideas to the already converted. What is missing, according to Tom, is analytical power to challenge the terms, their strong convictions, and categorical statements stemming from them. This would take positive steps toward shoring up a “serious deficiency.” According to Tom, there is a lack of attention paid toward exploring the assumptions underlying bold proclamations oftentimes involving powerful yet loosely defined terms (8). Tom’s attempt to address these concerns was by introducing to the profession the metaphor of “teaching as a moral craft.” To do this, however, involved a serious evaluation and reassessment of the very mundane, ordinary, and taken for granted term of teaching.
Unlike Tom, I have no desire to introduce a new metaphor to my professional field of teacher education. In this work, however, I do follow Tom in one respect. Whereas he was explicitly concerned with evaluating the ordinary, undefined, dogmatic, and assumptive term of *teaching*, I turn my attention toward an analytical exploration and evaluation of *diversity*. The goal of this dissertation is the conceptual clarification of diversity, and not because the field is confused or full of dispute regarding its meaning, but because diversity has become so ordinary.

This introduction is designed to accomplish two things. First, I establish my position in relation to diversity, a position that acts as the impetus behind this work. Implicit within this discussion is a statement of the problem, the purpose for such an exploration, and the significance of the study at hand. And second, I explain my overall approach to this exploration. It is what many will recognize as the essay.

**Taking a Stand**

*A Personal Position*

I begin with an acknowledgment of my personal position about diversity. On my view, and in the many realms of education, the concept of diversity is quite influential and powerful. For this reason, diversity is essentially a normative concept concerned with right conduct and valued ends. In this sense, diversity is morally-laden.

My specific concern with diversity, as my experience in education informs, is that its virtues are espoused and pronounced in the absence of proof or without standing against serious and systematic criticism. My experience also suggests that those who look at diversity with a suspicious eye are also looked upon with equal suspicion. If this is so,
which I think it is, and by definition, diversity as an educational concept is dogmatic. Borrowing again from Tom, educational terms or concepts used in dogmatic ways are usually loosely defined and suffer from an inattention to undergirding assumptions. When concepts are powerful, influential, morally-laden, and dogmatic, there is reason for concern. It is my position that diversity is just such a concept. A few examples follow.

On college campuses, it is a common occurrence to hear that diversity is something to celebrate and respect. For example, Northern Illinois University suggests that diversity is something in which we should find unity. Stanford University’s groundbreaking Office of Multicultural Development (OMD) goes a bit further. According to their Affirmative Action Plan, our society is multiethnic and multiracial, and because so “new thinking” incorporating diversity is society’s means toward harmony. The plan continues to state that “diversity is fundamental to the pursuit of excellence and knowledge,” a reality that students need to accept and understand (Parker).

In terms of activities, some campuses across the country, including Stanford, have designated specific weeks or months to enjoining the campus communities around taking in and appreciating the valued good of diversity. Utah State University’s inaugural celebration of Diversity Week occurred in the Fall semester of 2001 and is still going

__1__Northern Illinois University has “Unity in Diversity” as a motto. On that campus there is a “Unity in Diversity Steering Committee” which coordinates “the university's Unity in Diversity activities and calendar of events designed to acknowledge, educate, and celebrate the diversity of the Northern Illinois University campus community relative to race, gender, sexual orientation, culture, religion, and physical ability.” This information can be found at the following site: http://www.niu.edu/u_council/commbook/unitydiv.htm.
strong. Montclair State just celebrated its 3rd Annual Diversity Week this past academic year: a week dedicated to instilling “a university-wide appreciation and tolerance for diverse perspectives while uniting students, faculty, staff, alumni, and surrounding community members in an inclusive setting.” Diversity Month at Seattle University is on its sixth year whereas Diversity Month at Indiana University’s School of Education doesn’t seem to have made it past the 1998-1999 academic year, though similar activities occur through their Commission On Multicultural Understanding.

Taking a look at things closer to teacher education, popular preservice teacher textbooks espouse the virtues of diversity. An introductory level foundations textbook posits that a “guiding principle on the nature and purpose of education” is the belief that “diversity provides students with important new information and perspectives that expand their minds, open their hearts, and prepare them better for global citizenship” (Breitborde and Swinarski 18). Another textbook geared for students studying elementary social studies methods comments that “social studies lessons help learners understand people both in the present and in the past with all their fascinating diversity” (Savage and Armstrong 9) and that “diversity is something to be welcomed, not feared” (17). And a bit more predictably, a multicultural education textbook asserts that such an education “assumes that diversity enriches a nation and increases the ways in which its citizens can

---


4 See Kara Salge, Indiana Daily Student, November 5, 1998
perceive and solve personal and public problems” (Banks 1). For these reason diversity is obviously a good thing.

For students in teacher education programs, their chances at graduation hinge on their “dispositions” in relation to this thing called diversity. For professors, their continued employment within certain departments of education on equal employment opportunity campuses lie in the balance of how well their courses incorporate diversity related issues. For new professors entering the professoriate, consideration for open positions depends on how well their diversity statements are received by search committees. And for administrators focused on accreditation, it is politically and professionally expedient for them to follow the winds toward achieving diversity in terms of faculty hires, course offerings, and student admission, retention, and graduation. To this extent it can be said that diversity matters and is an encompassing project undertaken simultaneously by many people in many places.

If, according to the above reasons, diversity does matter and is a normative and valued good, then seemingly one could safely assume that diversity means something. It must mean something in order to answer a few of the more obvious questions. For example, what does it mean that teachers should have dispositions oriented toward something called diversity? How can dispositions even be oriented without knowing the something toward which they are being oriented? What does a course look like that incorporates diversity related issues as opposed to other issues? How should a diversity statement read making it is really a statement about diversity and not something else? What makes one faculty hire or admitted student more diverse than another? Is there an agreed upon calculus to determine this, and, who is doing the agreeing? How can
administrations that are expending energy recruiting and retaining some faculty/students over others know that their efforts are toward diversity? Is it really possible to find unity within diversity? How can we possibly know? What does it look like? Are there precedent setting examples? Why are assume that diversity leads to harmony? Why is diversity fascinating? Is the kind of diversity a hiring committee is concerned with the same diversity that helps elementary students solve problems? And, can any of these questions be answered without knowing the meaning of diversity?

Statement of Problem and Purpose

Borrowing again from Tom, what I see as a problem is that diversity, especially in teacher education, is ubiquitous though ill-defined, is dogmatic in the discourse, and little attention is paid to its assumptions. In other words, diversity is taken for granted. The ensuing study is geared toward showing that this is so and doing something about it. Diversity is too influential not to think critically about what it means, why, and the implications of its meaning.

Furthermore, I believe the discourse has come to a point whereat efforts should be directed toward wondering whether the interests in diversity are warranted. Teacher education, as a discourse, should seriously consider taking up the issue of whether the project of diversity should continue. As I see it, this dissertation is a nascent effort toward orienting the discourse in the direction toward wondering about the meaning and efficacy of diversity as a concept and project. It is my position that the first place to begin is by taking steps in the direction of conceptual clarity. In other words, if the efficacy of diversity is at issue, which I think it should be, then it is important for the discourse to have precision regarding what diversity means conceptually.
Simply stated, the present work inquires into “What does diversity mean as used in the teacher education discourse?” Its purpose is to provide conceptual clarity as a base upon which future inquiry can take place. To accomplish this I take three steps. First I develop a common sense understanding of diversity. Second I provide a thematic review of the teacher education literature. This review is organizational. It categorizes the purposes for writing about diversity and classifies the uses of diversity within each purpose. And third, I develop a hybridized form of conceptual analysis and apply it to a small, purposefully selected sample of artifacts culled from the reviewed literature. This is my attempt at heeding Tom’s advice and providing the discourse with analytical work revolving around a salient concept: diversity.

Significance of Study

The significance of this study is not that it is the first to inquire into or look for the meaning of diversity. Some precedent does exist as the following chapters will indicate. What is significant and unique, however, is that the inquiry occurs within the discourse of teacher education, and, it is analytical in nature. What I am offering to teacher education that is original and substantive is an exploratory attempt at clarifying diversity. I do this not by stripping it of assumptions, but by lying bare its assumptions, and by shining light on the discourse’s dogmatism and categorical statements pertaining to diversity. It is my way of providing the discourse with a mirror and asking whether this is what the discourse wants to see, and whether this is what it wants others to see. As with many explorations, there is the chance I don’t find what I’m looking for, but I do think the reward is worth the risk.
Overall Approach: The Essay as Exploratory Methodology

Though I consider this exploration of diversity methodological, research based, and philosophical, it is largely written as an essay. As Scholes et al. inform, essay is “a very flexible form and has been so ever since it originated with the sixteenth-century French writer Montaigne” (4). According to the authors, Montaigne used the essay “as a means of exploring himself and his ideas about human experience, in a sense, a means of thinking on paper, of trying things out in writing” (ibid.). Montaigne called these explorations thought exercises, or essais, which, according to Scholes et al., is derived from the French verb essayer, meaning to try. This dissertation is an exploration into finding the meaning of diversity as well as the trying out of a practical and philosophical methodology to do so.

The term essay has become a catch-all word for much non-fictional prose, particularly works of shorter length, though this is not necessarily a rule. Many essays are not literary in any respect and are quite practical pieces of writing designed to accomplish a particular purpose such as exploring an idea, explaining, reporting, or persuading through an argument and can at times be lengthy. Such straight-forward, strictly business and no-nonsense writing is meant to get something done quickly in the world, and because so, “they are likely to be systematically organized, factually detailed, closely reasoned, and plainly written. Their form is as downright efficient as a chair, a bowl, or a candlestick” (Scholes et al. 3).

Much writing in the social sciences fits into this category. Though there is a methodology and a science behind the writing, there is always a position or perspective. The mark of an essay is whether the author has a position to convey and uses the medium
of writing to go about persuading the audience of the position’s legitimacy. Usefulness, however, does not preclude beauty; for something that is as utilitarian as a chair, an apt carpenter can beautifully transform one into a throne.

More than likely, many of the essays one will come across are somewhere in between, though leaning more so toward the literary rather than the utilitarian mode. To help enliven an essay’s essential persuasive quality, many authors borrow from the literary elements of narrative, drama, and poetry.

A narrative essay is closest to the common story, an historical account, involving persons, events, and is set in a particular setting. The author generally takes the role of the storyteller who is reporting something for a definite purpose.

The dramatic essay finds the author taking the position of the director who sets the scene and introduces characters, but who lets the characters unfold the story. In some essays heavily leaning on this dramatic element, it is hard to tell the difference between the main character and the author/director. Plato’s dialogues come to mind here.

Lastly, when an essayist borrows from poetic elements, the essay reads as a personal meditation, as if the reader is overhearing the author talking to himself or is actually inside the head of the author. Some exemplar authors who masterfully combine all elements are George Orwell and Virginia Woolf.

As an essayist, Orwell definitely has a political purpose for writing, and wishes “to push the world in a certain direction,” by transforming writing into an art. On his terms, he wouldn’t think of writing “…even a long magazine article, if it were not also an esthetic experience” for himself and the reader (Scholes et al. 3). One of his more famous essays – “Shooting an Elephant” – combines his goal of anti-imperialist political writing
that has a point with good storytelling that leaves the reader in a state of discomfiture about the paradoxes of colonial imperialism. Orwell’s essays borrow from multiple literary elements. The reader is left wondering whether the account is autobiographical, a work of historical/realistic fiction, or a piece of absolute fiction.

Regarding the purpose of essay, Virginia Woolf is of the position that essays are for pleasurable contemplation. According to Wolf, “The principle which controls [the writing of an essay] is simply that it should give us pleasure…Everything in an essay must be subdued to that end.” By immersing the reader into the world of dramatic and poetic imagination, even about real-world affairs, the essay according to Woolf “should lay us under a spell with its first word, and we should only wake, refreshed, with its last. In the interval we may pass through…amusement, surprise, interest, indignation…but we must never be roused. The essay must lap us about and draw its curtain across the world” (Scholes et. al. 4). She does this quite well in her essay “The Death of a Moth.” At first she is enthralled by the movements of a moth, constrained by the world of the wooden window sills and the glass pane. However, she soon forgets about this moth until she notices that the moth is no longer moving as it was. Her description of the moth’s condition and its descent to death, though of a common insect, moves the reader to contemplate the helplessness of death. A question the reader is left with is how odd and uncomfortable it is to contemplate something so common.

The essay also finds a home in philosophy. Philosophical essays are exploratory and closely adhere to Montaigne’s sentiment of “thought exercise.” One of the more notable, though not necessarily well known, essays in philosophy is Stephen Toulmin’s Cosmopolis. On his terms, he wrote an essay that “chronicles a change in mind (ix); an
essay written to “enable readers to recognize, and even follow, the steps that led [him] both to a more complex picture of the birth of Modernity, and to more sanguine ideas of how the 17th century’s achievements could be humanized, and so redeemed (xi). His is very organized, detailed, and written to persuade, yet narrative, meditative, and almost poetic at times.

Toulmin’s goal, along with chronicling his change in mind, is to convince readers through detailed argumentation that they, too, might consider a change in mind if their intellectual trajectory at all matches his. For Toulmin, he would have the reader consider that “The very project of Modernity…seems to have lost momentum, and we need to fashion a successor program” (3). And the reason Modernity is losing momentum is for the simple reason that the ideas that held it together, albeit for about 300 years, no longer carry the same type of cohesive and totalizing conviction that it was used to.

For Toulmin, we are in a bit of a philosophical and scientific identity crisis. As he sees it, the ideas of the 17th century humanists and romantics such as Montaigne lost out to the more theoretical and rational ideas of Descartes. The Cartesian rationality that guaranteed a well organized, planned, predictable, and certain world was appealing to those in positions of power and influence, those capable of funding Modern scientific and philosophical projects. Generally speaking, however, there was something exciting about this new vision and use of science and philosophy. The excitement surrounding such thinking was that humanity could finally rely on itself to control its own fate, to improve its conditions, and no longer had to rely on stifling and superstitious organized forms of religion or be held captive to the whims of nature. Free from such constraints, humanity
was able to progress toward perfectibility, to rise out of the Dark Ages and challenge the civilizations of an ancient past.

To take such control, all science had to do was to find the immutable laws governing humanity through the laws of nature and of society. To find such laws scientists and philosophers developed the very systematic and rational science of empiricism. To develop this science, to take control, and to plan toward certainty, 17th century scientists and philosophers set aside and turned away from humanistic knowing. No longer was science and philosophy concerned with the type of knowledge that came from the oral, the particular, the local, or the timely, but concerned itself with knowledge that was in written form, universal, general, and timeless. Toulmin’s point, and one he works to convince his audience of, is that perhaps humanity would be better off if science and philosophy erred toward the side of and reverted to that of 17th century humanism.

What makes Toulmin’s essay so wonderful, is that he masterfully tells the story of this intellectual change. Though the reader knows at the outset that Toulmin is critiquing Modernism, he tells the story of the rise of Modernism and the concomitant counter-movements. The reader hears about the lives of those involved, the intellectual and historical contexts, and the tensions that might have led to the rise of one instead of the other. Toulmin does this in an entrancing and storybook type of way. An excellent example of this is his recasting of the story of the assassination of King Henry IV of France, also known as King Henry of Navarre as an “epoch making” event and one emblematic of the change from humanism to something resembling rationalism. In classic storybook fashion, Toulmin begins his account with “The year is 1610; the date is May 14; the time is early afternoon; the place is the rue de La Ferronnerie in Paris” (46).
Toulmin is an exemplar at using essay to prove explore as well as prove a philosophical point.

Pertaining to education related work and study, perhaps one of the more well known and read essayists is Neil Postman. Though his institutional affiliations were more closely related to culture, media communication, and technology, he had a close affinity to K-12 public education. As mentioned earlier, the word essay is exploratory in intent and comes from the French verb *essayer*, meaning to try. Postman is used here to illustrate the purposefulness of essay in helping others think through different ideas pertaining to the whys and ends of education; to illustrate how essays pertaining to education can exemplify the exploration and trying out of ideas, or, the sharing of ideas so others can try them out.

In one of his earlier book length essays – keeping in mind his career spanned over four decades – Postman tries out, and encourages others to try as well, the idea that perhaps we should view *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*. Postman’s (and co-author Charles Weingartner’s) jumping off point is that schools are exactly as we have created them to be, and that’s the problem. As they see them, schools are irrelevant and obsolete sites that foster unintelligence, engender fear, are concerned with insignificant learning, induce alienation, and punish creativity and independence. If this is so, as they seem to believe, then it is the responsibility of those caring, thoughtful, and concerned teachers to teach in a way that subverts this condition and make a change.⁵

---

⁵ Postman and Weingartner borrow these ideas from a host of other scholars whose work was directed toward education, though the authors can hardly be considered as working within the education establishment.
On their view, a significant change would be a change in perception and attitude regarding the role of the school in society. According to Postman and Weingartner, “the history of the human group is that it has been a continuing struggle against the veneration of ‘crap’” (3). To that end, they “have in mind a new education that would set out to cultivate just such people – experts at ‘crap detecting’” (ibid.). The remainder of their essay is the trying out of that idea, and includes blank pages as a way to encourage the reader to try out it out as well. In short, they are concerned that in a society of rapid technological and social change, students aren’t being prepared to deal with the changes in an intellectual or skeptical sense. Schools are basically sites that help students accommodate and adapt to the change, instead of helping students critique the change or figure out whether the change is good, bad, necessary, whimsical, etc. Postman and Weingartner believe that if this is the case, that schools aren’t concerned with helping students think through the onset of social change, then schools are acting in a very non-democratic way. And if schools are in fact acting non- or even anti-democratically, then it is the responsibility of good democratic citizens to want teaching that is subversive.

About ten years later, Postman seems to have had a change in heart. In the prologue to Teaching as a Conserving Activity, he comments that “I do not seem to be facing in the same direction as I was in 1967. Frankly, I do not know if I have turned or everything else has” (2). Whereas his former essay was the trying out of an idea suggesting that teaching and schools should be pushing society in a particular direction for particular purposes, this essay is more suggestive of schools as being a stabilizing force for society, thus the language of conserving in the title.
The idea Postman tries out, and would have the reader do so as well, is ecological. To do this, he focuses on the importance of balance in relation to environments and ecosystems. To this point, Postman comments that “The stability and vitality of an environment depend not on what is in the environment, but on the interplay of its elements; that is, on their diverse and dynamic complementarities. … but without doubt the most important form of complementarity is opposition. … What makes something good or useful is the existence of some opposing force which keeps it under control” (18). In other words, and on Postman’s terms, healthful environments depend on what he calls “oppositional complementarity”. To illustrate this point, he uses the trope of thermostat.

A balance to any system requires some feedback mechanism. One of the more well known systems for providing feedback and triggering oppositional complementarity is the thermostat. A thermostat includes a thermometer that reads temperature as a form of feedback, but also contains a trigger mechanism that cools warm environments and warms cooler environments. As Postman suggests, “A thermostat, in short, releases a counterargument…and for this reason it provides an apt metaphor for the educational function I wish here to introduce and develop: Education is best conceived of as a thermostatic activity” (19). To this point, Postman asserts that “education tries to conserve tradition when the rest of the environment is innovative. Or it is innovative when the rest of the society is tradition-bound. …The function of education is always to offer the counterargument…” (ibid.). The idea that Postman is trying out via the essay is that education is a check and balance of society. The more apt metaphor for education is
that of a thermostat, not a vehicle of sorts taking society in this direction or that as
intimated in an earlier essay.

There is import and a relationship of the above essay to the one being developed
here. Though this work is not concerned with providing any sort of counterargument or
oppositional complementarity, it is an exploration concerned with providing mirror-like
feedback that might provoke complementarity as envisioned by Postman, feedback that
might inspire work geared toward checking and balancing the work involving diversity in
education. To provide this feedback, I borrow from the work of another essayist, one
whose work inspired Postman and one whose work is a skeletal foundation of mine.

The essayist, if one can call him that, who is the most influential regarding the
form taken by this dissertation’s analysis chapter is the noted critic and pioneering
philosopher of media studies and modern mass communication, Marshall McLuhan. In
no way do I consider myself a devout student of McLuhan’s or even an avid reader of his
work. I am, however, familiar and taken with one of his earlier works that explores,
assesses, and critiques the affects of mass media upon people, *The Mechanical Bride:
Folklore of Industrial Man*. In this early work, McLuhan uses techniques commonly
reserved for art or literary criticism and applies them to consumer ads, comics, and pieces
found in the popular press.

*The Mechanical Bride* is comprised of fifty-nine sections of reproduced printed
artifacts with accompanying critical essays that can be read in any order. McLuhan sets
out to analyze the chosen artifacts through a method that sets the reader at center stage
and in the active position in relation to the artifacts and the affairs they represent; an
unusual position when taking in advertisement. On McLuhan’s terms, “Ours is the first
age in which many thousands of the best-trained minds have made it a full-time business to get inside the collective public mind…in order to manipulate, exploit, [and] control…[where generating] heat and not light is the intention” (v). In this work, McLuhan sets for himself the lofty goal of providing a critical account of the strategies at place in the mass media of advertising via the essay, an account of the strategies generating heat and not light. He sets out to reveal patterns that might allow people to take a more enlightened stance in relation to media communication and consumption, to prevent the helpless state of “prolonged mental rutting” engendered by ads and entertainment.

What I borrow from McLuhan is the procedure of his book in its barest form. McLuhan uses “commentaries on the [artifacts] merely as a means of releasing some of their intelligible meaning” (vii). His analyses and “commentaries are intended to provide positions from which to examine the exhibits” and his conclusions are merely points of departure to begin other explorations and conversations into the complexity of the ideas and concepts underlying the artifacts. This is what I borrow from him and it is what Postman borrowed as well. McLuhan examines and explores the unseen dimensions of media artifacts and provides commentaries as a result of his examination for others to try on and try out. His goal is to help others think through things that people don’t ordinarily think about: the message beyond and behind the product. I, too, attempt to do the same thing. Through a hybridized conceptual analysis of artifacts, I am hoping to uncover what many no longer even think about by exploring the literature for the meaning of diversity.

My undertaking here is more speculative than anything. I proceed in a way inspired by Postman and McLuhan. However, whereas McLuhan’s work is a critical
examination of society and in particular the media, mine is more of an exploration and analysis into clarifying an idea pervading society and specifically within the realm of teacher education. The general method to accomplish this is that of the essay, and essay is a definitional component of dissertation.  

---
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Searching for and struggling over diversity’s meaning is hardly unprecedented. What follows is the development of a common sense rendering of diversity, a rendering that I believe holds in many contexts, and borrows from various sources. This development is my first step toward conceptual clarification and occurs in two stages. The first stage is contextual. This stage briefly looks at the development of diversity within the larger and encapsulating sphere of multicultural education. The second stage is an attempt toward a more intellectually based development that borrows from scholars outside of education. This development, though necessarily incomplete, is a springboard for the following chapter’s thematic review of the literature, my second step.

**Contextual Development**

Understanding diversity outside of its connection to multicultural education is nearly impossible. One of the earliest links is found in an early statement by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). Quoted by Greenman and Kimmel, the 1973 statement reads that “Multicultural education rejects the view that schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that schools should merely tolerate cultural pluralism” (360). What multicultural education should do
is acknowledge our culture’s diversity, and help our students address diversity in multiple and positive ways (ibid.). What follows is a development of this tight and historical association.

According to James Banks, a long-time advocate, “Multicultural education is a reform movement designed to make some major changes in the education of students” (1). Those major changes are “designed to restructure educational institutions” so that all students can effectively function in a diverse world (8). It “is an education for freedom” (7) in that it broadens the interactive possibilities between people, contexts, and knowledge.

Multicultural education, as a movement, operates from the presumption that the United States is a deeply divided nation rather than a highly cohesive one (Banks 11). To create more social cohesion and unity, and using the schools as sites for such a struggle, multicultural education focuses on practices and policies that “recognize, accept, and affirm human differences and similarities related to gender, race, [disability], and class” (Sleeter and Grant 137), in a word: diversity. And, according to Sleeter and Grant, focusing on the strength and value of diversity toward some larger sense of unity is perhaps the number one goal of multicultural education (ibid.). It can be said that diversity and unity are twin goals.

That diversity and unity are twin goals is not by accident. According to Seelye and Wasilewski, one of the more pressing concerns facing westernized nation-states is over how much diversity a nation can accommodate without loosing the vitality that is oftentimes found through a sense of unity (40). The tension between diversity and unity has been felt in the United States’ educational system since Mann’s efforts to standardize
educational experiences through a common school (Hlebowitsh). The common schools were not only the balance wheel of the social machinery through which equality of conditions could be more realistically reached, but indeed were aimed at creating a common American mentality and outlook through a standardized and standardizing experience. In reference to our national motto – *e pluribus unum*, out of many comes one – the common schools sought to create *unum* out of the *pluribus*. The presumption was that national viability was an outgrowth of uniformity. For roughly 100 years this was the operational premise of American education, and what multicultural education seeks to dismantle.

It has only been in the last fifty years that the United States has started an emergent process toward becoming officially a pluralistic society. A few landmark legislative cases mark this shift. Most notably were the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* case in 1954 and subsequent court ordered dictates to desegregate schools. But also were the various forms of Civil Rights legislation that gave us the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as affirmative action programs opening up business and educational opportunities. These cases represented an official shift toward finding viability in embracing our nation’s diversity. They represent a shift toward what Banks refers to as the necessary negotiating, discussing, and restructuring of our national motto to more appropriately reflect the needs of the *pluribus* when constituting the *unum* (11).

Multicultural education seeks to reformulate the *unum*. This reformulation invariably involves “power sharing and participation” by people who have historically been left out of positions of power as well as prior formulations of *unum* (Banks 11). This means discussions and debates – demonstrations of equal status participation – to decide
how to achieve our *unum*. Of course the idea is to achieve *unum* in ways not replicating the damaging assimilative practices of the past, practices that required Catholics to read from a Bible they don’t believe in, Native Americans to cut their hair, and African-Americans to make concessions regarding their belonging to an inferior culture.

Multicultural education is a “structured process” intimately connected with diversity. It is a process by which the *pluribus* gets to decide on the *unum*. This can only happen, however, if people are educated to constructively understand, respect, and even accept the various differences (diversity) amongst us. But in accepting our differences (diversity), we as a society must also not loose sight of our significant similarities (unity) (Hoopes and Pusch).

Another tight connection is found through the work of Kincheloe and Steinberg. In their work titled *Changing Multiculturalism*, the authors admit that multiculturalism in education is changing because it means so many things to so many people. With that said, they too seek to change it by capturing it in another sense, what they refer to as “critical multiculturalism.” However, in order to do this, they develop four typologies of progressing and prior instantiations. Their development puts diversity at the cross-hairs, those typologies follow.

Their first typology is “conservative multiculturalism/monoculturalism.” According to Kincheloe and Steinberg, this instantiation is highly reactionary. Diversity is viewed as anything falling outside of what is socially dominant. Diversity is dangerous, a pejorative, something to eliminate if and when possible. The authors comment that adherents of this position seek to assimilate into the dominant culture all those who are capable of assimilating (4). The notions of “unity” and “common” are taken to mean
something very narrow and unchanging, and, are guarded notions. For those diverse peoples who don’t fit such a narrow conception, or don’t want to, they are marginalized and deemed reprobate.

Second, and with a few progressive steps away from the previous position, is “liberal multiculturalism.” Diversity in this case is viewed as something quite natural, especially in regards to unchangeable individual characteristics like sex and skin color. However, and what is more important, is that there are underlying and also natural commonalities amongst people, commonalities that bring people equally together. Adherents of this position want to bring people together and thus focus less on diversity, even if it is natural. Unfortunately this position, and according to the authors, really underestimates and even undermines the saliency of categorical differences – diversity – such as race, class, gender, ability, etc. Diversity, though not a bad thing, is oftentimes ignored in an effort to humanely bring people together under the broad umbrella of dominant society.

“Pluralist multiculturalism” is the third instantiation. In their progression, this position most closely accords with what might be considered a mainstream understanding of diversity. Here “diversity becomes intrinsically valuable and is pursued for its own sake to the point that difference is exoticized and fetishized” during efforts to celebrate diversity (Kincheloe and Steinberg 15). People are categorized into groups and are studied. Such studies are conducted for the sake of not only appreciating “diverse” groups, but also for the purpose of critiquing mainstream society in light of the knowledge owned by diverse groups. The value of diversity is that it might help purge society of its unsavory practices.
Fourth is their category of “left-essentialist multiculturalism.” Adherents of this position view categorical differences – race, class, gender – as embodying essential, unchanging, and unchallengeable, characteristics. Diversity is not readily viewed as the result of socially constructed, unstable, and historical phenomenon. And rather than being anything unifying, this version leads to intractable definitions of “authentic” identity that perhaps prevents people from relating to each other.

And lastly is what they refer to as “critical multiculturalism.” This version is the highlight reel of the prior three. Diversity is viewed as natural, but not something to overcome due to a desire for commonality. Diversity is understood as being constructed as the result of innumerable unstable historical processes, but is nothing intractable or fetishized. People of diverse backgrounds can come together, especially for the purposes of critiquing and changing the damaging and demeaning aspects of a society predicated on protecting dominant group interests. Diversity provides multiple perspectives on reality, helping nuance worldviews pertaining to issues of inequality and justice. In this last instance, if society is to progress and improve itself, then diversity is an imperative.

This section developed a connection between diversity and multicultural education. As this present work is an exploration of the meaning of diversity as used in teacher education, it seems only necessary to make a connection between diversity and the primary encapsulating context in which it is used. Suffice it to say, diversity is a goal of multicultural education, but this still says nothing substantively of what it means. What follows is another attempt toward a commons sense meaning of diversity, a prelude if you will of a more robust exploration in the following chapters.
Intellectual Development

Anthropologist Peter Wood, who is also the Executive Director of the National Association of Scholars, has dedicated much time and effort toward trying to figure out the meaning and attractiveness of diversity. He comments that it has “genuine imaginative appeal...[with a] promise of providing a way of looking at the world anew and a way of escaping tired old prejudices. Diversity bids us to be tolerant, open-minded, helpful and fair; and many respond to this call in good faith. But diversity offers doubtful directions to these worthy destinations” (1). On Wood’s terms, “Diversity is a large idea in the way that Wyoming is a large state: it is a big part of everyone’s map of America, but there is not much there” (ibid.). As Wood sees diversity, it “is an idea without a clear intellectual context. Its background is murky, and the language in which its proponents speak is often misleading” (16). However, the word diversity possesses a bit of magic within our society.

In terms of a common sense understanding and usage of diversity, Wood challenges his readers to wonder why the term diversity is used and not something else. According to Wood, the English language provides a host of other terms that seemingly convey the same message or idea of diversity, or so one would think. A few straightforward examples are: “a mix, a stir, a mingling, [and] a medley” (82). He also provides “metaphorical candidates” such as marl which refers to rich soil comprised of “diverse” parts. There is also the reference to an olio, or “a dish made of diverse ingredients or any heterogeneous mixture” (83). As well as fancier words including the likes of heterogeneous, allotropic (“an element that exists in two or more molecular
forms”), *multifarious*, or even *variegated* (ibid.). That diversity is the word that has had the most staying power is unique in light of its original pejorative sense.

Etymologically speaking, diversity as being something unfavorable, inferior and something to avoid is one of the earlier meanings of diversity. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the actual origins of diversity is a toss up between very similarly spelled roots in Middle English – *divers* – and an Old French version of the same spelling as well as another rendering – *diviers*. The 11th century meaning accorded diversity revolves around “different, odd, wicked, cruel,” as well as “perversity”.7 Anything standing in contradistinction to whatever was considered the standard for rightness and profitability was considered diverse, and subsequently frowned upon. It is more honest to say, however, that diversity’s etymology is neutral and accords with Wood’s aforesaid terms pertaining to a vague numerical sense, simply meaning varied, a variety, multiple, as well as unlike in quality or kind. To look for the current instantiation of diversity infused with moral tenor and good feelings, one need look no further than Charles Darwin.

Though Darwin speaks much more frequently of variation, the positive connotation between variation and diversity in Darwin’s work, and on Wood’s terms, is unmistakable (84). Fundamentally speaking, Darwin’s theory of natural selection turned the scientific community on its head. Instead of thinking of species as consisting of essential and immutable qualities that are forever unchanged, Darwin argued a species of animal actually consists of natural intraspecies variation or diversity. And, it is this variation that is foundational for a species’ survival in an ever-changing world (85).

---

amount of diversity within a species is what allows and enables the species to survive. In other words, diversity is necessary to the survival and health of a species. It is a strong scientific idea that has worked its way into our current mainstream understandings of diversity, thus rendering diversity basically as something good and necessary to achieve. Still this is to say nothing of what diversity means in any identifiable way.

In his provocatively titled book, *The Trouble with Diversity*, English professor Walter Benn Michaels suggests that diversity is not merely good, but borders the sacred. He comments that “diversity has become virtually a sacred concept in American life today. No one’s really against it; people tend instead to differ only in their degrees of enthusiasm for it and their ingenuity in pursuing it” (12). Regarding a common sense meaning, Michaels offers that is has something to do with a respect for difference, but difference in relation to the identities people ascribe to. In admitting this is a de facto definition of diversity, he is still critical of the concept. Michaels asserts that identity – who we think we are in whatever simple or complex way – is “the least important thing about us…[yet it] is the thing we have become most committed to talking about” (19). The commitment many Americans make to diversity – identity – is essentially a distraction from more important material concerns affecting our lives (160). But the “distraction” of diversity is winning out.

In a similar vein, Stephen Macedo, Laurence S. Rockefeller Professor of Politics at Princeton comments that “though economic divisions remain important…the focus has shifted to a politics of identity” (1). Diversity, according to Macedo, is a broad term that encompasses many issues pertaining to the protection of “difference.” When the term is used it is usually done as a signal of opposition against discrimination, prejudice, and
exclusion. Macedo comments that “At the broadest level, the typical invocation of diversity embodies an insistence that no one should be excluded from the American dream of equal justice based on arbitrary and irrelevant differences of skin color, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation” (2). And to prevent such exclusion, diversity requires society to mobilize in particular ways so as to protect the identity of those considered “different.” Protection is found through the recognition of identity, which Michaels ultimately considers a distraction.

The common sense meaning of diversity being developed through Macedo is that the singular concept of diversity is taking on two complementary usages. One pertaining to identity and the other refers to some social action or response taken in relation to identity – recognition. And, diversity can only be understood through the interaction of both. To understand the importance of recognition in relation to identity philosopher Charles Taylor informs.

In his seminal essay on the “politics of recognition,” Charles Taylor develops the connection between identity and recognition. Taylor starts his essay with a thesis that is worth quoting at length.

The demand for recognition…is given urgency by the supposed links between recognition and identity, where this latter term designates something like a person’s understanding of who they are, of their fundamental defining characteristics as a human being. The thesis is that our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being (25).

What is at stake regarding recognition and identity in liberal societies is nothing short of the equal protection of guaranteed civil liberties, of which identity might be a new edition.
Taylor comments that in liberal societies such as the United States, “Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need” (26). A person whose identity is not recognized or is misrecognized by social institutions within a liberal society cannot give meaning to their life when they do not see themselves represented in the institutions making up the larger cultural context in which they are surrounded.

Taylor’s thesis turns on the question of what is meant by recognition.

For Taylor, recognition can be understood as existing in two spheres, the intimate and the public spheres. The intimate sphere is “where we understand the formation of identity and the self as taking place in a continuing dialogue and struggle with significant others” (37). Significant others in the intimate sphere can refer to people with whom we are the closest, such as family members, friends, lovers, etc. It can also mean the multiple and at times competing conversations playing out in our heads while walking to class, getting on the bus, looking in the mirror, or from our favorite authors, television shows, and news programs; these are all significant in terms of shaping how we think about ourselves.

The public sphere of recognition, on the other hand, is a bit more concerned with looking at identity in terms of resource distribution. Identity in this sense is a “primary good” that requires equitable distribution throughout society. How people’s demands for recognition are satisfied are determined by how identity as a good is understood, distributed, and under what conditions is the distribution considered equitable. To explain this, Taylor divides the public sphere into two different and competing strands. One strand he refers to as the politics of equal dignity. The second strand as the politics of difference. Each strand has a distinct conceptualization for how a liberal society should
equally distribute identity toward the end of satisfying demands for recognition. And each strand struggles differently with the value placed on diversity, as diversity is understood as the interaction around identity and its recognition.

The politics of equal dignity animates out of a universalism. This universalism aims toward protecting the individual from a society predicated on debilitating caste systems or other forms of stifling and categorical hierarchies that pepper the world’s historical record of social organization. This form of politics emphasizes that each and every individual is worthy of equal respect; that individuals are equally endowed with a “universal human potential” (41) to rationally direct their own lives, and it is this potential that is worthy of respect. Societies should organize in such a way that allows individuals to realize their potential. And individuals should seek to develop their potential within such a society not only for their own individual sake, but for the sake of preserving a society that allows individuals to realize their potential.

There is a caveat, however, with the universalism animating a politics of equal dignity. The caveat, which is what makes it stand in contrast to the following politics of difference, is that individuals are worthy of respect because of the potential inhering in every single one of us. Individuals are not worthy of respect because of what people decide to do with or make of that potential. The end result of one’s potential, or what they have decided to do with it, is not inherently worthy or respect. A doctor is no more worthy of respect than the person who discards of the medical waste that comes from the procedures she performed to produce such waste. Of course the economics of the scenario disagrees, but the politics do not. If the ends matter, then a society organized around respecting ends is no better than the societies predicated on social hierarchy that
came before; recognizing ends is a form of discrimination, differential treatment, and oppression. Again, it is the individual who is worthy of respect because of the potential inhering inside and not anything on the outside or what gets done with the potential.

In terms of recognizing and distributing identity as a resource, a society predicated on the politics of equal dignity does so in a way that springs from its universalism. In other words, because every individual is equally worthy of respect due to the potential inhering in all of us, the identity that is recognized is a universal identity; thus it is distributed evenly to all. Recognition comes in the form of an “identical basket” of rights, privileges, immunities, and equal access to primary goods and services that help individuals realize their potential. The politics of equal dignity is really a politics of indifference in terms of what people do with their potential.

In contrast is the politics of difference. This form of politics for recognizing and distributing identity is an outgrowth of a politics of dignity and more closely accords with our present uses of diversity education, which is developed further below. It is an outgrowth in that this politics also animates from the universal premise that every individual is worthy of respect. However, the significant difference regards recognition. A politics of equal dignity recognizes identity in terms of a universal identity, and because so, recognition is accorded through the equal distribution of what is commonly referred to as citizenship rights – the identical basket mentioned above. In opposition, and as Taylor states, “with the politics of difference, what we are asked to recognize is the unique identity of this [or that] individual or group, their distinctness from everyone else” (38). As Taylor explains, “it is precisely this distinctness that has been ignored, glossed over, assimilated to a dominant or majority identity. And this assimilation is the cardinal
sin against the ideal of authenticity” (ibid.). What started as an outgrowth has departed significantly, especially in terms of distribution.

At the expense of repetition, identity within a politics of equal dignity is equally shared in that every individual is a bundle of potentialities and is capable of directing their lives toward the realization of those potentials. One can realize their own unique identity through the protections afforded by a society via the extension of equal rights. What is of the single most importance in such a politics is the recognition of equal rights. Identity for or a politics of difference, and on the other hand, very much revolves around the results of said potentials. In this sense, yes, everyone has an identity, but it is far from universal. And though everybody possesses equal rights, what is important is that a society recognize particular identities, some of which are outgrowths of poorly distributed and recognized equal rights.

According to this form of politics, a society and its institutions must recognize individual identity (even if the individuals solely identify with groups) because only through this recognition can one even realize their potential. Nonrecognition or misrecognition, as Taylor states in his thesis, is a form of violence and oppression; it stultifies the development of potential and thus identity, which is paramount for those espousing such a politics. And at times, a society might even need to participate in policies of differential treatment to help people realize their potentials; all of which is a marked detraction from a politics of equal dignity.
Conclusion

Evidenced from the above development is something rather simple and what guides the review in the following chapter. Ostensibly, diversity is a singular concept comprised of two complementary senses or dimensions. I borrow again from anthropologist Peter Wood. Diversity has two senses which he refers to as diversity I and diversity II (emphasis original). The former pertains to simple and indisputable demographic facts pertaining to racial and/or ethnic composition (24). In terms of the above development, diversity in this demographical sense is identity-based. For the purposes of this dissertation, I refer to this dimension of diversity as its descriptive sense. That diversity revolves around demographical considerations is a forgone conclusion. Nobody really contests this sense of the word.

Wood’s latter designation is a reference to a social vision or ideal which suggests how a society should or ought to respond to considerations of demographic composition. I refer to this as diversity’s normative dimension. That diversity is normative is hardly contested either. Diversity is normative because its invocation strongly implies right conduct that should or ought to be taken toward the valued end of diversity in its descriptive sense, and thus is morally laden. From the above, this action or response is in terms of recognition. What is contestable, however, is how this recognition occurs. Is it contested is a question for another time.

The two senses or dimensions of diversity – descriptive and normative – are quite interactive and perhaps even inseparable. In other words, the singular concept of diversity is more like a double helix of sorts, where two separate and unique helices are virtually inseparably bound. The following chapter explores the teacher education literature for the
interaction between the descriptive and normative with the hopes that their interactivity will offer further insight into diversity’s meaning, something beyond the common sense being developed above. I now turn toward a more formal and thematic review of the teacher education literature.
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CHAPTER 3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Recounting from the prior chapters, diversity thus far is a singular concept in education comprised of multiple dimensions: a *descriptive* and *normative* dimension. What seems clear in my exploration thus far is that the senses are interactive in some general way, but not meaningful in any specific way affording diversity precision when being used in teacher education. This chapter is my second step toward conceptual clarification.

To gain further insight into diversity’s meaning, the following review seeks to do three things. First it provides a rationale for establishing the boundaries in which literature is selected. Second it categorizes the literature into four dominant purposes for writing about diversity. Accompanying the categorizing is a review of the literature within each category, paying special attention to the interaction between the descriptive and normative uses of diversity. And third, this review suggests that a need exists for adding yet more purposes for writing.

**Rationale: Establishing Boundaries**

In his preface to *Democracy and Education*, John Dewey refers to education as an enterprise. Though this reference is passing, it is very appropriate. Thinking of education
as an enterprise is to think of it as an adventurous project on a grand and bold scale. Many such projects require teams of people with vast and varied experiences to come together, satisfying a common purpose. Regarding education, one of those teams is teacher education, and its common purpose is the special preparation of future teachers to work in PK-12 school settings.

Though there are many people concerned with the preparation of our nation’s teachers, teacher education is distinct. In this dissertation, what comprises teacher education is quite narrow. Specifically speaking, teacher education is a reference to traditional – as opposed to alternative – undergraduate academic programs dedicated to the preparation and certification of school teachers (Darling-Hammond and Bransford; Darling-Hammond). Such programs found on college and university campuses are generally housed in education schools or schools/colleges of education (Labaree; Darling-Hammond). Students in such programs receive an undergraduate degree in education on their way toward certification and becoming a practicing teacher. In all likelihood, students in teacher education programs at the undergraduate level are those studying elementary, early childhood, physical, or, special education. Students wanting to teach secondary education subject areas generally receive a major in their field of study and minor in education.

Those who are a part of teacher education are appropriately referred to as teacher educators. Such individuals have intimate connections to undergraduate students as they teach courses required for graduation. Teacher educators are not merely the individuals teaching the plethora of methods courses, but also include those who teach traditional foundations, educational psychology, multicultural education, special education,
leadership, and policy courses. And most likely, a teacher educator was at one time a 
school teacher. To be sure, not all those working in education schools are a part of 
teacher education.

Grey areas, however, do exist which require a slight expansion of the above 
parameters. For example, I’m not sure how many principles or various level school 
administrators meet the above criteria. They are, however, keenly interested in the 
preparation of teachers in teacher education programs. Principles and superintendents 
have a vested interest. They have much to gain or lose from hiring or not hiring teachers 
who can astutely create achieving classrooms and meaningfully function within 
successful schools (Darling-Hammond). Their unique perspective as executive officers of 
schools and school districts position them nicely to contribute to the knowledge needed 
for successful teacher preparation, though they are not traditional teacher educators.

Another grey area concerns educational researchers whose work informs the 
teacher educators working with preservice teachers. Researchers hardly meet the above 
criteria either. And though many never set foot in undergraduate classrooms, their work 
is indispensable to the preparation of teachers. Their perspective also positions them 
nicely to contribute to the teacher education literature.

In light of the above, teacher education literature is specific and is comprised of 
four criteria. For the purposes here, teacher education literature is that literature 1) written 
by teacher educators 2) for teacher educators 3) concerning the special preparation of 
future teachers in American public school settings. This literature 4) is found in peer-
reviewed journals (e.g. *Journal of Teacher Education*) as well as professional periodical 
publications (e.g. *Phi Delta Kappan*).
Concerning the work at hand, a fifth and sixth criterion are added. As the interest of this review is with how diversity is treated in the literature, the search is narrowed to 5) only those artifacts with diversity in the title, and, 6) artifacts written over the past twenty years. In total, twenty-one artifacts are part of this review.

Categorizing and Reviewing the Literature

A basic premise of this positioned essay is that diversity’s normativity requires closer inspection. Regarding normativity, when diversity is invoked it is implied or suggested that certain action *ought or should* be taken in the name of or in relation to some-thing called diversity. The result of this normative action is something good. In this sense, diversity is morally-laden. Furthermore, it is held that the concept’s normativity is in part predicated on diversity’s descriptive demographical sense.

This review pays special attention to how the descriptive and the normative interact. And in doing so, the literature is categorized into four distinct purposes for writing about diversity, and reviews the literature within each category. The four categories are: explications of diversity (3 artifacts), policy recommendations (5 artifacts), preparation of preservice teachers for diversity (9 artifacts), and, teaching about diversity (4 artifacts). Each category struggles with the interaction between the descriptive and normative, and thus some overlap is necessary. Overlap and repetition are salient finds for establishing diversity’s meaning. This is done as a prelude to a more specific attempt toward clarification in a later chapter.

*Explications of Diversity*

The first category consists of literature concerned with explicating diversity. In this category, diversity is treated less as an object of scrutiny or inquiry and more as a
concept whose descriptive dimensions require clarification. Generally speaking, this category of literature doesn’t make great strides moving from the descriptive is of diversity to a normative ought. Conceptual clarification remains in the descriptive realm though a moral tenor is very much involved.

In directing her comments “to the specific issue of diversity,” Gloria Ladson-Billings finds disturbing practices within the realm of teacher education (229). In particular, what she finds most disturbing, and what she refers to as the “real problems facing teacher education,” are the disconnections between teachers and the families, students, and communities they serve (ibid). On her terms, demographical and cultural mismatches between teachers and students make the prospects for academic success quite distant.

Descriptively speaking, diversity for Ladson-Billings is any demographical consideration that deviates from the White-middle-class-monolingual-woman norm, with a general emphasis on White (230). To this point, she cites research on population projections that suggest as 2010 approaches the student population in the Unites States will become increasingly diverse, though our teaching force – and even our teacher educator force – will become less so. In other words, mismatch in the future is ever more likely.

Perfect matching, however, is also problematic. If matching were an answer to the educational problems facing students of color, “then Detroit and Washington D.C. would be the most exemplary school districts in the nation for African American students” (231). Perfect matching is a concern because status quo stories, experiences, and ways of knowing are more likely to remain intact.
It is on Ladson-Billing’s point of cultural matching where diversity’s descriptive sense becomes clearer. A Black teacher teaching Black students is an example of cultural matching. A White teacher teaching White students does not represent cultural matching, but is an example of homogeneity and a lack of diversity, whether in a school setting or an academic teacher education setting (230).

Diversity, on her terms, is when Black teachers teach White students. Ladson-Billings comments that “a more diverse teaching force and a more diverse set of teacher educators is to ensure that all students, including White students, experience a more accurate picture of what it means to live and work in a multicultural and democratic society” (231). A White teacher teaching Black students is not necessarily an example of diversity. It represents an unbroken circle of “White teacher educators [who] prepare White teachers [to] teach children of color who fail to achieve success in schools and are unable to pursue postsecondary education where they might become teachers” (ibid) and thus eventually breaking the circle.

Though she abhors deficit discourses in education when directed toward Black students and teachers (231), Ladson-Billings seems comfortable applying it to White, middle-class, and monolingual female teachers. On her terms, something is wrong with an all White team of educators. Borrowing from a call and response cheer, Ladson-Billings imagines the diversity cheer team calling out in a loud and clear voice, “What’s the matter with the team?” To which she responds “The team’s all White!” rather than the familiar “The team is all right!” as indicated by the title of her article (233). It’s not clear if something would be wrong with an all Black team. This is where moral tenor comes into play and where diversity takes on normative contours. Diversity in this descriptive
and demographical sense, especially pertaining to teacher education, is seemingly anything other than her White standard. Normatively speaking, diversity as other than White is a good thing and is something schools and teacher education programs should pursue.

Other authors, in their attempts to explicate diversity, are less forthright than Ladson-Billings. Their approaches are a bit more subtle and nuanced. Studies by Cochran-Smith and Lytle as well as Harrington and Hathaway explicate diversity through research with preservice and inservice teachers. The goal of their research is to inventory and comment on how teachers struggle with common explanations andattributions of diversity. It appears that the authors of both studies operate from the premise that their students’ ideas or beliefs about diversity need changing and both studies use treatments to see whether those beliefs do in fact change, something seemingly quite common in teacher education as another category will explain.

The descriptive dimension of diversity is much more subtle than with Ladson-Billings. Both studies cite research concerned with preparing teachers to teach in diverse or multicultural school contexts. The concern is usually with disparities that exist between the race/ethnicity of the teachers and students as well as the cultural knowledge of the school with that of the home. And with both studies, it takes the authors a few pages before commenting on the fact that the students in their studies who are to experience a treatment for interrogating and maybe even changing their beliefs are either predominately White women (Harrington and Hathaway 277) or represent White women (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 111). Thus, it seems one can safely assume, again, diversity in its descriptive and demographical sense is other than White women. However, it is
evident from these studies that the authors believe students of all stripes should interrogate their beliefs.

The normative dimension for these studies differs markedly from Ladson-Billings. For Ladson-Billings, diversity as other than White is a matter of fact, but is also unqualifiedly a good thing. For the researchers above, that diversity is good or bad is a non-issue. What is at issue is whether teachers can get to know their students if their students differ in certain notable ways such as by race or ethnicity – diversity.

Getting to know students in all their diversity is just what good teachers do. However, getting to know students requires teachers to know the students on their terms and in their contexts which further requires that teachers enter into relationships with biases, assumptions, and stereotypes duly interrogated (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 109; Harrington and Hathaway 280). The normative dimension of diversity through these studies, seemingly, is that diversity is a resource to help teachers effectively teach students. In that sense it is something good and is necessary in teacher education.

*Policy Recommendations*

Second is the category of policy recommendations. The literature under this category focuses on aligning the goals of educational institutions, and in particular teacher education programs, with diversity related affairs. The purpose for writing about diversity is to influence, and because so, the normative dimension is a bit more palpable.

In this category more so than the prior one a definite interactive relationship appears between the descriptive sense of diversity, or the *is*, and the normative sense, or the *ought*. From this category, a bridge between the descriptive and the normative is
evidenced, and because so, the “stuff” of diversity outside of demographical considerations becomes a bit more evident, though still inchoate.

Descriptively speaking, Melnick and Zeichner understand diversity in its relation to demographical considerations. They are quick to pronounce that diversity in this sense poses a task for teacher education. On their terms “Demographic projections suggest that, in the coming years, students in U.S. schools will be even increasingly different in background from their teachers, making the task of teacher education one of educating largely ‘typical’ candidates – White, monolingual, middle class – to teach in an increasingly diverse student body composed of many poor students of color” (88). Diversity might mean many things, but first it means not White.

In regards to this category, the descriptive sense of diversity seems well established and consistent. To this point, Price and Valli actually use Melnick and Zeichner to establish the same descriptive parameters. Hood and Parker borrow from the Holmes Group to define diversity as a “de-emphasis of the traditional European-centered canon” (164). And, Futrell et al. establish the descriptive by commenting that if current demographical trends continue, 51% of students in America’s elementary and secondary schools will be from a racial or ethnic minority by 2050 though the teachers will remain overwhelmingly White (382). Banks et al. nod in this direction too by commenting that an “increasing cultural and ethnic gap…exists between the nation’s teachers and students” (197), though this demographical aspect is a small component to their work.

Similar to Ladson-Billings, these demographical considerations are concerning. For Melnick and Zeichner, as well as the others above, the main concern is that the “typical” preservice teacher in a “typical” teacher education program experiences a form
of preparation that historically benefits “White students but have largely failed to provide quality instruction for poor and ethnic and linguistic minority students” (89). This “unpreparedness” of White teachers to teach “diverse” students, it is believed, leads to dire consequences for racial and ethnic minorities. What is interesting about this artifact is that the authors admit they have no real reason to believe that preservice teachers whose backgrounds match “diverse” student populations will be able to translate their experiences or dispositions into meaningful and effective pedagogy (94). The empirical evidence is just not there. However, what seems evident is that mismatch is problematic. The problematic nature of mismatch is wherein we find a possible bridge from the descriptive to the normative. Before turning to the normative dimension, a turn toward the bridge seems necessary.

On one side of the bridge is diversity in its descriptive sense. This side is where one can find basic understandings of what diversity is. These understandings pertain to the demographical considerations found above. In this sense, the meaning of diversity is clear. On the other side of the bridge is the normative sense. Though this sense has yet to be discussed, it is where one can find what ought to be done in the name of diversity. The bridge, then, is the realization that demographical cultural mismatch might result in a poor quality of education for minority students, thus having dire consequences on the future educational opportunities for those students.

Mismatch exists for a few reasons. According to Melnick and Zeichner, whose theoretical foundations come from B. Othanel Smith, teachers are often “limited in cross cultural experiences” due to their insularity from minorities (Melnick and Zeichner 89). Also, many teacher education programs, because they are taught by professors who are
themselves insular, do little to sensitize teachers to the needs of many minority students, or challenge commonly held assumptions concerning how minority students should be taught (Hood and Parker; Melnick and Zeichner; Price and Valli). The cultural insularity of teachers coupled with the insularity of coursework results in underprepared White teachers to teach minority students. These concerns are referred to as “issues of diversity” (Melnick and Zeichner). The bridge between the descriptive and the normative are these issues.

As this category is labeled “policy recommendation,” the above authors provide suggestions regarding how such concerns ought to be addressed institutionally – the normative dimension of diversity. Similarly to the understandings of the descriptive sense, there is an agreement in terms of the normative.

If the question is “What ought to be done in order to ensure that minority students receive a quality education by White teachers?” there are seemingly four recommendations found within this literature. First is to minimize the effects of mismatch between students and teachers. Banks et al. make many recommendations, twelve actually, but their first concerns mismatch. They comment that it is necessary to “help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups with U.S. society and the ways in which race, ethnicity, and social class interact to influence student behavior” (197). This can be done through professional development programs for inservice teachers. It can also be done by structuring preservice teacher programs around a curriculum that exposes White teachers to the multiple forms of knowledge pertaining to the dangers of mismatch.
Another recommendation found in much of the literature focuses on the roles played by institutions of higher education. Diversity’s urgency (Hood and Parker) requires colleges and universities to support their teacher education programs (Price and Valli; Futrell et al.). One example of support is monetary. Futrell et al. comment that because institutional support for teacher education is low, such programs find it difficult to recruit, train, and retain talented students and faculty, especially those of color, all of which is quite expensive (384). Recruitment efforts for schools of education are being undermined by other more lucrative university-wide endeavors. For example, some colleges and universities have invested millions of dollars into state of the art Latino and Black studies centers and programs that entice quality minority students away from teacher education programs.

Besides offering more monetary support, colleges and universities should also consider focusing their leadership priorities in the direction of diversity related issues. To do this, institutions can work on placing diversity at the heart of what they do, by making it a part of their overall mission and the mission of the various departments. Doing this can change the general organizational structure and culture especially if each department is to plan for regular diversity related initiatives (Price and Valli).

A third recommendation agreed upon in the literature is related to a previous one. This recommendation challenges teacher education programs to specifically focus energy on the recruitment of diverse faculty members (i.e. not White, middle-class, monolingual, women). This is difficult in light of the fact that roughly 10% of all PhDs granted each year go to persons of color, though many in education related fields. Institutions can help by providing funding for new positions, funding for special positions, and incentives to
departments that hire diverse faculty (Melnick and Zeichner). Such efforts are necessary when the supply is so limited.

And lastly, the literature seems to suggest that the only way classrooms can be taught by teachers of color is if teacher education programs are graduating students of color. Students of color, so the idea goes, not only provide schools with diverse faculty, they provide White students in teacher education programs with exposure to the many imperatives that guide why people of color want to teach (Hood and Parker). The problem is that many teacher education programs are inhospitable to students of color (Melnick and Zeichner). This happens as a result of the resistance that oftentimes comes from White students and faculty who feel indicted by the guiding imperatives of students of color and also the tokenism that occurs when there are few students of color in a program.

For the literature found within this category – policy recommendations – the task is to overhaul teacher education programs with respect to diversity related issues. This task is normative because it is what ought to be done with respect to diversity’s descriptive dimension. What is also evinced from this category is that the notion of cultural mismatch is the bridge from the very mundane and demographical to the very moral and prescriptive. It’s not too much of an overstatement to say that if the above policy recommendations are put into place, lives of students are invariably improved.

The next two categories differ markedly in their intent though they sound similarly. The purpose for writing about diversity in the third category is to exchange ideas about how to best prepare preservice teachers for diversity. The fourth category is what I consider literature concerned with teaching about diversity. The main difference
between these two categories is the intended audience. The third category is written by teacher educators for teacher educators regarding preservice teachers and was easily the largest category of literature (9 artifacts). The fourth category, however, seems a bit more inclusive and directed toward inservice teachers and preservice teachers first, and then teacher educators.

*Preparing Preservice Teachers for Diversity*

The title of this category, which was essentially borrowed from titles in the literature, seemingly assumes three things. First it assumes that preservice teachers are unprepared for diversity and that this unpreparedness is a bad thing. Second, it assumes that teacher educators have knowledge of how to conduct the preparation, knowledge of how to change something bad into good. And third, it assumes that diversity is known. The interaction between the descriptive and normative, on this basis, is evident. This section of the review proceeds by addressing the aforesaid assumptions. In keeping with the prior categories, I turn first toward diversity in its descriptive sense.

Similar to the literature above, and regarding what diversity is descriptively, there is agreement within this category and across categories, a salient find thus far. With near unanimity, diversity is again understood demographically. According to this literature, teachers in American schools and those who enter teacher education programs are overwhelmingly White (European-American or Caucasian), middle-class, English speaking (or monolingual), and female (Knapp 202; Brown 325; Chance et al. 386). Garmon suggests that nearly 90% of our public school teachers are White (275). Brown, using census extrapolations posits that by 2010 “95% of K-12 classroom teachers will be Caucasian, middle-class females with limited cross-cultural interaction” (325). White,
middle-class, monolingual, women are what is normal when it comes to who is teaching in American schools, and is also indicative of who is enrolling in teacher education programs. Diversity is understood as those demographical considerations that do not match the norm. In terms of public schools in the United States, and according to Major and Brock, “students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds…continue to increase exponentially” (7) though the teaching force does not.

As discussed above, the fact that the teaching force is not diversifying along with the student population represents a problem. According to this literature, as well as from the previous category, the problem is referred to as mismatching (Garmon; Major and Brock). And, mismatching is a result of poor preparation, not to mention a by-product of cultural insularity as suggested by Melnick and Zeichner.

This notion of mismatching bridges the descriptive with the normative. Mismatching, according to Garmon “has precipitated concerns about…teachers’ ability to effectively teach minority [or diverse] students” (275). This is concerning for one particular reason. It is believed that teachers within this normal category (White) do not possess the necessary “cultural frames” by which diverse students make sense of the world (Brown). Mismatches between the cultural values, beliefs, practices, and life experiences – worldviews – of teachers and their students can be devastating on students’ learning experiences (Major and Brock). The literature is primarily concerned that the devastation oftentimes comes through unexamined biases and prejudices against diverse student populations (Baldwin et al.) and manifests through low expectations, inequitable pedagogy, and limited access to multiple forms of knowledge (Bennett). As has been evinced from this literature, there is plenty of reason to assume that White preservice
teachers are unprepared. The normative dimension, or the *ought*, is to prepare White, middle-class, monolingual, female teachers to teach diverse student populations, which ostensibly has something to do with matching.

The last assumption not yet addressed is the assumption that teacher educators know how to prepare (White) teachers for diverse student populations and what “preparation” really means. Efforts toward preparation have been categorized into three main models: curricular, experiential, and structural (Hyland and Meacham). According to Hyland and Noffke, the curricular model is coursework centered and focusing on studying diverse learning styles in concert with the social, political, and historical reasons dominant groups might have contrasting worldviews to those of marginal populations. The experiential model “features practical experiences in nonmainstream community settings as a means of obtaining comfort within those communities as well as knowledge about students from historically marginalized groups and their families” (370). And lastly, the structural model attempts to help preservice teachers understand and teach diverse populations through programs designed to bring into relationship public schools, traditional coursework of teacher education programs, and population needs according to community organizations (ibid). The literature gathered within this category all fall within the aforesaid models. It does seem honest to say, however, that how the preparation occurs is still in development.

Knowing how to do something seemingly indicates there is a level of effectiveness regarding the models or methods used. On this point, there is a bit of a gap in the literature. To be sure, and as indicated by the fact that there were more articles included in this category than the others, many teacher educators do in fact think they
know how to prepare preservice and even inservice teachers for diversity. Garmon is the only one to really address the issue of effectiveness. He states that “despite over twenty years of [multicultural teacher education] efforts, research on [its] effectiveness…has yielded only mixed results” (275). Garmon’s concern about effectiveness should give teacher educators some pause regarding what it is they are actually trying to do when “preparing” preservice teachers. Perhaps what preservice teachers are being prepared for is the wrong thing, as well as the wrong form of preparation. Imbedded within the question of form or model, is the question of what is really happening during the preparation, or supposed to happen, or should happen in a normative sense? What are the results Garmon alludes to?

At first blush the results seem to point toward the effective teaching of diverse students by White teachers. After all, if a preservice teacher is properly prepared for diversity, then it only makes sense that the teacher’s diverse students should succeed academically. In other words, successful preparation should mean some form of academic achievement that can directly be traced to the treatment the teacher experienced while matriculating through a teacher education program. None of the artifacts procured for this review and falling within this category of preparation, however, explicitly focused on the achievement of future students in schools.

The preparation of preservice teachers for diversity, instead, means one thing: the alteration of perceptions. On this point the literature is consistent though there are subtle differences in how this gets done. According to Chance et al., in order to “prepare all preservice candidates to teach in culturally diverse classrooms…It is necessary to alter the perceptions of all preservice teachers about working with children from culturally
diverse backgrounds, children of color, and children in poverty” (387). The authors continue to state that “Teacher educators must seek to alter preservice teachers’ negative perceptions of schools with large percentages of students with cultures different than their own…and their stereotypes of children with backgrounds different than their own” (ibid).

And though the authors, and much of the literature, do a good job of stating “all” preservice teachers, it is seemingly obvious from statements such as “but the teaching force remains overwhelmingly White and female” (386) that they are really only talking about the perceptions of White, middle-class, monolingual, female preservice teachers.

According to Brown, how people perceive things and make sense of the world is in part a function of their cultural frames of reference (325). For White, middle-class, monolingual, female teachers, their perceptions are built within and, according to Bennett, “patterned after the [frames of] mainstream culture, a culture steeped in the legacies of racism and colonialism” (261). Hyland and Noffke submit that such legacies impel White teachers to perceive their diverse students through a demeaning deficit lens, a lens that tends to reify White teachers’ privilege (368) much to the detriment of their diverse students’ academic successes.

To change these perceptions, what is required is some form of treatment – teacher preparation programs. According to Baldwin et al. teacher preparation programs serve “as a vehicle through which to examine in depth personal bias and racism and to better understand the meaning of diversity” (315). They continue to state that “teacher preparation programs are challenged with building bridges across a critical gap in the understanding of [the experiences] and the inequities existing for people different from the mainstream culture” (316). Changing the detrimental frames White teachers bring
with them requires students to acknowledge, explore, and examine their experiences with
diversity (Knapp 204). According to Major and Brock, this is no simple task. As they see
the situation, “teacher education candidates often enter teacher preparation programs with
beliefs and dispositions that mitigate against fostering the educational success of children
from diverse backgrounds” (9). This is how teacher preparation programs seek to address
the perceived mismatch spoken of earlier.

According to the literature, teachers are prepared for diversity by undergoing
treatments that positively alter their perceptions of diversity, of diverse student
populations, and the life contexts students find themselves in. Ostensibly, successful
preparation is when teachers’ cultural frames have been realigned or altered to
accommodate – match – those frames of diverse students. The normative dimension of
diversity in teacher education, according to the literature, requires White teachers to be
altered as the result of undergoing teacher preparation treatment, again, this is the
normative action required by diversity in its descriptive sense. And though the literature
broached many ways in which to alter perceptions, all falling within curricular,
experiential, and structural considerations, what seems more relevant and interesting is
that to prepare preservice teachers for diversity first and foremost is a reference to
perceptual alteration. Preparation, unfortunately, and according to this review of the
literature, really has little to do with teaching practices. The idea, of course, is that the
practices will come once the cultural frames and perceptions are altered.

The normative dimension as it comes through in this category is quite morally
laden. This literature strongly assumes, almost in an a priori way, that there is something
wrong with White teachers, that they are deficient and need fixing. In particular, the
mismatching cultural frames that cause, according to one artifact, devastation (Major and Brock) need fixing.

In many respects, the literature concerned with preparing preservice teachers for diversity resembles a deficit discourse. Ironically, the deficit discourses are no longer directed toward students of color as Hyland and Noffke would have their readers believe. The literature does a good job of moving the deficit placed on diverse populations by Moynihan (Hymowitz 2005) over forty years ago and placing it on White, female, middle-class, monolingual women. By the mere virtue of being White, preservice teachers are assumed to be unprepared, to have a deficit, and are in need of treatment. And, according to the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory administered by Brown, the assumption is a safe one. From this literature, it is not much of a stretch to get the impression that White is a remediable pathology equated with bad and that diverse or diversity equates with purity, innocence, and/or good. This category pushed the normative dimension a bit further than the previous two.

In bringing this category to a close, it is worth noting that not a single artifact sought to show or prove causality between White teacher cultural mismatch and student underperformance. That is not to say that such literature does not exist or that there is no causality. It is to say, however, that in accordance with the boundaries set for this review, it was not found here. And, in checking the references used when authors made assertions regarding mismatch and its adverse affects on diverse student learning, the work of Martin Haberman was regularly invoked. A perusal of Haberman’s referenced work suggests that causality is not found there either.
And lastly, of the artifacts procured for this category, only one focused primarily on inexperience rather than something pertaining to a cultural deficit, making this artifact a bit of an outlier. In Kleinfeld’s discussion using case studies to prepare White teachers for the diversity found in remote Alaskan communities and villages, she focuses on the necessity of experience (141). To be sure, the other artifacts do as well. The main difference, however, is that Kleinfeld focuses on providing her students with experience, through case studies, in teaching subject matter. It is safe to assume that Kleinfeld would very much like her students to alter any negative perceptions they might have of the indigenous communities. However, alteration is not her primary focal point though it is a desirable by-product. Her goal is to provide students with successful and proven teaching strategies in village schools, strategies that employ local customs, traditions, and knowledge – frames of reference. By discussing the problems, true-life dilemmas, and methods of address regarding, for example, the teaching of the lateral area of a cylinder to Eskimo students, Kleinfeld’s preservice teachers are also learning about cultural frames of reference and how their own might differ and even contend with that of the local villagers (142). Kleinfeld is clear to state that cultural antagonism and mistrust prevent learning, and learning is what teachers are there for. Thus, in order to effectively teach, Kleinfeld’s students examine their own frames for possible points of antagonism while learning to teach subject matter.

Teaching About Diversity

The artifacts included within this category are specifically concerned with teaching about diversity. This category is distinct from the others in terms of the intended audience. The artifacts in the previous categories were mainly for teacher educators. In
this category, the artifacts are written with application in mind for preservice and
inservice teachers. Interested teacher educators might also find them informing. The
journals in which these artifacts are found – *The Reading Teacher, The Social Studies,
Education*, and *Kappa Delta Pi Record* – support this claim. Diversity is treated as a
knowable object with identifiable substance. This makes sense if it is something a teacher
can teach *about*.

Similar to the prior categories, diversity in its descriptive sense is very much
demographical. However, and unlike the artifacts in the categories above, this dimension
is only of passing interest and there’s not much evidence of an interaction between the
descriptive and an implied normative. Of the four artifacts in this category, only two
show such an interaction.

Davis et al. start off in a familiar fashion by quickly moving from the descriptive
into the normative. In an article concerned with using children’s literature to teach about
diversity, they comment that preservice teachers “are predominately European-American,
middle-class, and monolingual; have limited experiences with diverse populations; and
may perceive diversity in a negative way” (176). They then move from the descriptive
and onto the bridge of mismatch. The authors comment that “Teacher candidates’ lack of
understanding of diversity issues can negatively affect the educational success of their
students” (177). Because so, and “in order to work effectively with students from diverse
cultures in all grade levels, they need to become familiar with some of the major issues
that students confront in today’s society” (ibid): the normative action that *ought* to be
taken.
Howard Miller’s moves, on the other hand, nod toward the demographic but in a very tacit way. His article, also concerned with the use of children’s literature to teach about diversity, starts off with a discussion regarding the anemic treatment minorities receive within school curriculum. He comments that “Diversity education does seem to be stuck in a cycle of ‘multicultural moments’ – a Hanukkah song tossed into the Christmas assembly in December, a Black History program in February, and perhaps a Cinco de Mayo celebration in the spring” (602). These moments, according to Miller, result in a “collective sigh and shaking of the head among minority populations, even as the majority group basks in self-congratulations for its sensitivity and awareness” (ibid). Within these brief sentiments, it is evident that diversity is demographically understood in terms of the majority/minority split. The bridge of mismatch is also intimated through his dichotomous characterization of the minority and majority responses to the institution of “multicultural moments.” The normative for Miller, is that majority group children in schools, along with inservice and preservice teachers,  ought to experience the stories of vulnerability and frustration of minorities. On Miller’s terms, “What better audience can there be for these stories and voices than the children in our classrooms?” (ibid). Experiencing such stories not only minimizes the mismatch that might exist between teachers and students, but, and perhaps more importantly for Miller, between students who eventually grow up and maybe even become teachers.

What makes this category unique is how it treats diversity as something knowable. The artifacts do this by breaking down diversity into component parts, or particulars. As stated in the Introduction, one of the purposes of this work is to find the “stuff” or matter of diversity. This category seemingly provides that stuff. The articles in
the previous categories reference “diversity issues,” however, those issues are hardly expounded on as they are here, and are seemingly wrapped up in the larger issues of “mismatch.” And though the “stuff” discussed below could be added to the descriptive dimension of diversity, or could even reside on the bridge of mismatch, they seem to warrant their own dimension: the substantive. What follows in this review is a discussion of how the literature within this category treats diversity as being comprised of knowable particulars, or, the substance of diversity.

Beginning with Davis et al., understanding diversity in this substantive dimension, is to have an understanding of the major issues facing children of diverse populations. According to Davis et al., for White teachers to effectively teach diverse students, it is necessary for them to know some background information on what characterizes the existential experiences of certain diverse populations (the normative is implied here). The characteristics of these experiences are grouped into four categories: racism, poverty, gender equity, and religious beliefs. These characteristics are also the particulars comprising diversity in its substantive dimension. In order for students to know what diversity is, and as a result of her teaching about it, the students must know how life experiences are shaped by racism, poverty, gender, and religion. The medium through which diversity is learned is children’s literature.

Children’s literature is also Miller’s medium for teaching about diversity. According to Miller, “There are stories aching to be told and voices keening to be heard” (602). The messages of these stories are the substance of diversity. If diversity can be understood as a story, Miller would have us believe that it “is the story of intolerance, disrespect, and cross-cultural fear, distrust, and violence” (ibid) – the stuff of diversity.
Miller would have teachers use literature that broaches these particular aspects of
diversity. “This does not mean we must go through the ritualistic flogging for the ‘sins of
the past’, but it does mean,” according to Miller, that “we need to be forthright about the
lessons of history” (ibid). Substantively speaking, teaching about diversity is teaching the
stuff of intolerance, disrespect, fear, distrust, and violence. To know diversity is to know
this stuff.

Ava McCall is a social studies teacher educator. In her article, she entreats
teachers to use poetry within social studies classrooms as a way to teach about diversity.
McCall comments that poetry helps capture students’ attention regarding the life
experiences of people in less valued cultural groups – the descriptive and normative sense
wrapped in one. Such poems capture diversity’s substance by portraying the difficulties
and rewards of resisting oppression or illustrating the physical and symbolic violence
oftentimes accompanying prejudicial comments and discriminatory action (172).
Knowing diversity is to know the difficulties of less valued cultural groups. Poems along
such lines easily address the National Council for the Social Studies’ thematic strands.

Lastly is Guofang Wan’s article which discusses teaching about diversity through
a thematic storybook approach. Before getting into diversity’s substantive dimension, it is
worth noting that on Wan’s terms diversity in a descriptive sense is basically a reference
to plurality. She comments that “our society is made up with various cultures, religions,
and ethnic groups, it is bound to be diverse and multicultural” (140). Teaching about
diversity “becomes one important step for us to take towards peace and harmony in the
world” (ibid). Diversity, normatively speaking, is also morally laden: we ought to teach
about diversity because diversity will bring peace.
Substantively speaking, diversity can be known in terms of universal human themes. Teaching about diversity is to teach these themes. According to Wan, there are six special themes “relevant to all human being experiences, no matter what cultures” students come from (142). The themes include family traditions, holidays, religious ceremonies, emotions, and the lessons learned through nursery rhymes, and folktales. Teaching about diversity requires a teacher to select a theme, a variety of books revolving around that theme, and then to teach it in an interesting and thoughtful manner through story-boards, -diagrams, and -maps.

As an example, Wan uses Cinderella stories within the theme of folktales. Wan comments that the “rationale for using Cinderella is that there is a Cinderella tale or story in almost every culture. As a matter of fact, it is believed that there are 347 known versions of this popular story” (144). The enduring universal lessons within this story revolve around the struggle for acceptance, self-worth, beauty, and true love. Wan would have the reader believe that by teaching these lessons through Cinderella stories, students can come to appreciate how the many different cultures think about and struggle over the same things. The substance of diversity, and paradoxically speaking, are the universal themes all cultures share. Knowing diversity is to know such themes and how they play out in different cultures.

This review categorized teacher education literature into four main purposes for writing about diversity. The first category is comprised of artifacts seeking to explicate diversity. The articles in this category seem more concerned with describing diversity demographically and less with what ought to be done because of diversity.
The second category is policy recommendations. This category focuses on aligning the goals of educational institutions with diversity related affairs. The interaction between the descriptive and normative dimensions is palpable, and a bridge between the two is identified. The authors make suggestions regarding what institutions ought to do in relation to diversity in its descriptive sense, and that if the suggestions are heeded, lives of students will invariably be improved.

Third is the category of preparing preservice teachers for diversity. There is also quite a bit of interaction within this category. Most importantly, from this category is evinced the notion that preservice teacher preparation according to the literature means altering the cultural frames of reference of White, middle-class, monolingual, woman. Such frames when used in teaching ostensibly debilitate the educational opportunities of diverse student populations. Because so, preservice teachers must undergo a special treatment to fill their deficits.

And lastly, the fourth purpose for writing is to teach about diversity. This category reveals yet a third dimension of diversity: substantive. Thinking about diversity in this dimension is to think of diversity as being comprised of knowable and identifiable particulars. Teaching about diversity is to teach about such particulars.

The Possibility of More Purposes

In light of the above review, and taking into consideration the established boundaries, a few gaps seem to exist in the literature. Most notably is the lack of literature directly concerned with the impact that teacher preparation actually has on the targeted student populations. The impact should revolve around whether diverse students
taught by White teachers experience academic success as a result of their teachers’ preparation.

Many serious and significant claims about the debilitating effects of White teachers on diverse students were levied in the literature. Two of the more provocative claims come from Ladson-Billings and Major and Brock. Ladson-Billings’ claim is that what’s wrong with teaching and teacher education is that it’s all White. The problem, on her terms, is the ostensible cultural mismatch that makes classrooms discouraging places for students of color and teacher education programs equally as insufferable. Brock and Major claim that this mismatch is “devastating for children.” Ladson-Billings admits, though, that the matching of cultural frames isn’t necessarily the answer either.

Such claims would seemingly require some sort of empirical data. However, the literature is seemingly bereft of any. The data introduced by Harrington and Hathaway as well as Hood and Parker seems guided and contrived. For example, Hood and Parker note that an African-American female student supports the notion that mismatch might in fact have devastating effects. This student comments that “when it comes to minorities and women, we learn to deify and glorify white male heroes and are not encouraged to recognize our own culture as having great leaders. White male supremacy is so rampant and teachers and students don’t even realize it” (167). In certain respects this is a form of data, but more so it is a response to a prompt. Change the prompt and the responses change.

None of this is to say that the literature doesn’t exist. It is to say, however, that it doesn’t exist according to the search parameters of this review. The closest approximation is found within the sociology of education discourse pertaining to teacher
quality. The most recent data come from a study conducted by Bruce Fuller and adapted by Cornelius Riordan. Of the twelve variables considered regarding teacher quality, none of them pertained to cultural matching. It should be noted that this data is just over twenty years old, though reprinted for a text in 2004. The author of that text, Riordan, is quick to point out that the measures of teacher characteristics are flawed (197), and, that the literature pertaining to teacher quality is vast and voluminous. In other words it’s likely the literature does exist.

Another gap is very much related to the above. While sifting through the literature in respect to the search parameters, it was evident that there were no artifacts questioning the diversity project itself. This is an ironic find. The literature is replete with pronouncements pertaining to the need for those within the dominant culture to question and interrogate their cultural frames (Brown). Not to mention the call to question the dominant, traditional, and prevailing beliefs about history (Wan; Miller) as well as the beliefs about students of diverse and marginalized backgrounds (Hyland and Noffke). According to the literature, diversity as a discourse is the prevailing and dominant system of belief, it is the dominant culture in education. Paraphrasing the work of anthropologist Peter Wood, diversity is by far the dominant worldview of much of American society (307), and, the teacher education literature supports this claim. However, the fact that diversity should be questioned is literally unthinkable. The work questioning diversity comes from without the realms of education.

The most recent and robust study questioning the efficacy of diversity comes from political scientist Robert Putnam. In his study, Putnam questions whether diversity in its demographical sense is actually a good thing for American communities, which is also a
challenge to diversity in its normative sense. Specifically, he researches the implications of diversity on social capital (137).

His finds are interesting. In short, communities with high rates of cultural diversity tend to experience a hunkering effect. On Putnam’s terms, “Diversity, at least in the short run, seems to bring out the turtle in all of us” (151). People in highly diverse areas tend not to trust their neighbors who most closely resemble themselves (in-group) as well as those who are markedly different (out-group). However, areas that are predominantly White and culturally insular tend to trust both out-group and in-group neighbors.

The possible implications of his research on the literature above are, ostensibly, profound. Most notably, and contrary to the artifacts concerned with preparation, short-term exposure to diversity could actually have a negative effect. The treatments offered above might actually negatively impact the development of matching cultural frames, if matching cultural frames are even an important characteristic for teaching diverse populations.

Putnam’s findings might also be construed to mean that White teachers from insular backgrounds (Melnick and Zeichner 89) are the best candidates to teach diverse populations. Conversely to the above literature, White people’s “insularity” actually protects them from the debilitating biases, stereotypes, and discriminatory practices found in highly diverse areas. This is seemingly supported by an article by Ayers et al. Reflecting on the efficacy of their critical pedagogy with preservice teachers, the authors comment that “Interestingly, we’ve seen only a limited correlation between those who embrace a critical perspective and those who are ‘successful’ as first year teachers…”
Oddly enough, one of their more successful graduates was a young White woman from Wyoming who “seemed extremely naïve about issues of race, culture, and urban schooling” (ibid). Though she was more successful than other preservice teachers whose backgrounds better match their students, the authors, however, consider her success “accidental.”

Furthermore, Putnam’s data might suggest that the “diverse” scholars making such pronouncements are the ones whose perceptual frames require alteration. If this is the case, it is easy to understand how people might have serious concerns and disagreements with Putnam’s findings applied to teacher education, especially people who have built careers on convincing White people that they are the problem and in the way of the successes of students of color. And perhaps they should. It is likely that generalizing these findings into other contexts is irresponsible. And though my comments are a bit sensational, they are meant to provoke, not unlike those of Ladson-Billings.

Lastly, and most relevant to the work at hand, absent within the literature are philosophical attempts toward conceptual clarification. The simplest explanation for this is that those producing the literature are not conceptually confused. It is a bit disingenuous, however, to assume that those who want clarification are only those who are confused. There is a rich tradition within the academic realm of philosophy of education concerned with clarification – conceptual analysis. It is hardly imaginable that those minds are confused about the concepts they seek to clarify – teaching, learning, indoctrination, education, aims, curriculum, discipline, etc. A more honest assessment suggests that their work aims toward taking an analytical look into the everyday language and assumptions of education as a way to philosophically approach the problems of
education (Barrow and Woods). The present work seeks to provide filler for the gap of conceptual clarification.

The next two chapters are dedicated to designing a methodology for conceptually analyzing diversity and then conducting that analysis. The following chapters are complementary to the work of clarification conducted in this review and continue my exploration into meaning.
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CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

The prior review indicates that the teacher education literature is bereft of attempts toward the conceptual clarification of diversity. As demonstrated in the Introduction through Tom, this is a pretty serious analytical deficit. Conceptual clarification requires teacher educators to move away from a reliance on conviction and categorical statement, away from grandiose plans and toward a precision of language that puts into check the inattentiveness to assumptions that oftentimes leads to an exclusive dogmatism (8). And though a precision of language can hardly solve all issues under dispute, it can at least help clarify disagreements (7) by challenging educators to interrogate various positions, especially those that are highly moral and normative.

This chapter attempts to do just that: to provide the literature with an exploration—harkening to Montaigne’s *essais*—aiming toward a precision of language by focusing attention directly on assumptions. Here I develop and explain a hybrid strategy of conceptual analysis used to analyze the assumptions of a small purposefully selected sample of artifacts. A rationale is also provided for the selection of artifacts analyzed.
Conceptual Analysis as Methodology

Within and underneath the umbrella of essay is yet another methodological component of this dissertation. This component is largely recognized as conceptual analysis, which itself is bound by methodological as well as philosophical considerations. Conceptual analysis aims to provoke thought through inquiry rather than close inquiry by finding answers. To do this, I develop a strategy for conceptual analysis, a strategy that is later applied to academic artifacts for the purpose of clarifying diversity. The connection between essay and conceptual analysis is made at the end of this chapter.

Conceptual analysis, broadly speaking, is a philosophical approach that examines the complex and central concepts used in disciplines and fields of study. It is used to study technical terms that have become common sense due to their ordinary usage. Conceptual analysis facilitates the “thinking through” of such concepts, their meanings, and relationships. According to educational philosopher, Jonas F. Soltis, much of the ordinary language used day in and day out by specialists carries with it assumed yet complex meanings and relations with other terms. To make the language of any field work, Soltis suggests that “we must be clear about its intent and meaning and not be swayed…by its imagery and poetry” (88).

Central to conceptual analysis is a concern with meaning. Quoting Soltis at length regarding this point, he asserts that “Unless we know what meaning [original emphasis]

---

8 As the reader will come to see, I borrow models and methods of conceptual analysis from Jonas F. Soltis.

these terms carry, it is difficult to answer the questions or to agree or disagree with the statements made about them. In fact, analytically speaking, each requires that the prior conceptual question, ‘What is the meaning of \(x\)?’ be asked and answered before one can go on to consider the substantive content of the message” (95). And so it is my position in relation to diversity. I analyze for the discursive – composite of descriptive, substantive, and normative – meaning of diversity as a prior move to future considerations pertaining to agreement or efficacy.

The conceptual analysis developed here and used in the following chapter is a hybrid form. Borrowing again from Soltis, there are three basic strategies for the analysis of concepts: generic-, differentiation-, and conditions-type. On Soltis’ terms, each strategy “aims at reaching a certain kind of clarification by asking a certain kind of prior question” (97). Brief explanations follow.

The guiding question of a generic-type analysis is simply, “What is an \(X\)?” According to Soltis, this analysis “aims at finding the necessary conceptual features or properties of a thing” (ibid). To find these conceptual features, the analyst looks at several standard and indisputable cases of \(X\) to gain a clearer idea into what is essential about being \(X\). The results of the analysis reveal clearly identifiable conceptual features that make \(X\) an \(X\).

The question guiding a differentiation-type analysis focuses on the uses of \(X\) and possible multiple meanings. This analysis asks, “‘What are the different uses of the term \(X\)?’ or, ‘What are the various types of \(X\)?’” This form of analysis acknowledges at the outset that there are multiple uses of \(X\), and thus there are multiple meanings or senses of \(X\). Similar to a generic-type analysis, differentiation-type proceeds by culling standard
cases of $X$, cases that also exemplify varied meanings. The analyst proceeds as if conducting a generic-type analysis for, let’s say, both senses of $X$, creating categories predicated on distinguishing conceptual marks in each sense. The final result not only clarifies $X$ by revealing multiple meanings, it also helps clarify the conceptual terrain covered by both meanings (ibid.).

Soltis’ third strategy for conceptual analysis – conditions-type – is a bit less straightforward than the prior two. Whereas the former relied on the possibility of finding standard or model cases, this type focuses on certain conditions in which a term is used. Questions guiding this analysis sound like “‘What are the contextual conditions governing the proper use of the term $X$?’ or, ‘What are the contextual conditions under which it would be correct to say that someone is $X$-ing?’” A few educationally related conceptual terms that fit this category might include teaching, learning, understanding, explaining, etc. Model cases of each might be difficult to identity, so, to establish what one means by the term “teaching” requires that various contextual conditions be met.

Earlier I mentioned that my methods borrow from Soltis and are a bit of a hybrid. Largely, the analyses occurring in the following chapter fit the generic-type mold. In its most basic sense, I am asking “What is an $X$?” My main concern is to analyze what I think are standard cases of diversity to identify diversity’s essential conceptual features. The notion of hybrid comes into play because, and per my review of literature, I openly acknowledge that diversity has multiple senses that are really a part of one larger concept; this is a reference to Soltis’ differentiation-type analysis. Though I have no intention to analyze for different meanings, I still intend to use my analyses as a way to get a clearer
idea of the terrain in which the term is located, as would occur in a differentiation-type analysis.

My strategy for analysis does, however, depart from Soltis’ in a distinct way. Rather than seeking clarification by intuitively culling essential features of X from standard cases, I set out to clarify X by casting out and onto standard cases what amounts to a conceptual netting, still for the purposes of identifying (capturing) conceptual features. My thought into doing this is that I think diversity’s discursive meaning is elusive. I don’t think one can intuitively cull features from standard and indisputable cases of diversity as Soltis suggests through his generic-type analysis, and because so, a different type of strategy is required.

I have decided to call this strategy the net-type strategy for analysis. Its namesake comes from a tool called a “netgun”. This tool is used to capture large and wild game while trying not to hurt them for research purposes. It is an air-powered device that launches a net anchored by several weights. The weights aid in the launching of the net toward the game, and are also instrumental in helping wrap-up the game for capture.

As I envision the strategy, the analyst casts a conceptual net over the terrain (written artifact) in which X is used. The netting, albeit metaphorical, is comprised of the logical interconnectivity woven amongst conceptual anchors and is held together by those anchors. As the netting settles over the terrain, thus capturing X, the anchors become markers, marking the conceptual contours (features) of X for study into its meaning. The necessary prior step before conducting a net-type analysis is to find a conceptual net complete with anchors or assemble one. Since this dissertation is the maiden voyage for the net-type strategy, I must assemble one anew.
In assembling my conceptual netting, I borrow from comments made by Kenneth L. Marcus regarding the question of diversity. In February of 2004, Marcus, writing out of the United States Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, penned a letter to the “Leaders of the Education Community.” This letter, which was the preface to the Department’s report titled “Achieving Diversity,” assures the readers that the report has less to do with prescriptive practices and more to do with highlighting several promising approaches for “finding positive [and] constructive methods for achieving and maintaining diversity…” (v). This report, and ostensibly those before and after, is rooted in Marcus’ premise that “The diversity question in America now is not ‘Whether?’ but ‘How?’” The specific question stemming from the premise is how can educational institutions in the United States establish “more diverse [and] inclusive academic communities…while meeting the highest academic and legal standards?” (ibid.). Marcus’ question is compelling; however, what is also interesting is his premise, something that seemingly requires a closer look.

From his premise, we can assume four things about diversity, four things that make perfect conceptual anchors held together by a netting of interconnectivity. And, by focusing attention squarely on clarifying and illuminating diversity’s assumptions, the analysis challenges the literature’s perceived dogmatism as Tom recommends. The netting and anchors are as follows.

The first assumption – or, conceptual anchor hereafter – concerns Marcus’ use of “how”. If the question is with “how”, then what really is of concern is the manner by which diversity is achieved, and, manner is usually time consuming and expensive. I will refer to this anchor as \textit{conduct}. Second, if educational institutions in America are willing
to devote time and money to achieve something called diversity, then it is assumed that diversity is a moral good and is worthwhile to achieve. This worthwhileness is suggestive that diversity is an end in itself, the second anchor. Third, it can be assumed that if institutions are spending time and effort achieving this good and worthwhile thing called diversity, they do so because they do not currently have it, but need it and want it. The fact that institutions do not have it but want it is the problem diversity solves, the third anchor. And fourth, in order for institutions to achieve something they do not have, something morally worthwhile, it is assumed that this thing – diversity – is known, identifiable, and agreed upon so as to spend time devising a “how”. This last assumption is the anchor of criteria.

Putting it all together, and in list form with accompanying questions, the conceptual anchors are:

Criteria: What is diversity as something achievable?
Problem: Achieving diversity solves a problem, so what is the problem?
Conduct: How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem?
End: How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end of achieving it?

The netting is comprised of the interconnectivity between these anchors as explained in the prior paragraph. It is worth noting that the anchor of criteria has close affinity with what the literature review referred to as “uses,” “senses,” or “dimensions” of diversity. I expect overlap, especially in terms of the descriptive and normative dimensions of diversity.

In this net-type analysis, the net is cast over the artifacts and the anchors settle capturing diversity. In settling, they mark out diversity’s assumptive contours. Diversity
is found and studied within this marked off area, within the contours. Admittedly, much falls outside of that marked off area.

The analysis is conducted quite simply. Because of the conceptual net, I have a purpose for reading. I will look for how the artifacts address or answer the questions accompanying each anchor. The anchors cull from the reading and mark the assumptions for future inspection. After reading, and assembled before me in the metaphorical net, are the contents of criteria, problem, conduct, and end. So, in that sense, the analysis is brief and to the point. Again, it is an effort to illuminate and lay bare the assumptions undergirding the meaning and use of diversity in a plain and simple way, to offer clarification, not obfuscation.

Rationale for Selecting Artifacts

The following chapter will see net-type analyses of five artifacts that were reviewed in the previous chapter. If the reader would recall, I categorized the teacher education literature into four dominant purposes for writing about diversity: explications of diversity, policy recommendations, preparing preservice teachers for diversity, and, teaching about diversity. Simply put, the number is set at five because of its manageability. More specifically though, considering that the literature’s sample size was around twenty, and that there were many consistencies across categories, I believe it is possible to subjectively select specific artifacts that do a good job of representing an aspect of the literature, if not the literature itself. Thus by purposefully selecting and targeting five specific artifacts, my hope is that some representativeness of the literature can be found, though admittedly not truly representative from a research standpoint.
At first blush it seems commonsensical to analyze at least one “representative” artifact from each of the four categories and then to analyze one extra from the largest category. However, in light of the articles, their authors, and possible implications, I have decided differently. What follows below are brief explanations for the choosing of artifacts to analyze. The following chapter will provide summaries prior to each analysis.

Regarding the literature that was reviewed, the artifacts within the “explanations of diversity” category were rather unhelpful. Diversity was hardly developed past the descriptive dimension. Conducting an analysis of these artifacts seeking conceptual clarification of diversity, on my view, probably won’t yield much fruit. In terms of analysis, none of these artifacts will be considered. The three other categories do indeed provide articles worthy of consideration, starting with policy recommendations.

All five artifacts in the “policy recommendations” category are quite substantive. The descriptive and normative dimensions of diversity are nicely developed. The artifacts are written by traditional teacher educators as well as by administrators and researchers. They are found in peer reviewed top-tier journals as well as highly regarded professional periodicals. Any one of them would be an excellent candidate for analysis. And rather than choosing just one, I have decided on two.


The Banks et al. article was chosen for a few reasons. Because the authors present what is currently known about diversity and how practice related to diversity can be improved (197), casting a net over this artifact will surely catch something meaningful.
Superficially, I chose this article because the list of authors reads as a veritable who’s who in the realm of multicultural education over the past twenty years. The authors are a combination of researchers, directors of centers, traditional teacher educators, and those whose academic work informs teacher education though is not part of it. These authors are powerbrokers in positions to change and implement policy, and they have. If anybody can be considered authorities in the field, many of these individuals fit that profile. For the above reasons, it seems important that their artifact is considered for analysis.

Futrell et al. was chosen for reasons similar to the above. The authors are administrators within an influential school of education and a high school in the Washington DC area. These individuals are in positions of power to make institutional changes in relation to diversity. Casting an analytical net over their artifact seems rather necessary as well.

Regarding the category labeled “preparing preservice teachers for diversity,” many of these artifacts are substantive and worthy of consideration. As this was the largest category, it makes sense to choose at least two artifacts for analysis. The chosen artifacts are:


Keeping in mind the subjective nature of this choosing, and that I’m trying to form some semblance of representativeness, these two articles were chosen because of how different they are not only from each other, but from the other artifacts. By choosing these two, perhaps some happy medium is formed.
Out of all nine artifacts within this category, Garmon was the only one to nod in the direction of futility regarding the efficacy of preparing preservice teachers for diversity. In this sense, his is unique. It is important to note that futility isn’t because the student group is incorrigible, but because education, its dilemmas and variables are inexact and the work by nature is inexhaustive. What might work with one person at one time might not work with another. However, and on Garmon’s terms, the project is still worthwhile. Garmon is also the only one to admit that within the standardized demographic of White, female, middle-class, and monolingual women, there is a considerable amount of diversity that often gets ignored in the literature. Also unique to the literature, and in complementarity to Garmon, in tone and beliefs, are Major and Brock. This artifact was chosen because of their confrontational tone and seemingly intractable position regarding what is diversity, how to achieve it, and who is standing in the way. Casting nets over these artifacts should surely result in something interesting yet meaningful in terms of finding diversity’s meaning.

And lastly, from the “teaching about diversity” category, I have chosen to cast a net around the artifact written by Howard M. Miller. Similar to “policy recommendations,” any artifact within this category would do well. All of the artifacts are primarily concerned with teaching about diversity through children’s literature, and, all of the artifacts offer to the literature a third dimension of diversity – substantive. I have chosen Miller for the simple reason that I like what he provides in terms of the substance of diversity – “intolerance, disrespect, and cross-cultural fear, distrust, and violence.” Also I like how he provides and explains exemplar pieces of children’s literature that might help teach the “stuff” of diversity to children.
Conclusion

This chapter has been devoted to laying out the method for conceptually clarifying diversity as well as providing a rationale for the artifacts chosen for analysis. The developed hybridized form of analysis – net-type – is part of a larger methodological approach for finding the meaning of diversity within the teacher education discourse.

As Sholes et al. informed, essay is a flexible form of writing that finds roots in the work of sixteenth-century writer, Montaigne. As a means to explore ideas about himself and the world, Montaigne engaged in thought exercises he referred to as *essais*, which simply means to try. The connection between essay and conceptual analysis is twofold.

Firstly, and in reference to Montaigne, this work is what I would consider a thought exercise. Similar to Montaigne, I see my work here as a trying out of an idea, an exploration, to help make sense of an existential realm affecting my life – teacher education. The idea I’m trying is a new and hybrid form of conceptual analysis indebted to the work of educational philosopher, Jonas F. Soltis. Borrowing from his generic- and differentiation-type strategies, I developed a new strategy called a net-type strategy for the purposes of exploring the meaning of diversity.

And secondly, this work borrows from McLuhan’s analysis of advertising artifacts in his early work, *The Mechanical Bride*. Though this method better unfolds in the following chapter, what I borrow from McLuhan is his approach toward clarifying the positions behind artifacts. McLuhan set out to provide readers with provocative explorations about everyday phenomenon – advertisements – as a way to begin conversations into the complexity of what is seemingly mundane. By analyzing artifacts
pertaining to diversity’s meaning through my net-type strategy, I hope to do the same.

The following chapter, it is hoped, melds together both methods – essay and analysis.
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CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS

My entire project aims toward conceptually clarifying the meaning of diversity as used in teacher education. It is far too powerful of a concept not to have work dedicated to such an end. Thus far I have developed a common sense understanding of diversity as well as provided a thematic and interpretive review of the literature as steps toward clarification. Recounting Tom’s comments, however, what is still absent is an effort with analytical power to break through the assumptions and layers of platitudes and categorical statements perpetrated as truths. What follows is that effort.

Below I conduct five net-type analyses of a set of purposefully chosen artifacts culled from the previous literature review. These analyses are the maiden voyages of my hybridized methodology; they embody my exploration into meaning. It is a method that aims toward clarification by illuminating assumptions. And though this work has established that diversity has multiple senses or dimensions, my hope is that the analyses found herein take the discourse in the direction toward answering the question of what does diversity mean via an analytical framework. Closely adhering to Montaigne’s *essais*, what follows is the trying out of an idea for others to see, a systematic meditation on the use and meaning of diversity.

There are three parts to each analysis. The first part is a summary of the artifact being analyzed. Following the summary is the actual casting of my analytical net,
comprised of conceptual anchors, over the artifact. For reference, the conceptual anchors are: Criteria: What is diversity as something achievable? Problem: Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem? Conduct: How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem? End: How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end? And the third part is a condensed version of the findings.

Analysis


Summary

According to this article, the increasing student body diversity within our nation’s schools is a “persistent” and “daunting” challenge. The extent to which teachers are capable of teaching a diverse student body depends in large part on how teachers are prepared by schools of education. In order to effectively teach diverse students, and see to it “that students are educated to be life-long learners, to become gainfully employed, and to contribute to and benefit from our democratic society,” (382) teachers must undergo preparation “to help them understand the benefits of diversity in every area of our lives” (383).

According to the authors, however, a problematic and disturbing picture is emerging. If current demographical changes continue to be coupled with status quo teacher preparation at the university level, the resulting effects are tantamount to “educational misfeasance.” By miseducating students at the hands of poorly prepared teachers, “we are weakening the future potential of the nation” (383) by laying waste to our most precious resource: students in schools.
Acknowledging that solutions are neither simple nor many, the authors provide two suggestions. First, the authors submit that it is necessary for schools of education to undergo “deep structural changes.” To this extent, schools of education must “redefine and restructure” their curricula and programs to ensure that students of diverse backgrounds will have competent teachers, even if the teachers don’t necessarily mirror their students. One way to do this is to follow the model of the “professional development school.” Through such models, teachers of all levels are given opportunities within learning communities to combine theory and practice as a way to “refine their repertoire of teaching skills and strategies” (383). However, in order for schools of education to successfully “examine their own structures and ways of thinking,” the universities housing schools of education “must make the preparation of the nation’s teachers, counselors, administrators, and teacher educators a top priority” (384), the authors’ second suggestion. If universities acknowledge the importance of schools of education by offering overdue resources and seeing to it that the programs therein are preeminent, they are not only investing in the future of their campus, but in the success and stability of our nation as well.

What follows is a net-type analysis of the artifact. This type of analysis aims to illuminate the many assumptions of diversity as a way toward clarifying its meaning and offering the discourse some precision of language.

**Analysis**

As the net falls over this artifact, the *criteria* for diversity – or what it is – are seemingly clear and accord nicely with the descriptive dimension established in the review. For the authors, diversity as something achievable pertains to cultural
demographics. So when they refer to the challenges of “meeting the needs of a diverse student body,” or “our nation’s diversity,” or that “America’s cultural diversity is one of its national treasures,” they are essentially referring to demographical information garnered from census data (381). Specifically borrowing from that data, the authors conclude that there are 53 million children in our elementary and secondary schools, 35% of those students come from racial or ethnic minority backgrounds. By 2010, the number will be 40% and by 2050 the percentage will be just over 50% (382). Also demographically speaking, our nation’s cadre of teachers does not “truly reflect the diversity of our student population” (ibid.).

What the net caught in terms of diversity’s criteria are two things, mainly. First diversity is a simple reference to demographical considerations. And second, how demographical considerations play out in schools between students and teachers isn’t all that simple. As a matter of fact, the artifact suggests that institutions redefine and redesign themselves in accordance with such considerations, which leads into both the problem and conduct of diversity.

In close proximity to criteria is the problem that diversity solves. If institutions should engage in restructurings around issues of diversity, then the problem must be quite significant.

The census data reveals a trend. On one hand the student body within our nation’s schools is diversifying while on the other the teaching force is not. Why this is a problem isn’t stated in this artifact, but that it is a problem can easily and safely be assumed. The authors borrow from studies indicating “that preservice teachers are not being prepared to meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students” (382). And that when
preservice teachers are interviewed regarding their own preparation, only 32% of those questioned felt they were adequately prepared “to address the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds” (ibid.). If teachers are feeling this way, then it might be further assumed that their teacher educators are also unprepared to teach diverse students (383). According to these authors, a focus on teacher education is perhaps the first place to start.

What can be assumed is that the teaching force which isn’t diversifying is not linguistically or culturally diverse. Though nowhere do the authors use the term “mismatch” as was heavily found in the literature review, mismatch can be inferred as the problem diversity solves. However, nowhere is it explained as to why the lack of diversification of the teaching force is a problem, or why the diversification of the student body is not a problem, all of it is assumed. How this problem gets solved is part of the conduct of diversity.

The authors offer a few comments toward conduct. A few of them seem routine, as if they could be found in any number of journal articles discussing the educational problems of their time. For example, comments toward conduct such as “School districts and schools of education will need to develop strategies to provide professional development that prepares teachers to teach diverse audiences, while at the same time aligning instruction with the assessments, curriculum, and standards” (382) is par for the course in education. One could easily replace “diverse audiences” with “multiple intelligences” and get the feel of an article written twenty-five years ago. Also, suggestions that schools and schools of education should partner with the fields of law, medicine, engineering, or business to help identify content needs is really nothing new.
Or that schools should restructure away from the industrial model of the early twentieth century (383) is a rote and conditioned response that has been going the rounds since Dewey’s lab school or Counts’ demand for school to build a new social order.

What is more interesting, however, is the *conduct* geared toward recruiting teacher education faculty members identified as belonging to a minority group. The authors comment that “Currently only 5% of all university faculty members are identified as members of minority groups.” As a measure to bolster this number, the authors comment on the “creation of Holmes Scholars programs that are designed to offer a more racially diverse community of faculty, staff, and students and to prepare additional people of color who are excellently trained to become professors, especially in schools of education” (384). Such a faculty “is crucial to developing and implementing strategies to more successfully educate a diverse student population” (ibid.). And to do this, schools and schools of education must “be willing to examine their own structures and ways of thinking” (ibid.) and “to make a commitment to address the challenges of diversity” (385).

The robust *conduct* of restructuring and redefining strongly assumes and suggests that there is something very worthwhile about diversity. One can, or should, safely assume that diversity is a desired *end*. Looking for the contents of the net that address diversity’s worthwhileness should answer this question. However, such contents are a bit elusive. The authors comment that “America’s success will depend in large part on our commitment to diversity as a powerful component of our national vision” (385). And that committing to diversity is a commitment to “preparing educators to meet the challenges
of providing a high-quality education for all Americans” (ibid.). What could be more worthwhile than that?

Piecing diversity together as captured by the net is quite easy at this point, though somewhat unfulfilling. Whether the samples that follow continue these trends or break them will be an interesting find. As far as the first analysis is concerned, diversity is conceptually clarified to mean:

**Criteria:** *What is diversity as something achievable?* Diversity, in this sample at least, has come to mean cultural and racial composition, especially of students in schools. But not just any composition, the unique composition is specifically in reference to those within minority groups, or what the authors refer to as people of color. This only makes sense when juxtaposed with the composition of our nation’s teaching force, which is not very diverse.

*Problem:* *Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem?* The problem, according to this sample, is that the teaching corps in the United States is not diversifying along with the student populations. Also, the teaching corps is not adequately prepared within teacher education programs to teach diverse populations.

*Conduct:* *How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem?* The manner by which to achieve diversity is through the recruitment of minority teachers and teacher educators. The recruitment is geared not only toward gaining minority preservice teachers, but also to help prepare White teachers for diverse populations.

*End:* *How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end?* What is so unfulfilling from this sample, or my analysis of it, is that I’m still not sure why diversity is so worthwhile, or why it is good, why it is an end to achieve. We might conclude something along the lines of cultural matching, but this is a big leap. There is no substantive statement clarifying why diversity is a powerful component of our national vision. It is simply assumed.
Summary

According to Howard Miller, multicultural education too often is mired in cycles of moments. On these terms, the extent to which a classroom’s instruction resembles anything multicultural can be determined simply by looking at dates on a calendar. Similarly to many multicultural education advocates, Miller believes that for such an education to be effective, an education he uses interchangeably with diversity education, it “needs to be woven throughout the curriculum from September to June, and from prekindergarten on” (602). However, its effectiveness largely depends on the “what” that gets woven in that time.

On Miller’s terms, the “stuff” of diversity education is particular “stories aching to be told, voices keening to be heard” (602). And there is no better outlet for these stories and voices than the children in our classrooms. Exposure to such stories occurs through the rich array of children’s literature dedicated to telling in an honest and forthright manner the terrible stories of intolerance, disrespect, fear, distrust, and violence. Make no mistake, Miller “does not mean we must go through a ritualistic flogging for the ‘sins of the past’, but it does mean we need to be forthright about the lessons of history” (ibid.).

Struggling candidly with lessons of diversity might help students ease into positions of vulnerability. Such a positioning, according to Miller, helps students consider life from perspectives different than their own, which arguably is a precept of multicultural education.
Miller does offer caution about how these stories are allowed to be told and used in classrooms. As important as it is to hear the horrors of the Holocaust, about the forced immigration and servitude of Africans, the forced assimilation of Native Americans, and the lives lost due to the vision of manifest destiny, these stories “are not merely a roll call of victims.” Miller submits that they are “stories of heroes – not the heroes of classical mythology, but the genuine article, ‘just plain folks’ who transcended the cruelty and injustice to take their place among the great leaders, mentors, and role models of history” (603). These lessons – the terrible and the heroic – are the “driving force and compelling reason” for making a commitment to diversity education.

Analysis

Based on the prior analysis, criteria seems to be a good place to start. As the net is cast over Miller’s artifact, the criteria anchor locates his assessment of the multicultural moment as an indicator of what is diversity. According to Miller, “Diversity education does seem to be stuck in a cycle of ‘multicultural moments’ – a Hanukkah song tossed into the Christmas assembly in December, a Black History program in February, and perhaps a Cinco de Mayo celebration in the spring. You can sense a collective sigh and shaking of the head among the minority populations, even as the majority group basks in self-congratulations for its sensitivity and awareness” (602). Within this passage, the author offers criteria similar to Futrell et al. that diversity is essentially equated with demographics.

Embedded within his assessment of the multicultural moment is the understanding that diversity means racial (or ethnic) heritage, primarily other than non-Jewish white (602). As was mentioned in the previous sample, understanding diversity in such a
demographical sense accords with what has been established by the literature review, that people of differing heritages occupy the same space. Moreover, though, Miller’s comment evidences an interesting tension between the minority and majority populations. Miller does not offer any defense or argument for why he assesses the multicultural moment the way he does. And because so, I believe the reader can safely assume that Miller believes his assessment is accurate, one with which readers of his article would agree. I will quickly explain this tension as a prelude into a discussion of the problem.

Miller remarks that minority populations during “multicultural moments” breath a sigh, and not of relief. During that same moment the majority populations engage in self-congratulations about a job well done. From this, one can assume that minority populations possess a form of knowledge, a form of enlightenment that the majority does not have, but needs. The reason the majority needs this knowledge, and from the minority standpoint, is that the lack (deficit) of this knowledge causes some form of pain for those in the minority, hence the sigh of frustration and not relief.

Within this tension lay the problem. Simply stated, the problem is that there is almost a natural conflict between the minority and majority populations regarding making sense of the world. The conflict or tension exists because of a knowledge gap. From the review, one could infer that this is a form of cultural mismatch, though those terms no where appear in the artifact. The problem is that the majority populations do not have this pain-relieving knowledge, but desperately need it. Complicating things, they do not know they do not have it, and nor that they need it, hence the collective minority sigh. This knowledge is either diversity itself – its criteria – or pertains to diversity. To be sure, perhaps a look at the net’s contents of conduct might help.
According to Miller, teachers who have a commitment to diversity are committed to providing students with a fuller depiction of history. Miller’s connecting of diversity with history indicates that there is something about diversity that equates its criteria with knowledge of something. That something is found within “stories aching to be told, voices keening to be heard” (602). On Miller’s terms, those are the stories of the past and present, stories that speak toward issues of “intolerance, disrespect, and cross-cultural fear distrust, and violence (ibid.). Diversity, then, is a form of knowledge pertaining to the lessons of history, lessons that help students understand what life is like outside of the advantageous positions of the majority. The conduct required to teach such knowledge is found through children’s literature.

Miller would have the teacher use various children’s books to convey those “stories aching to be told.” On his terms, “This does not mean we must go through the ritualistic flogging for the ‘sins of the past’, but it does mean we need to be forthright about the lessons of history” (602). Miller states, “What better audience can there be for these stories and voices than the children in our classrooms?” (ibid.). To help the reader envision his form of conduct, Miller discusses various children’s books that convey the special knowledge intolerance, disrespect, fear, and distrust. These are the stories of the Holocaust, the forced immigration and slavery of Africans, the forced assimilation and cultural annihilation of Native American’s through the doctrine of manifest destiny, and the paranoid actions as a result of war that led to the internment of Japanese-Americans. It is through this conduct that the problem of majority ignorance is addressed; it is through this conduct that diversity as a form of knowledge is achieved.
What is left to find within the net is diversity’s worthwhileness, or its *end*. An assessment of the terrain containing the other contents seemingly suggests that diversity’s *end* is nothing other than the alleviation of the tension and pain which exists between majority and minority populations. The terrible lessons of history bring us closer to the multicultural realization that we are quite connected and in this life together (602).

Perhaps this alleviation will lead to a collective – minority and majority – sigh, one that is of relief.

From this artifact, finding conceptual clarity with diversity was a bit easier. Evincéd was a more substantial notion of *criteria*. Also, the interconnectivity underneath the conceptual netting was more significant and logical. An analysis of this sample found the following:

**Criteria:** *What is diversity as something achievable?* Diversity is a form of knowledge. The knowledge comes from stories told through voices of “‘just plain folks’ who transcended the cruelty and injustice [of society] to take their place among the great leaders, mentors, and role models of history” (603). Diversity is the knowledge that comes from the stories that in part account for present day injustices benefitting certain groups at the expense of others. Diversity as knowledge is moral because it leads to a more moral and just society, a society wherein the tensions between majority and minority groups are quite dull.

**Problem:** *Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem?* Diversity as a form of knowledge, if transmitted and received, minimizes majority ignorance and the pain this ignorance causes minority groups. Because so, it helps alleviate the tensions existing between groups

**Conduct:** *How is diversity achieved, or how should it be achieved to solve the problem?* According to Miller, the conduct is the teaching of “these terrible lessons of history” to the children in America’s classrooms through select children’s literature.

**End:** *How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end?* The end, and why diversity is so good, is that it leads to a better society. This society is absent any palpable conflict amongst groups, and is also devoid of the structures leading to certain groups being unjustly privileged over others. For Miller, such a
society is one of tolerance, respect, and cross-cultural understanding, and is the result of achieving diversity.


Summary

A commonly held assumption by many multicultural teacher educators regards something called cultural matching. This was healthily evidenced within the literature review and has been only intimated thus far in this chapter. According to the assumption of mismatch, effective teaching and learning takes place when the teacher’s cultural background accords more so than less with that of the students’. If this is the case, though Garmon admits the research is mixed, then there is reason for concern. The concern animates from the fact that 90% of our nation’s public school teachers are white while 38% of the student population is comprised of racial/ethnic minorities. Garmon comments that this “mismatch between teachers and their students has precipitated concerns about these teachers’ ability to effectively teach minority students” (275). The disquieting facts related to mismatch and effective teaching has given teacher educators reason to inquire about better ways to prepare candidates for teaching minority students.

One of the ways multicultural teacher educators prepare teaching candidates for diverse students is by focusing on the candidates’ beliefs and attitudes regarding such populations. According to this view, a multicultural teacher education program is a kind of treatment candidates undergo to change their attitudes and beliefs for the purposes of bridging cultural gaps and minimizing the effects of mismatch. However, and at best, Garmon comments that the results over the past twenty years are mixed. In other words, there is no clear indication that teacher education programs effectively change preservice
teachers’ attitudes toward teaching diverse populations, nor is there any indication that if attitudes and beliefs are changed as a result of the program that that change leads to more effective teaching. For Garmon, this is not reason enough to abandon the project. He would rather have us look more closely at the personal variables involved that make some students more amenable than others to the treatment of multicultural teacher education programs.

Using his own research compiled over the span of a decade, Garmon has come to postulate that there are six factors associated with changing preservice teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about diversity. Garmon categorizes these factors into two broad groups of three factors each.

The first group is what he refers to as “dispositions”. On Garmon’s terms, one’s disposition refers “to a person’s character traits and tendencies” (276). The three dispositional factors are: “openness”, or how receptive one is to new information; “self-awareness / self-reflectiveness”, which refers to how aware one is of their own beliefs and attitudes; and, a “commitment to social justice”, which he defines as “a deep concern for achieving equity and equality for all people” (278).

Garmon labels the second group as “experiences”, which seems self-evident enough. The three experiential factors according to Garmon are: “intercultural experiences” which he defines as “direct interactions with individuals from racial/ethnic groups different than one’s own” (279); “educational experiences” which refers to the types of multiple and varied experiences preservice teachers have with students of diverse backgrounds; and, “support group experiences” that provide “feelings of safety and acceptance for a person while also encouraging that person’s growth” (282).
The import of recognizing these six factors in preservice teachers is to help teacher education programs tailor their courses around their students and move away from a “one-size-fits-all” approach (283). Garmon also hopes that these six factors will help prevent teacher educators from regarding their students, even groups comprised of all white females, as knowable homogeneous groups. Perhaps by keeping these six factors in mind, multicultural teacher education programs might have better results in terms of helping prospective teachers adjust their attitudes and beliefs regarding diversity.

**Analysis**

The criteria from the previous samples strongly suggest that diversity pertains to race or ethnicity, usually done in terms of a majority and minority, or, White and people of color. Furthermore, and as evidenced in the last sample, the “what” of diversity is in reference to a type of knowing. Garmon follows suit, suggesting a trend in terms of a base-line meaning of diversity that pertains to demographics and involves a special form of knowledge. In other words, when asking the question “What is diversity that it needs achieving?” the answer seems to be that it is knowledge of something.

In terms of demographics, Garmon comments that “Nearly 90% of the public school teachers in this country are white, while approximately 38% of the student population is composed of racial/ethnic minority students” (275). This base-line demographical understanding of diversity gives way to diversity as specialized knowledge. Similar to the prior sample, this knowledge pertains to making sense of the present in light of the historical injustices perpetrated against minority populations. To this extent, Garmon asserts that the racial/ethnic “mismatch between teachers and their students has precipitated concerns about these teachers’ ability to effectively teach
minority students” (ibid.) because the worldviews might be drastically different, almost irreconcilable. Extending this argument, the ineffective teaching of minority students, presumptively by White teachers, and over the course of several years, has a debilitating effect on minority student populations. The effect is that minority students, because of poorly prepared teachers, are less competitive or prepared when it comes to college entrance or entry into the job market. This phenomenon results in a continuous cycle of minority disadvantage equable to a form of violence.

The criteria of diversity, that it is really knowledge, are starting to crystallize in three forms. We have already seen that it is an acknowledgment of demographical conditions largely pertaining to race. That this knowledge points to a tension or mismatch that further points to some form of social injustice. And now, in Garmon, we see that the perpetrated injustice occurs because White teachers “generally lack knowledge of and experience with individuals from racial/ethnic backgrounds different than their own” (ibid.). Of course Garmon sites the work of others who presumably have proven these things to be true as he begins his discussion of key factors. On my read, however, I think he holds open the possibility that the criteria for diversity are not so intractable. To such an extent he comments that “even a class composed entirely of young, white female students from mostly white suburban communities can still manifest considerable diversity” (ibid.). However, this doesn’t seem to accord with the criteria evidenced through these three samples.

Achieving diversity, or, obtaining this specialized knowledge, solves a problem. The problem in this sample, similar to the Miller sample, is the lack of knowledge on behalf of the White teaching corps of the realities of minority populations and the
structures that lead to such realities. This lack of knowledge, which is perhaps responsible for some harm committed unto minority populations through schooling, is in part due to the lack of experiences White teachers have with minority populations. This of course assumes that the realities of minority life are drastically different than the realities of majority life, and that there is some way to know this outside of basic generalizations, not to mention some form of knowing that harm is actually being done. What is of interest now is the conduct to achieve this knowledge that will alleviate the problem, supposedly.

Finding conduct in the netting is a bit tricky. On Garmon’s terms there are six key factors that multicultural teacher educators should consider when designing courses and contemplating teaching strategies. The six factors are of two different types. The first type consists of dispositional factors and includes openness, self-awareness/self-reflectiveness, and commitment to social justice. The second type pertains to experiences and includes intercultural, educational, and support group experiences.

The importance of these factors reads like a very well organized and thoughtful review of literature pertaining to the significance of each factor in relation to diversity. An example Garmon uses comes from the research of Pohan (277). Regarding the importance of openness, her research suggests that “students who demonstrated strong biases and negative stereotypes about diverse groups were less likely to develop beliefs and behaviors consistent with multicultural sensitivity and responsiveness” (ibid.). In other words, and borrowing from the research of Major and Brock, Garmon comments that a lack of openness limits students’ receptivity to diversity.
Another example, though much of the piece follows in similar fashion, is found within his discussion on the importance of a commitment to social justice. On Garmon’s terms, he defines “a commitment to social justice as a deep concern for achieving equity and equality for all people” (278), which seems consistent with the prevailing scholarship.\(^\text{10}\)

Definitions, however, do very little in terms of suggesting a course of travel, or conduct. Regarding the conduct necessary to achieve diversity as developed here, Garmon’s commentary reads more like self-righteous platitudes that are really unhelpful. How helpful is it in terms of conduct to know that preparing teachers for diversity means preparing them to act as change agents in schools, a common belief of social justice educators (278). Garmon cites Rosaen in that “teachers must help their own students – tomorrow’s citizens – to question the structural inequality, racism, and injustice that exist in today’s society” (ibid.). Obviously these things should occur within teacher preparation programs, but nothing is said regarding the actual conduct to bring about this questioning. To Garmon’s defense, his piece is not overly concerned with conduct more so than with identifying beliefs. The possible conduct, on my read, occurs through the teacher educator’s pedagogy, and unfortunately the reader is not let in on procedural insights comprising the pedagogy.

And as for the desired end of diversity, finding evidence within the netting is a bit difficult. As in previous samples, the end is seemingly taken-for-granted. That many of the readers would need this spelled out is dubious, thus it is not explicitly commented on.

It is obvious that there is worth to diversity and that is why preservice teachers’ attitudes need to be directed toward it.

From this analysis what is found in the netting is that diversity is a form of knowledge, and is definitely important in terms of addressing the problem of White ignorance and cultural mismatch. To provide minority children taught by White teachers with quality educational experiences, it is important that the teachers’ attitudes about diversity are altered. Though from this sample it is difficult to say how this gets done. It seems safe to assume, though, that achieving diversity occurs through teacher education programs. And regarding diversity’s worthwhileness, there is a bit of a question. Ostensibly diversity is necessary for the sake of minority student achievement? If so, none of this is explicitly commented on.

Following is a review of the net’s contents, helping to get a better look at what the assumptions are behind what diversity means:

Criteria: What is diversity as something achievable? Similar to Miller, diversity is a body of knowledge pertaining to minority (largely racial) realities. It is assumed the realities pertain to disadvantages of being a minority. It is important that such knowledge be achieved by the predominantly White teaching corps, who lacks it, and needs it in order to be effective teachers for their minority students.

Problem: Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem? The problem, as mentioned above, is that White teachers are bereft of knowing about the realities of their minority students. This lack of knowledge, so it is assumed, prevents them from effectively and successfully teaching minority children. This ineffectiveness hinders the future successes of minority students and perhaps reinforces a status quo of White dominance.

Conduct: How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem? From this sample, it is a bit difficult to comment on the particular conduct regarding how diversity as knowledge should be achieved to ameliorate the problem. Suffice it to say, and from Garmon’s comments regarding the six factors for changing preservice teachers’ attitudes toward diversity, the pedagogy of teacher educators is influential in achieving diversity. In other words, the conduct
occurs in the teacher education classroom. But how this occurs is not commented upon.

End: How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end? Similar to conduct, and as previously mentioned, the worth of diversity is not explicitly commented on by Garmon, at least not on my read. What I do find interesting, and hope others do as well, is that diversity’s worth outside of solving the problem at hand seems so inherent. In other words, why comment on its worth when everybody knows what it is because it is so obvious. Will society be better, more just and human? Perhaps the next sample will tell us.


Summary

In this article, the Multicultural Education Consensus Panel provides teachers and educational policy makers with twelve “essential” design principles. The principles are the result of a four-year project dedicated to studying and synthesizing the research on diversity and education. The project was sponsored by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington and the Common Destiny Alliance at the University of Maryland, and was supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Animated by the belief that schools “can make a significant difference in the lives of students,” the panel mined research to find “ways in which education policy and practice related to diversity can be improved” (197). According to the panel, “Diversity in the nation’s schools is both an opportunity and a challenge” (203). Based on their findings, the twelve “essential principles” are designed to helps schools and teachers “meet the challenges of and benefit from the diversity that characterizes the United States (ibid.). A loftier hope is that these design principles, by helping schools find “diversity
within unity” can help maintain and even strengthen our democratic society that is both fragile and in progress.

The panel organized their essential principles into five broader and at times overlapping categories. Respectively, the categories are: 1) teacher learning; 2) student learning; 3) intergroup relations; 4) school governance, organization, and equity; and 5) assessment. Some categories contain more principles than others, with intergroup relations consisting of the most at four principles.

Analysis

Casting the analytical net over this artifact is a bit problematic. As the artifact is crafted, I’m not sure the net is actually big enough. The twelve essential principles basically stand on their own and are explained in some detail. In other words, each principle is in itself an artifact about diversity. What I have decided to do in this analysis is to focus on those essential principles that best embody and exemplify conceptualizing

11 Teacher Learning category: Principle 1, Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups within U.S. society and the ways in which race, ethnicity, language, and social class interact to influence student behavior; Student Learning category: Principle 2, Schools should ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards; Principle 3, The curriculum should help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers’ personal experiences as well as the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live; Principle 4, Schools should provide all students with opportunities to participate in extracurricular and cocurricular activities that develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that increase academic achievement and foster positive interracial relationships; Intergroup Relations category: Principle 5, Schools should create or make salient superordinate or cross-cutting groups in order to improve intergroup relations; Principle 6, Students should learn about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations; Principle 7, Students should learn about the values shared by virtually all cultural groups (e.g., justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity); Principle 8, Teachers should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups; Principle 9, Schools should provide opportunities for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to interact socially under conditions designed to reduce fear and anxiety; School Governance, Organization, and Equity category: Principle 10, A school’s organizational strategies should ensure that decision making is widely shared and that members of the school community learn collaborative skills and dispositions in order to create a caring learning environment for students; Principle 11, Leaders should ensure that all public schools, regardless of their locations, are funded equitably; Assessment category: Principle 12, Teachers should use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess complex cognitive and social skills.
about diversity. Then at the end of this sample’s analysis, I will synthesize my findings as per the previous analyses. Of the twelve essential principles, I cast my net over three. This artifact seems too important to be left out, though leaving it out would simplify things.

The first principle for analysis is Principle 1 found in the category of “teacher learning.” The principle reads: “Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups within U.S. society and the way in which race, ethnicity, language, and social class interact to influence student behavior” (Banks et al. 197). In terms of diversity’s criteria, the authors, similar to previous artifacts, suggest that diversity’s meaning revolves around demographical characteristics bifurcated into majority and minority populations. The way this is done, again similar to the above, is through the language of cultural mismatch, and therein lays the problem, too. To this point, the authors comment that “Continuing education about diversity is especially important for teachers because of the increasing cultural and ethnic gap that exists between the nation’s teachers and students” (ibid.). And to the authors benefit, they intimate that cultural mismatching can occur in innumerable ways.

To alleviate the problem of mismatch, the authors suggest a form of conduct that comes by the way of professional development programs. And though this is a form of conduct, it is seemingly part of diversity’s criteria. Through this fourth artifact we are starting to see how intertwined the assumptions of diversity are. Through professional development, teachers should “1) uncover and identify their personal attitudes toward racial, ethnic, language, and cultural groups; 2) acquire knowledge about the histories and cultures of diverse…groups within the nation and within their schools; 3) become
acquainted with diverse perspectives…; 4) understand the ways in which institutionalized knowledge…and popular culture can perpetuate stereotypes…; and 5) acquire the knowledge and skills needed to develop and implement an equity pedagogy” (ibid.). It is safe to say that through such programs, teachers would acquire special sets of knowledge. And similar to the previous analyses, what is evidenced is that diversity is viewed as a form of knowledge revolving around demographical considerations more so than mere demographics alone. Diversity, then, is achieved through some conduct when that special knowledge is achieved.

The importance of such knowledge and why it is so worthwhile – diversity’s end – is that it helps close the gap between teachers and their students. Having such knowledge, according to the authors, leads to teaching that is “culturally responsive to students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups…[which] involves strategies such as constructing relevant cultural metaphors and multicultural representations…” of school knowledge (198). Though what those metaphors or representations might look like are not commented on. And regarding school knowledge the analysis moves into the next principle.

Next is Principle 3 within the category of “student learning.” This principle reads: “The curriculum should help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers’ personal experiences as well as the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work” (198).

In this principle, knowledge is specifically commented on, and school knowledge in particular. According to the panel, “students often study historical events, concepts, and issues only or primarily from the points of view of the victors. The perspectives of
the vanquished are frequently silenced, ignored, or marginalized. This kind of teaching
privileges mainstream students – those who most often identify with the victors or
dominant groups – and causes many students of color to feel left out of the American
story” (ibid.) The criteria of diversity as a form of knowledge is that it is knowledge of
the perspectives of the vanquished, but also knowledge that there is a perspective of the
vanquished. Within this realization we have diversity as demographic – White and people
of color – but also a special form of knowledge animating from the demographic
considerations. All of this is quite consistent with finds from the other analyses. What is
different, though, is that more substance is being added to what was previously mere
platitudes.

The problem diversity solves relates to knowledge as well. The main concepts of
school knowledge, especially in relation to the social sciences, “are often taught primarily
from the points of view of the European Americans who constructed them” (ibid.). This
is a problem, as the prior paragraph indicates, because many students of color feel left out
of the American story. Diversity as a form of knowledge solves that problem. It helps
students (and teachers) “better understand the complex factors that contributed to the
birth, growth, and development of the nation” (ibid.).

The conduct to achieve diversity and diversity’s end is less apparent within the
contours of the net. From the authors’ remarks some associations and conclusions can be
drawn. Because this principle specifically focuses on curriculum, it seems evident the
conduct through which diversity is achieved, or the manner, comes through a specifically
planned and written curriculum that focuses on telling a comprehensive American story,
one that includes perspectives of many involved in shaping America’s contours. The
curriculum as *conduct* is, of course, integrally related to the teaching of that curriculum, thus the teacher’s *conduct* is paramount, pointing again to the issue of matching.

And as for diversity’s *end*, its worth, the authors comment that because much of the American story is told from the victor’s point of view, many children of color are left out. Diversity’s worthwhileness is that it includes many more people and their voices into the shaping of America. Whether telling these perspectives really achieves this *end*, the artifact leaves the reader unfulfilled. However, the authors seem confident, that their study of research and practice over a four-year period suggests that such curricular revision will “help students develop empathy for the points of view and perspectives of various groups and will increase their ability to think critically (ibid.), back to diversity as knowledge.

The last is Principle 8, which is part of the “intergroup relations” category. Principle 8 reads: “Teachers should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups” (200). The *criteria* of diversity, according to this principle, is that it is knowledge of skill sets to help students “perceive, understand, and respond to group differences” (ibid.). In keeping with the findings found in prior principles and analyses, diversity as knowledge points to a particular *problem*. According to this principle, the *problem* is that students do not possess the “social skills necessary to interact effectively with members of another culture” (ibid.).

The *conduct* to achieve diversity as knowledge of intercultural communication comes through classroom conditions and activities. One such activity encourages members of minority groups to share with majority members their experiences of being
the targets of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (201). This accords well with Miller’s artifact. However, such an activity seems hardly interactive, and neither is it suggestive of any skills. The authors find that “Sharing such information informs the majority group of the pain and suffering their intentional or thoughtless acts of discrimination cause” (ibid.), which assumptively, is the worthwhile end of diversity.

A question the analyst is left while surveying the contents of the net are whether there are any skills to be found in grouping students into bifurcated categorizations and then assuming that one group is comprised of victims and the other victimizers. This analysis also uncovers the assumption that one group is inherently capable of teaching, and the other group deserving to sit passively, quietly, and as objects absorbing as truth everything being deposited into them. Though this seems to be diversity’s end according to this principle, pitting two historically tense groups against each other seems problematic.

Synthesizing the analyses of this artifact is a bit difficult. My fear is that the result will be nothing more than bland generalizations hardly indicative of diversity’s conceptual meaning. What I think is worth noting, are the developing trends.

Criteria: What is diversity as something achievable? Similar to previous analyses, diversity is a form of knowledge. This knowledge, generally speaking, pertains to the cultural gaps existing between White teachers and their students of color. According to this artifact, diversity as a body of knowledge specifically includes knowledge of one’s own attitudes toward racial, ethnic, cultural, and language diversity, that there are other perspectives regarding the American story which comes from the vanquished and not the victors, and, that there are particular skill sets to know that help facilitate intercultural understanding.

Problem: Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem? The problem(s) solved by achieving the knowledge of diversity is the minimizing of the cultural gap between teachers and students. The problem is that people in majority groups, so it is perceived, lack empathy for the feelings and experiences of those in the minority group who endure stereotyping and discrimination. And,
another problem is that school-aged students do not possess the necessary skills to bridge gaps and establish relationships with those of differing backgrounds, most likely because their teachers are bereft as well.

**Conduct: How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem?**
As per this sample, much of the conduct to achieve diversity occurs through some form of teaching and learning, most of it occurring within schools. The teaching occurs in the form of professional development consultants teaching teachers how to achieve diversity in and through their classrooms as well as teachers teaching their students in just such a way.

**End: How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end?**
The worth of diversity and why we should achieve it in our classrooms, according to this distinguished panel, is that achieving diversity will help realize and maintain the survival of democracy in the United States, in the face of demographical shifts and economical changes. Again, what is showing up through these analyses is that diversity is a body of knowledge pertaining to certain demographical considerations, but is in no way limited to those considerations.


**Summary**
In this article, Major and Brock dialogically explore their concern regarding the preparation of teachers serving diverse populations. Specifically, the authors are concerned that many of the preservice teachers entering teacher preparation programs do not culturally match student populations in the greatest need of good and effective teaching.

On the authors’ terms, the number of students entering U.S. public schools whose cultural backgrounds differ from those occupying positions in the U.S. teaching force is increasing “exponentially”. Citing several sources, the teaching force in the United States consists “primarily of monolingual middle- to lower-class European American women who may lack the requisite background knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach
effectively children from sociolinguistically diverse backgrounds” (7). This perceived mismatch “can be devastating to children”, and because so, teacher education programs must help their dominant group teachers come to understand “that their values, beliefs, and cultural practice can vary tremendously from…the children in their classrooms” (ibid.). However, the most difficult obstacle facing teacher educators is oftentimes the candidates themselves.

To express their point, Major and Brock use as an example a candidate from their program whom they refer to as Shanna. The central piece of this article is the dialogical exploration of the moral dilemma surrounding what to do with candidates such as Shanna. Such students are referred to as “persistent problems.” They are dominant group students who enter teacher education programs with “negative dispositions toward diversity” (10) that might actually “mitigate against fostering the educational success of children from diverse backgrounds” (9).

If Shanna and similar problem students are of an inappropriate disposition to teach minority children, the authors ask each other what do they expect of teacher candidates and what are the appropriate dispositions. Once identified, the authors inquire as to how teacher education programs should go about fostering such dispositions and how can such dispositions really be measured as a way to test the efficacy of the program.

In the end, and through their dialogue, Major and Brock admit that they do not see simple or clear-cut answers to such complex questions (20). However, and though teacher preparation programs are just the beginning to a successful and long career teaching, they
see it as a very important step in guiding candidates to develop the skills and dispositions necessary to teach minority children.

Analysis

Similar to the prior analyses, the casting of this net yields that diversity’s criteria are two-fold. The first pertains to demographical considerations, generally in relation to race/ethnicity/culture. The particular terms these authors use in relation to diversity is ethnolinguistic and sociolinguistic. In other words, diversity means those people who speak a different language than the majority population – what they refer to as dominant – and have a different ethnic heritage – which for these authors is anything other than European, with an obvious disregard to the multiple languages and cultures coming out of Europe. The criteria for diversity’s meaning is evidenced through their statement that “While the numbers of students from diverse backgrounds are increasing, the U.S. teaching force consists primarily of monolingual middle- to lower-middle class European American women (7). In terms of criteria, diversity means anything other than White, middle-class, English speaking women. As we have seen through prior analyses, diversity means something more as well.

Major and Brock also strongly suggest that diversity is a body of knowledge, a “common core.” This body “includes knowledge of second-language-acquisition theory and pedagogy, use of culturally-relevant curricula, the propensity to validate the students’ home language and culture, engagement in reflectivity and professional growth, a clear sense of their own ethnicity, and a commitment to student advocacy” (8). It is clear from their piece that they are writing for an audience that doesn’t require any of that to be
explained or defended. The legitimacy of that knowledge is assumed and unquestioned by their intended audience, and perhaps even unquestionable.

The problem, again, is that the bulk of the teaching corps in America, identified as not being diverse by the authors, lacks this common core or body of knowledge. Specifically, the problem is with the cultural mismatch that, presumably, adversely affects the teaching and learning process (9-10). It appears that a “monocultural” teacher cannot teach diverse students. The authors fear that such a teacher might unknowingly or even knowingly attempt to assimilate diverse students into the dominant culture. That this is a good possibility is assumed. The authors offer no defense as to why assimilating minority students into the majority culture is bad. Its badness is simply assumed (12). Regarding the dangers of assimilation, the authors comment that “Unexamined mismatches between prospective teachers’ worldviews and the worldviews and life experiences of their students can be devastating for children” (8). And though they cite a number of scholars, no proof or mention of any other possible variables are offered as to how children are devastated. According to the authors, in light of the demographical changes occurring in our nation’s schools, many teachers “lack the requisite background knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach effectively children from sociolinguistically diverse backgrounds,” and, that “this mismatch between teachers and students…is unlikely to change in the future” (7). The problem is identified, again, as a cultural mismatch which results from a lack of knowing diversity understood as a body of knowledge; the teaching corps does not have diversity and, according to the authors, desperately needs it for the sake of the children. Looking for conduct, or the manner by
which to achieve diversity, to achieve this body of knowledge, is the next move in the analysis.

It seems obvious that the *conduct* occurs through preservice teacher education programs. According to Major and Brock, they claim that “When preservice teachers enter teacher education programs without [understanding diversity], teacher educators must help them to develop it” (8). The difficulty of finding *conduct* within the conceptual netting is that *conduct* is referenced, but not specifically developed. This occurs through the citing of sources and approaches dedicated to helping teachers develop an understanding of diversity, but absent any discussion of the approach’s pedagogy or a study of its efficacy. For example, the authors identify approaches such as “modeling modified pedagogical strategies, providing cross-cultural field experiences, providing placements in community agencies coupled with systematic reflective assignments, selecting master teachers who are effective educators of minority students, and seeking out life experiences in diverse communities to gain insight into being in minority position” (9). However, there is no mention as to how such strategies might get done, nor any discussion as to how, why, or even whether these strategies really work. Nor is there any mention whether their strategies might reproduce stereotypes by encouraging White students to “seek out” minority populations to learn from them. This hearkens to the Banks et al. comment that minorities, by the mere virtue of being a minority, are predisposed teachers of those in the majority.

As for diversity’s *end*, its worthwhileness, again the net is quite empty. Of course worthwhileness has to do with providing minority students with competent teachers, but there is no mention of why this important. Again we can safely assume why this is
important: every child should have competent teachers. My point is that nothing larger is intimated. The previous artifact written by Banks et. al. connected the importance of diversity as a body of knowledge in relation to an open, free, and democratic society. The end according to Major and Brock is a bit more immediate – the graduation of competent teachers, as they define it. And perhaps that is good enough.

To conclude this final analysis, the meaning of diversity through an analysis of assumptions – what it is and why it is so good – follows:

Criteria: What is diversity as something achievable? Diversity is a body of knowledge pertaining to the teaching of ethno- or sociolinguistically diverse students – students who are not White speakers of English as a first and primary language. This body of knowledge consists of understanding such students’ existential experiences as part of a minority population and various pedagogical techniques outside of the dominant paradigm of schooling as transmission.

Problem: Achieving diversity solves a problem, what is the problem? The problem identified in this sample, similar to the others, is that the largely White, middle-class, and female teaching corps is bereft of this knowledge.

Conduct: How is it achieved, or, how should it be achieved to solve the problem? The achievement of this knowledge occurs through specially designed teacher education courses. These courses are taught by professors who are keenly sensitive to diversity in terms of demographical considerations and as a body of knowledge. In these courses, students learn how to bridge the gap of cultural mismatch through identified approaches “designed to help preservice teachers learn to address the needs of diverse students (8).

End: How is diversity’s worth commented on? What is the desired end? Diversity’s worth, according to Major and Brock, is that it helps ensure that teachers of ethno- and sociolinguistically diverse will be less likely to “devastate” their chances to succeed through the schools. Diversity’s worth is that it helps close cultural gaps between teachers and students.

Concluding Remarks: Findings

I conclude this analysis very tersely by limiting my remarks to the findings above, reserving further discussion for the following chapter.
In this chapter, I set out to analyze a small purposefully chosen set of academic papers using an analytical tool referred to as a net-type analysis. This chapter and its analyses are the maiden voyage. The tool is a metaphorical net of interconnectivity held together by four conceptual anchors. This form of analysis, deeply indebted to the conceptual analyses of Jonas F. Soltis, seeks to analyze a concept within the contours of an artifact. Specifically, the anchors try to illuminate and provide substance to a concept’s underlying assumptions. And through this form of analysis, it is my hope that a deeper conceptual meaning is found. The anchors are as follows: criteria – an indication that the concept has some assumed meaning; problem – an indication that diversity solves some problem; conduct – in order to achieve diversity, there is some manner by which it is achieved; and, end – this anchor looks for how diversity’s worth, or why it should be achieved, is commented on.

Diversity is a word and concept wielded regularly in the various realms of education, and is done so with great moral tenor. And though this analysis, and the entire project for that matter, started with the intent of exploring the discourse to find the meaning of diversity and why it is so good, I cannot say I have been all that successful. What I would like to do in this conclusion is to briefly discuss what I think are the overall finds of diversity’s meaning in light of the summaries above.

When I was looking for the criteria of diversity, I was looking to find how the author(s) use diversity in terms of some definitional meaning. The question on my mind was that if diversity is such a good thing in the minds of the authors, then ostensibly they should offer some understanding of what diversity means, what I refer to as the criteria comprising it. What I found is that diversity's meaning is taken for granted. Outside of
providing demographical data, the artifacts were without any explicit defining of what diversity means. I can only assume that the authors had in mind particular readers who wouldn’t look for this or ask such a question.

Another find accords with what was evinced through the literature review, that diversity has multiple senses. On one hand, diversity is simply a matter of fact and refers to America’s racial or ethnic composition, primarily in the schools. And on the other, it indicates a response to such facts. What I also found is that diversity is mainly a reference to a body of knowledge. This body of knowledge positions a person to identify the facts of racial or ethnic composition in a particular and prescribed way, and then to respond to those facts in a similarly prescribed way.

In a summative sense, and based on the analyses above, this body of knowledge consists of knowing that there is a racial (or ethnic) mismatch in the schools between White teachers and their non-White students. This mismatch imperils many students’ chances at success in the schools. This body of knowledge also consists of the stories of those students, their pain, where their families come from, how they process knowledge, how to help them process school knowledge accordingly, and the structural societal-level constraints that put students of color at somewhat of a disadvantage compared to the existential realities of their teachers.

It seems that this body of knowledge – criteria – is viewed as truth and is incontrovertible. This seems to make sense if the authors use research or conduct research confirming their own biases. And in light of the fact that the samples’ bibliographies share quite a few sources, I wonder as to the amount of “truth” contained within this body of “knowledge.”
As stated throughout this analysis, many of the anchors seemed to capture the same conceptual markers of diversity. In other words, it was hard to identify the markers as separate entities. For example, finding that the criteria of diversity are found within a body of knowledge pertaining to cultural mismatches between teachers and students is also an identification of the problem. I found this as the general problem identified by all the samples. And, diversity as a body of knowledge seeks to ameliorate this problem. So, when authors refer to the “challenge” of diversity in schools, they aren’t commenting that diversity is a challenge or a problem, they are commenting that the lack of diversity in terms of the ignorant White teachers is the challenge, which leads right into conduct.

To ameliorate this problem, the manner by which to achieve diversity, the conduct, occurs through teacher education programs, or in-services directed toward White teachers of students of color. According to the reasoning within the body of knowledge this just makes sense, and somehow is not implicated in the deficit discourses excoriated in a few samples. Through teacher education programs, preservice teachers can come to learn this body of knowledge (which they are deficient of) so that they do not perpetrate injustices unto their students of color. And as for the (deficient) White teachers already perpetrating injustices, well, that’s what the in-services are for.

Oddly enough, the last marker of diversity is also the most elusive. Before beginning my analyses I thought the worth – end – of diversity was something that would have been commented on regularly. Of course its worth is commented on several times but is done so in terms of achieving diversity as a way toward ameliorating the stated problem. In that sense, yes, it is worthwhile and good if in fact the stated problem is an
actual problem – which is assumed – and is actually ameliorated, which none of the samples commented on.

At the conclusion of my analysis, I can state with some certainty that diversity is really a reference to a body of knowledge that involves racial demographic considerations. What I cannot state for certainty is why it is so good. From the above samples I am not convinced that the identification of the problem is actually a problem or that the stated conduct to solve the problem will actually solve it, which are two main considerations of what diversity means. Then again, and to the authors’ credit, the samples I chose to analyze did not seem specifically geared toward “proving” such considerations, but heavily relied on the fact that their audience would not question those considerations.
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CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In *The Postmodern Condition*, Jean-Francois Lyotard suggests that there are no beginnings, just re-beginnings. On his terms, it is more honest to say that because our lives are inextricably intertwined with various historical processes, some of which are our own doing, when we begin something, it is really a part of another process. Thus when we commence to do something, it is really the re-commencement of something already occurring. And if nothing is really begun, then neither is anything really finished. This realization is lived out every spring during graduation ceremonies that are not too coincidentally called commencement ceremonies: the end of one thing (school) is really the beginning of another (career) but both are a part of yet something else (life).

I think the same can be said for conclusions. In terms of a definition, there are two I find apropos in light of Lyotard. In one sense, a conclusion is the end, last part, or the finish of something. In another sense, however, it is “a judgment or decision reached after deliberation.”\(^\text{12}\) The two are symbiotic: one cannot exist without the other. We cannot reach a decision without deliberating, and, deliberation is the result of thinking back on something that has more or less finished. And so it is in this last chapter. As conclusions

---

can take on many forms, I have decided to use this as an opportunity to engage in a
reflective process only possible at the completion of another.

In what follows, I reflect on what I set out to do in this study and whether I was
successful. In other words, I wonder if conceptual clarity regarding the meaning of
diversity in teacher education was established. I do this by revisiting the overall
methodology of this study – essay – and its influence on this work.

In the latter half of the introduction, I spent some time discussing the literary form
of essay as the overall methodology for inquiring into diversity’s meaning. I’d like to go
out on a limb and say were it not for this form, I’m not sure I could have completed this
study.

Conducting an inquiry in the form of an essay was freeing. I very much relied on
its original meaning. As Scholes et al. tell us, essay is a very flexible form of writing that
comes to us through the sixteenth-century French writer, Montaigne (4). In its barest of
senses, essay, derived from the French verb essayer, simply means to try. In other words,
essay as a form of writing, especially in Montaigne’s sense, is a means to try out ideas, to
try out and experiment with one’s thoughts on paper in an organized and developed way,
for the purposes of holding them to the scrutiny of others. Scholes et al. comment that
much of what gets done in the world through writing is essay.

What is freeing is that essay allows for experimentation and creativity pertaining
to how one goes about trying out their ideas for others. In terms of my study, I tried out
one large idea – clarifying the meaning of diversity. To do so I also tried out a three step
process to get there – developed a common sense understanding, provided a thematic
review of the literature, and conducted a hybridized form of philosophical conceptual analysis. The latter of which was also a new idea being tried out.

There is a reason why essay was the preferred and perhaps only mode. In one respect much of it is experimental. It is experimental for the simple reason that finding methodological precedent within the teacher education discourse was practically impossible. In other words, to find meaning in some analytical way, in some way that encourages replicability, it was evident that I needed to take steps toward inventing that way. Essay allowed me to experiment with establishing and trying out those steps. And also because of its experimental nature, there was much room to fail. Essay doesn’t necessarily remove any stigma from failure. It acknowledges failure as a great possibility and even a necessity for the future refinement of an idea toward success, or, to come to terms with the need for disbandment at the completion of the process. And in that sense, essay, again, is quite freeing.

In the remaining portion of this dissertation, I would like to take up the accomplishments of this dissertation in light of the possibility of failure. It is my way of reflecting upon the process, what I learned, and what I accomplished.

In one sense, and as much as I tried, this dissertation is a failure. It is a failure for the simple fact that I cannot unequivocally state that it was a success. I set out to conceptually clarify diversity as used in the teacher education discourse; however, I’m not sure I can make any substantial claim that that is in fact what I did. Yet, I do think many of the ideas tried are worthy and are worth reconsideration toward another attempt. To discuss this, I’ll start with my analysis.
In the three step process toward clarification, the philosophical conceptual analysis is the culminating step. It is the step that employs analytical methods to capture and study diversity. This was the step that I was hoping would fill the analytical void regarding the ordinary, taken for granted, and yet influential terms used in teacher education, terms like diversity. The analysis – a net-type analysis – is a hybridized invention borrowing from the analytical tradition within the field of philosophy of education. That I invented a form of analysis, I think, helps render this dissertation a success. But the success of the analysis is in question.

As stated earlier, one of the difficulties in conducting an inquiry toward clarification was the lack of any existing precedent. In order to find meaning through the analysis of academic artifacts, I needed some tool for doing so. I refer to this invented form of analysis as a net-type analysis. It was a way for me to consistently read individual artifacts in a way that would allow me to make general comparisons across purposefully selected artifacts. Metaphorically speaking, I read as if I were casting a net onto and through the artifact.

The unique feature of a net-type analysis is that it helps look for certain conceptual markers. The conceptual markers focused on in this dissertation are what I identified as four assumptions undergirding the use of diversity. In fact, they were inspired from a letter written by Kenneth L. Marcus out of the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights titled “Achieving Diversity.” I labeled these assumptions as criteria, problem, conduct, and, end. These assumptions form a netting of interconnectivity. As I read, the artifact’s assumptions were anchored down or caught by the net. The meaning of diversity is found somewhere within the casted net. Overall, my
analysis was an attempt at clarity by finding consistency of meaning, at reducing what I think of as diversity’s taken for granted status, ill-definition, and dogmatic assertions within teacher education.

Regardless of how unique, creative, or inventive was my form of analysis, the question of clarity, however, still stands. Did I clarify the meaning of diversity in teacher education? And, if so, what is it? My answer to the first part is a very qualified and conditional, yes. Perhaps it is more honest to say that by looking for conceptual markers within artifacts I established a terrain in which meaning can be found. On my view, for something so discursively loaded and packed, I think perhaps the only way to look for meaning is to establish a terrain via the net and then to start uncovering within that area.

Unfortunately there is a great amount of subjectivity guiding what gets found and how it gets interpreted within the net. I tried to create a form of analysis and a method that is replicable but there’s no way to remove the subjectivity guiding each analyst. With that said, I’m not sure I can really answer the question of what is the meaning of diversity. As I state at the end of my analysis, this is a bit unsettling since the entire purpose of this study was to do so. At this point I can say, however, that through a net-type analysis, terrains have been located in which meaning can be struggled over.

Within those terrains, and as a result of analyzing five purposefully selected artifacts, I found a few consistencies. These consistencies, I think, can be construed across artifacts, within this small set of studies, as maybe representing some larger terrain in which one can find meaning. So, in order to answer the question of what diversity means in teacher education, my analysis provides a few consistencies found throughout a small selected set of studies. These consistencies pertain to a body of knowledge
revolving around cultural mismatch in classrooms between teachers and students, but nothing more than that. Does that really clarify anything?

At this point, and in light of my ambivalence and perhaps even failure to find clarity, essay encourages and requires me to rethink this very important aspect of my thought exercise. Did I fail in part because the form of analysis needs tweaking? Is the form okay but are the markers (or anchors) wrongly constructed? Did a personal bias affect my reading even though the form was supposed to mitigate this? Regarding this portion of the project, I think I will tweak before disbanding. I will first look toward the net’s four conceptual anchors.

Continuing with accomplishments in light of possible failure, I would like to turn toward the common sense understanding of diversity. I think more is done toward clarity in this step and the subsequent review than through the analysis, which again does not bode well for the success of the analysis. As a prelude into the analysis, I tried to develop a common sense understanding of diversity. To do this, I leaned on the multicultural education literature as well as literature outside of education that focuses on interrogating the meaning of diversity. The result of this development is perhaps the most interesting find of my exploration into diversity’s meaning.

Looking back on the study, this step ostensibly clarifies diversity more so than the analysis. What results is that diversity’s meaning can be understood as existing in two dimensions. The first dimension is that diversity is a reference to some demographical identity usually revolving around race or culture. I refer to this as diversity’s descriptive dimension. Also, the reference to identity and demographics is furthermore a reference to a social response: that society as a whole or the individuals therein should behave in a
particular way regarding certain demographical information. I refer to this as diversity’s *normative* dimension.

This common sense understanding of diversity opens diversity as a layered and textured concept while concomitantly submitting that some semblance of meaning can be found. Diversity, so my development suggests, definitely refers to something, and to something identifiable and understandable. Yet this two-dimensional understanding of diversity makes no pretense toward pinning down a definition. In other words, and conceptually speaking, diversity is quite layered and dense. And because so, the entire project toward clarity is challenged by inherent limitations. If I learned anything through this thought exercise, that was it: that diversity is dense, layered, open, but still understandable and meaningful.

And the last accomplishment of this exploration into clarity and meaning is the thematic review of literature. This review seeks to gain insight into how the descriptive and normative dimensions of diversity interact. The literature indicated that there are four dominant purposes for writing about diversity: explications of diversity, policy recommendations, preparing preservice teachers for diversity, and, teaching about diversity. The categorizing and reviewing of literature was itself an experimental step toward clarity, a step that again was perhaps more informative than the analysis.

In closing, and to complement what is stated above, through this study I learned that diversity is meaningful. However, narrowing to a specific and perhaps universal meaning within teacher education is difficult. Though difficult and perhaps unfruitful, I see my work as laying the foundations for future work concerned with providing the discourse with a challenge and feedback regarding the efficacy of diversity as a purpose
or aim in teacher education. In the very least, I hope my study provides some insight into a general, though lose and open core of what diversity means. My work is not intended to be conclusive, but as the beginning of an analytically based conversation pertaining to diversity that seems absent within teacher education.

The more painful lesson learned regards my analysis. Admittedly I like the form of analysis used. I like its metaphorical appeal yet its very literal imagery. However, I am concerned about the emptiness of the net after casting it. This either means that the scholars in teacher education writing about diversity aren’t concerned with the same things I am, or, that they are and the tool I used to find them was inadequate. I lean toward the latter for the reasons mentioned above.
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