Copyright

by

Ryan M. Crowley

2014

The Dissertation Committee for Ryan M. Crowley certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Beyond Resistance:

Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and its Limits

Committee:

____
Anthony L. Brown, Supervisor

____
Cinthia Salinas

____
Keffrelyn Brown

____
Noah De Lissovoy

____
Terrie Epstein

Beyond Resistance:

Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and its Limits

by

Ryan M. Crowley, A.B.; M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2014

Dedication

To the memory of my father, Mike Crowley, and to Evelyn Flossie, the two best teachers I have yet known.

Acknowledgements

This moment seemed like it would never arrive and it would not have arrived without the many wonderful people that supported me in this process. These simple words I offer here pale in comparison with what you have given to me.

First, to Mom, they just have not invented words that would allow me to express what your presence means in my life. You have allowed me the space and the support to become the person that I am today. You always seem to strike just the right balance between being fun and being my mom. You are a fierce advocate for me in whatever I pursue. You are a champion for the people that you love. If I ever achieve even a fraction of the selflessness that seems to be natural for you, the people around me will be all the better for it. I look forward to watching Evie get to know her amazing Grandma. And, I look forward to lazy mornings of sipping coffee and watching birds on the feeders from the picture window in the kitchen.

To my late father, Mike Crowley, it goes without saying that none of this would be possible without the love of learning and the desire for critique that you instilled within me. Everything that I have done since you passed has been because of you and in honor of you. In both happy and sad times over the last two decades, you have visited my dreams and my memories, reminding me who you were, what you stood for, and what path forward I should take. If I had access to the clarity and analytical capacity of your mind, I would have probably finished this thing months ago. I wish I could share this moment with you in person but, for now, the memories will have to do.

To my beautiful and brilliant wife, Kibbe, I feel like this acknowledgement should really take the form of an apology. While this degree and dissertation cost me a lot of sleep and produced gray hairs, it cost you a husband and partner for large chunks of time. Thank you for being patient with me. Thank you for pushing me but for ultimately giving me the space to do what I needed to do. Having you in my life made this process about something so much bigger than it would have otherwise been. It became about family and about carving out our future together. I am eternally grateful for the sacrifices you made

for this to happen. I am so excited about what the next chapter holds for us. You are the glue for our family.

To my amazing daughter, Evie, I can say with confidence that no one on this acknowledgements page changed my life or won my heart the way that you did. You have brought such joy to our lives in these past few months and you have also brought great challenges. The wall in your nursery has an outline of a bicycle and the words "Enjoy the Ride." I see those words while I give you a bottle to put you to bed at night and during those unfortunate times when you wake up screaming in the middle of the night. I think those words are meant for me. They are telling me to stop worrying and to focus on how remarkable you are. You make that a pretty easy thing to do. I am so excited to see what you become.

To my siblings, you have been a constant presence during this time. Brendan, I do not have a better or more trusted friend in this world. If I ever need advice or help, you are the first person that I call. Our contact through emails, texts, and phone calls has been a sustaining force for me during this dissertation process. Colleen, I feel like you might be the only person I could commiserate with about the difficulties of this writing process. You and your family are always near the front of my mind. I have pictures of Tess and Tori on my desk where this project was written. Thank you for sharing your two wonderful daughters with our family. Erin, thank you for your unconditional support. I always know that if I need someone to listen or to reassure me that I am doing the right thing, then you are the person to call. I also think you somehow channel Dad and the advice he might give. Keep doing it. Kerry, my OLDER sister, thank you for always being the last one to get the joke so as to provide an easy target for us. But, on a more serious note, thank you for your fierce love and loyalty for our family. I appreciate that you wear your heart on your sleeve in that regard. Kelly, these past years in Austin have been quite the ride. I am grateful that you moved here and started your family here. I carry forward innumerable memories from these times. Perhaps most of all, thanks for bringing Declan and Rowan into my life. I truly cherish my time with them and I hate to think what it will be like to not be in the same city as them anymore. Also, many thanks

to the out-laws: Wilson, Pauletti, Joseph, and Crystal. I feel quite lucky that my siblings chose such fun and interesting people. You are family, despite the out-law status. And, thank you for giving our family its amazing next generation: Tess, Tori, Sean, Maeve, Cadden, Ryan, John, Declan, Finn, Rowan, Michael and Olivia. Their pictures dot my desk and bookshelves. They have been a great inspiration for me as well.

To Jim, thank you for your support during this process. Thank you for your visits to Austin and for always being willing to help in whatever way possible. Most of all, of course, thank you for coming in to my mom's life when you did. You helped to remake our family by providing companionship for her.

To Aunt Kathy, Tia, I wish you could have stuck around to see this process through to completion. You were such great support for me during my time in Austin. Thank you for sharing stories about Dad and the rest of our family. I will keep those stories alive by telling them to anyone who will listen. I was dreading saying goodbye to you and Ed when we leave for Kentucky. Now I wish I had the chance to do so. I hope you know that all of us miss you much. And, don't worry, we will keep harassing Tio to visit us in Kentucky.

To my wonderful in-law family, thanks for your overwhelming support over these past few years. I felt welcomed into your family from the moment I arrived and I have enjoyed every minute of it. Joe Ted, thanks for the conversations and for showing so much interest in my work. Estelle, thanks for the ten thousand things you have done for us. You are eternally thoughtful and selfless towards your family. To Christie, Jeremy, Jason, Mike, Juhee, Braden, Rylan, and Kaius, I look forward to many more holidays and other adventures with the Miller and Bruehl clans.

I have many friends to thank but two in particular have been crucial in the intellectual and emotional development of this project. To Glotz, you are one of a small group of people who actually know what this project is about. That is saying a lot. You may not realize it, but you have helped me to deepen my analysis through your great listening and your insightful questions and comments. Thanks for taking an interest in what I have been doing. The diversity of your intellectual curiosity is something I try to

emulate. To Josh, a.k.a. Utah Fake, the discussions we have had about the council practices of holding space and deep listening have also informed my approach to this project. I always feel like our conversations provide a needed shift in how I view the world around me. You bring me out of the tunnel vision of my own mind.

To Lambo, Eric, and Dongilli (and Glotz again), although it has definitely been a distraction, I cannot overstate the joy that our almost two-years running group text message chain has brought to this process. Who would have thought Lebowski quotes, song lyrics, and pictures of beer could generate a two-year conversation? Apparently, we did. To Minnihan, your visits to Austin every few months always make for some shaky mornings, but the nights before were well worth it. To Greg, thank you for the g-chats and emails over the last few years. The days we spent together in Houston are still among the most formative in my life. And, thank you for your insights on relationships and being a father. I draw upon them constantly. To Bowen and Hank, thanks for the happy hours that turned into last call.

To my other brothers, Ryan and Aaron, you still owe Brendan and me tacos from the shellacking we handed to you on the basketball court.

Thank you to my St. Michael's people. Jay, my grad school compatriot. It has been fun to watch your evolution over the last decade. I am excited for what the future holds for you. You are going to impact lots of people's live in positive ways. Mackey, so many great memories and one important rule: For best results when attending the final-exam making party, have final exam completed prior to start of party. To Koch, my political adversary, thanks for pushing me to think and to consider different points of view. Our trip to the Corbett Ranch is one of my great memories of my time in Texas. To Coach Hrin, thank you for what was undoubtedly a world record game of catch that stretched over four football seasons. Kami, Anna, and Billy, thank you for so many great memories in the trenches of SM(c)A.

Thanks to the three dogs in my life, Ty, Lily, and (the late) Dixie. Aside from my wife, I probably spent more time with these three than anyone else on the list. In the words of WSP, "sometimes a dog is as good as any man."

To Anthony, my advisor on this project, it goes without saying that what I wrote here would not have been possible without your guidance. Your ability to help me synthesize my arguments and connect them to the ideas of others has been crucial. I also had a really hard time figuring out why this project might matter (sometimes feeling like it didn't), but you were always able to remind me why it was important and what implications it had for the field. Our conversations in your office were always a pleasure. I usually left with more questions than I had when I arrived, but I suppose that was the point. Your enthusiasm for what I have been doing has almost always exceeded my own and it has given me confidence to say what I did in these pages. You are a model for how to be a mentor and for how to be a good person, citizen, husband, and father. I look forward to keeping these conversations going as I begin my academic career.

To Cinthia, there are just so many memories that arise from our last six years together that I don't quite know what to make of them all or where to start. Above everything, you have been an outstanding friend to me. Our conversations, which usually include a fair amount of hops, always improve my mood. You somehow made the grind of those PTL workshops not much of a grind at all. Somehow, I watched you lead the same session on historical thinking about 19 times and it never got old. Your energy is absolutely infectious and you have a way of making the people around you feel like they are important and that you are speaking directly to them. You have been an advocate for me before you even knew anything about me. You are why I pursued this degree and your support during my job search is a big reason why I will be at UK next year. I am happy to know that we have many more CUFAs together or else I would be getting some major separation anxiety.

To Noah, thank you for serving on my committee and for always providing such thoughtful feedback on my work. This goes back to the classes I took with you early in my time at UT up through my work on this project. Your careful attention has helped me to work out many of the nuances of this work. I am also very appreciative of the readings I was able to do in your courses. You exposed me to exciting scholarship that took me in lots of different directions.

To Keffrelyn, many thanks for serving on my committee as well. You have consistently pushed my thinking with your questioning and your passion for the issues that I discuss in this paper. The questions that you posed at my qualifying exams and at my proposal defense have shaped this work in profound ways. You live the scholarship that you create and that is a great inspiration to me.

To Terrie, I am honored that you were willing to serve on my committee. I respected your work for many years before I got the chance to know you. I am amazed by your humility and your willingness to work with young scholars. Your kindness to me and your thoughtful feedback have been of great support in this process.

To Ken, I think it was fated that I got to work with you on the Presidential Timeline. You have become a great friend during this time. The PTL workshops and conferences never quite felt like work because we got to hang out together. Thank you for the many conversations in your office and the ones that occurred over pints as well. And, thanks for being a musical outlet for me. I loved talking music with you and going to shows when we got the chance.

Lots of thanks to my graduate school friends. Brooke, the following fact should speak to the esteem with which I view you: Rather than reading through the University document about dissertation formatting, I just looked at what you did. You will always be flawless in my mind.

To LaGarrett, thanks for offering such great support during this process. I have enjoyed our collaborations and I look forward to more in the future. I aspire to one day have your dedication and work ethic. You are truly an inspiration in that way.

To Elizabeth, thanks for being such a great friend over the last few years. Your frequent texts and emails of support really made a difference. It was nice to know that someone was thinking of me. I look forward to many CUFAs together in the future.

To Jeannette, I say with confidence that my dissertation would have been different if not for our conversations. You have really pushed me to think differently about what I was doing and to spend more time interrogating the baggage I was bringing

to this project. Not that I quite got rid of that baggage, but you helped me to see it. I feel honored to count you as a friend and confidante.

To Billy, I feel quite lucky that you joined this program when you did. You have been a great friend over these last few years. Our conversations have been a great outlet for me. I learned a lot through our collaborations and I also learned a lot by watching you teach. You have a real gift for that and your future students will be lucky to have you.

To Amanda, it has been so much fun to watch you progress through the program. Your passion for what you do is infectious and you are just such a fabulous and considerate teacher. I am glad that I got to watch you in action this semester.

To Kathlene, Katie, and Noreen, thank you for showing me the ropes of the elementary world. I will undoubtedly be calling upon y'all frequently in the next few years to pick your brains and learn from your practice. Also, special thanks to you, Katie, for being so generous with your time and assistance during my job search process. You went above and beyond in that regard.

To Matt, thanks for being such a great friend over these last couple of years. I have great respect for your intellect and your insights. Our conversations have been a great escape for me while also being invigorating. I hope we can keep it going.

And, finally, a few special thanks: Derrick Bell, Stuart Hall, Howard Zinn, Zeus Leonardo, Tim Lensmire, Doug Foley, Charles Mills (both of them), Jon Stewart, Stephen Colbert, craft cans, Breaking Bad, Cherrywood Coffeehouse, Panicstream, ABW Fire Eagle, Bartholomew Park, KUT, KUTX, The Gourds, Rockin' Vegan Tacos, The Flag Store, French roast coffee, SXSW, the Dona salsa at Tacodeli, and Old Settler's.

Beyond Resistance:

Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and its Limits

Ryan M. Crowley, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Anthony L. Brown

This critical case study investigated the experiences of ten White preservice social studies and language arts teachers as they learned about race and racism during the first semester of an urban-focused teacher preparation program. Through observation, interview, and artifact data, this inquiry analyzed how the preservice teachers engaged with the topic of race through the conceptual framework of critical Whiteness studies. This theoretical lens seeks to identify the normalized, oppressive practices of Whiteness with the goal of reorienting those practices in antiracist ways. The author identified two broad themes of *transgressive White racial knowledge* and *conventional White racial knowledge* to characterize the progressive and problematic aspects, respectively, of the preservice teachers' engagement with race. The participants displayed transgressive White racial knowledge through the way they combatted deficit thinking toward urban students and through their knowledge of the mechanics of Whiteness and structural racism. They displayed conventional White racial knowledge through their stories of

early experiences with racial difference, their use of subtle resistance discourses during race conversations, and their tendency to misappropriate critical racial discourses.

As a whole, the racial knowledge of the ten White preservice teachers points to conflicted, ambivalent feelings at the core of their racial identities. Their desires to talk about race and to develop an antiracist teaching practice were mediated by competing desires to maintain their identities as "good Whites" and to protect their investments in Whiteness. The complex ways that these White preservice teachers engaged with critical racial discourses have significant implications for critical Whiteness studies, teacher education, and social studies education. Their willingness to explore race in a critical fashion should push teacher educators to resist homogenizing, deficit views of the antiracist potential of White teachers. However, their problematic engagement with race points to the importance of viewing White identity as conflicted. If antiracist pedagogies begin with this understanding of White racial identity, they can encourage profound shifts in the ontology, epistemology, and methodology of Whiteness. These shifts can help White teachers to develop racial literacy and to build an antiracist teaching practice.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: A Space Beyond Resistance……………………………………………1

Introduction……………………………………………..……………………1

De-homogenizing the White Preservice Teacher……………….…………………...3

Combatting Whiteness in Teacher Education………………………………..5

Research Questions……………………………………………………………..7

Rationale for the Study………………………………………………………8

Overview of Methodology……………………………………………………….10

Chapter Overview……………………………………………………………..11

Chapter Two: Review of Literature and Conceptual Framework………………………..13

Introduction……………………………………………………………………13

Conceptual Framework: Critical Whiteness Studies…………………………….13

Foundational Assumptions of Critical Whiteness Studies……………..…16

Defining Whiteness……………………………………………………18

Whiteness as Social Power………………………………………………22

Critical Whiteness Studies as an Analytical Lens……………………….26

Review of Literature……………………………………………………………..27

White Teachers and Resistance…………………………………………28

The Tropes of White Resistance…………………………………………31

A Retreat to Individualism……………………………………33

Accessing Alternative Identity Elements………………………...35

White Victimization……..…………………………………………37

White Discourses of Denial…………………………………...39

Whiteness and Personal Experience……………………………..42

Silence, Fear, and Finding ‘the Right Words’…………………...44

Colorblindness…………………………………………………...46

White Tropes of Resistance as White Racial Knowledge……………….49

Rethinking White Teacher Resistance…………………………………………..50

Approaching White Preservice Teachers with Complexity and Compassion……………………………………………………………53

White Racial Identity…………………………………………………….54

Compassionate Pedagogical Orientations with White Teachers………...57

Chapter Three: Method of Inquiry…………………………………………………….62

Introduction……………………………………………………………………62

The Qualitative Choice………………………………………………………..63

The Paradigmatic Choice……….……………………………………...…64

The Critical Case Study……………………………………………………….67

Context of the Study…………………………………………………………..70

Big State University…………………………..…………………..70

The Urban Teaching Program…………………………………………71

The Multicultural Education Course……………………………………..74

Description of Participants……………………….………………………77

Urban Cohort – Social Studies………………...…………………78

Grace…………………………………….………………78

Samuel……………………………………………………80

Patrick………………………………..……………..81

Zach………………………………..……………..83

Michael……………………………………………..85

Urban Cohort – English Language Arts…………………………86

Kevin……………………………….……………86

Litzy……………………………………..…………88

Maria……………………………………………………..89

Paige……………………………………………………...91

Thomas…………………………………………………...92

Establishing Trustworthiness…………………………………...………..93

Researcher Positionality: Everybody's All-American?…………...……95

Data Collection…………………………………………………………104

Data Collection Phase I: Observations in Multicultural Course………..105
Data Collection Phase II: Race Seminars………………………………106
Race Seminar I: Definitions and Conceptual Understandings….107
Race Seminar II: The Sociological Imagination and Racial Case Studies……………………………………………………..110
Race Seminar III: Historical Racial Case Study of US Voting Rights…………………………………………………….…...111
Data Collection Phase III: Written Reflections………………………...112
Data Collection Phase IV: Interviews……………………..….….……114
Methods of Data Analysis………………………………………………………118

Chapter Four: Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and Working with Students of Color….………………………………………………………………………...122
Introduction………………………………………………………………….122
Transgressive White Racial Knowledge…………………………………….124
The Sociological Imagination……………………………………………….126
Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and Working with Students of Color….…………………………………………...……………………...128
Combatting Deficit Discourses Toward Students of Color…………….130
Discussion……….……………………………………………..136
A Critique of the White Savior Model…………………………………137
Double Bind of the 'White Ally'…………….…………………143
Discussion……………………………………………………144
Teaching About Race and Racism………….………………………..145
The Public and Hidden Transcripts of Race………………...….147
The Public Transcript of Race Instruction……………………...149
The Hidden Transcript of Race Instruction……………………154
Discussion………….…………….…………………………….…161
Conclusion………….…………….…………….…………………………....162

Chapter Five: Transgressive White Racial Knowledge of Race Privilege and Whiteness……………………………………………………………………………164

Introduction……………………………………………………………….….164

Using Personal Privilege to Make Sense of Structural Racism………………...166

The Sociological Imagination and Privilege……………………………167

'Having someone to call': A critique of meritocracy…………………..171

The Differential Consequences of 'Bad Choices'……………………...175

Discussion………………………………………………………………177

Knowledge of Whiteness and Structural Racism………………………………180

The Normal-ness of Being White………………………………………181

Knowledge of the Operation of Race and Racism……………………...190

Discussion………………………………………………………………200

Conclusion………………………………………………………………...…202

Chapter Six: Conventional White Racial Knowledge…………………………………205

Introduction………………………………………………………………….205

The Sociological Imagination……………………………………………….…207

Learning to be White……………………………………………………………...209

The Policing of Whiteness……………………………………….....…212

Racial Silences and Missed Opportunities……………………………...217

Discussion………………………………………………………………221

The White Tropes of Resistance………………………………………………..222

The 'Good White' and the Housekeeper of Color……………………...224

A 'Safe Space' for Talking About Race………………………………..228

Downplaying the Salience of Race……………………………………..233

Discussion………………………………………………………………239

The Misappropriation of Critical Racial Discourses…………………………...240

The Single Story, Stereotypes, and Power……………………………..241

Racial Smog and the Passiveness of Active Racism…………………...246

Discussion……………………………………………………………254
Conclusion……………………………………………………………...255

Chapter Seven: Discussion and Conclusions………………………………………...258
Introduction……………………………………………………………..258
Overview of Findings…………………………………………………..258
Transgressive White Racial Knowledge and the Sociological Imagination.............………………………………………………….……260
Conventional White Racial Knowledge and the Sociological Imagination……………………………………………………..……264
Implications……………………………………………………………..267
Implications for Critical Whiteness Studies in Education………...……268
Traitorous White Ontology: 'Taking the Red Pill'…………..…270
'Off-centered' White Epistemologies……………………..……273
Methodologies of 'Learning to be White'……………...………274
Implications for Antiracist Teacher Education……………………...…275
Building a Common Racial Vocabulary…………………….…277
Attention to the Historical Trajectory of Racism…………….……279
White Privilege Pedagogy……………………………………...…280
Implications for Social Studies Education…………………...………282
Final Thoughts on the Urban Cohort…………………………………….….…284
APPENDIX A: Multicultural Course Syllabus……………………………………288
APPENDIX B: Description of Participants……………………………………….293
APPENDIX C: Racial Case Studies………………………………………………295
APPENDIX D: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol…………………………….…298
References………………………………………………………………………301
VITA……………………………………………………………………………319

CHAPTER ONE: A SPACE BEYOND RESISTANCE

INTRODUCTION

What happens when White[1] students arrive at their teacher training with a commitment to talking about power and the production of difference? What happens when these White teachers engage in deep consideration of the personal and societal implications of structural racism? By latching on to this knowledge, do they emerge as transformed, or as transformative educators? Or, are they re-absorbed by the racial milieu, armed with critical racial knowledge but hemmed in by the permanence of racism (Bell, 1992)? Will the practical realities of White privilege (McIntosh, 1989) and the ease with which they can retreat into privileged spaces overcome their desire to work with communities of color? These questions underpin this study and their answers have significant importance for the field of teacher education. While accounts of White teachers who resist antiracist pedagogies abound in the literature (McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005), few studies investigate the characteristics of antiracist teacher education as it moves into the complicated space *beyond resistance*.

While this study focuses on White preservice teachers with commitments to talking about race and other critical educational issues, I do not engage in this project in order to redeem Whiteness or White preservice teachers. I do not hope to replace a

[1] In this paper, I choose to capitalize the terms White and Whiteness following the lead of many other scholars in Critical Whiteness Studies (e.g. Marx, 2006; Sleeter, 2008). When quoting scholars who do not capitalize the terms (e.g. Mills, 1997; Leonardo, 2009), I preserve their original capitalization choices.

simplified understanding of White teachers as endlessly resistant with another simplistic view of White teachers as actualized antiracists or laudable racial-works-in-progress. Instead, this project aims to contribute to the de-homogenization of the White preservice teacher in antiracist teacher education (McCarthy, 2003). I approach this goal by examining a group of participants whose openness toward talking about race placed them in conflict with the "typical" White preservice teacher in the teacher education literature (Lowenstein, 2009). Investigating their experiences in antiracist teacher education is important for, as Brown and De Lissovoy (2013) note, "the obstacles to engaging even this interested group in effective praxis have not been fully considered" (p. 541). The ways that these participants interacted with the topic of race demonstrates the "tricky magic" (Ellison, 1970) of Whiteness. These teachers shared both critical and problematic views about the operation of racism. Alongside statements that displayed awareness of the implications of Whiteness, the teachers in this study also found subtle ways to distance themselves from the reproduction of racial hierarchies.

Leonardo (2009) would suggest that the White preservice teachers in this study, like all other individuals in a racialized society such as the US, do not possess the ability to act or to think outside of a racial consciousness as "racial ideology has no outside" (p. 96). What forms that consciousness takes, however, can vary across individuals and within individuals depending upon their prior knowledge, past experiences, or awareness of the topic at hand. While it is important to pay attention to the oppressive, normalized practices of Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993), one should not instinctively equate White people with Whiteness. Although Whites' racial upbringing (Thandeka, 1999) may make

certain aspects of racial learning difficult, I feel strongly that White people have agentic potential within the structures of Whiteness. The comments of the teachers in this study demonstrate how White teachers can engage in productive conversations about race. Moreover, the project of antiracist teacher education depends upon this belief in the possibility of working with White teachers, particularly because they represent the vast majority of the teaching force (Banks et al., 2005). Stuart Hall's notion of a "politics without guarantee" provides a useful description of the challenges inherent in educating White teachers for antiracism:

> One has to act with the notion that politics is always open. There's always the contingent of failure and you need to be right because there is no guarantee except good practice to make it right…to mobilization…to having the right people on your side committed to the program. So I want people to take politics a bit more seriously and to take biology less seriously. (Jhally & Hall, 1996)

While critical education efforts with White preservice teachers are necessary, they are also fraught with difficulties. Rather than viewing White racial identity as nothing but a barrier to antiracist work, Hall's implores us to focus on "good practice" in the political project of helping White teachers learn about race.

DE-HOMOGENIZING THE WHITE PRESERVICE TEACHER

This project aims to contribute to a de-homogenization of the White preservice teacher because I feel that complicating how antiracist teacher education views these individuals can complicate—and enrich—the pedagogical approaches taken towards them. Despite operating from a theoretical starting point that identifies racism as a structural force, many antiracist teacher educators use individualizing and homogenizing racial discourses that produce resistance and defensiveness in White student teachers

(Sleeter, 2008). Perhaps the most common example of such a pedagogy comes from the use of Peggy McIntosh's (1989) seminal article on White privilege. Its predominance in teacher education is such that Lensmire et al (2013) term McIntosh's article a synecdoche, or stand-in, for the difficult nature of antiracist work. They critique the use of McIntosh's article for its propensity to force confessions of privilege out of White teachers. When teachers resist admitting their complicity in racism via acknowledging their White privilege, the teachers' actions are read as resistant to antiracism. In effect, this "White privilege pedagogy" (Levine-Rasky, 2000) places White teachers in a double bind where they either must admit to being complicit in racial structures or, through pushing back, they position themselves as opposed to antiracist efforts. Trainor (2002) suggests that such pedagogies do not provide a de-essentialized White identity for White novice teachers to imagine and inhabit. They can only choose between denial and confession.

Aside from these narrow pedagogical perspectives, the homogenization of the White preservice teacher can also breed deficit perspectives on the part of teacher educators. Rather than viewing prospective teachers as potential learners, teacher educators might approach these teacher candidates with the assumption that they will resist antiracism (Lowenstein, 2009). From this mindset, these teachers can only understand the actions and comments of their students as implicated in Whiteness. A statement they pushes back against the notion of White privilege or structural racism is immediately read as resistance, closing off the possibility that the student teacher may

simply be struggling to integrate new knowledge. Lensmire (2010) shares this concern that

> The very way that we have imagined and conceptualized white people and their racial identities is contributing to our critical education failures with them. The complexities and conflicts at the heart of white racial identities have too often been ignored, and white students have been addressed…as nothing but the embodiment of privilege. (Lensmire, 2010, p. 169)

By creating a variety of portraits of White preservice teacher engagement with race, teacher educators can better grasp the workings of these “complexities and conflicts” at the heart of White racial identity. This project’s portrayal of a group of White teachers with openness towards race dialogue aims to contribute one such portrait.

COMBATTING WHITENESS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

To return to Stuart Hall’s phrase again, White antiracist teacher education lacks “guarantees” at every turn. One might even argue that the only guarantee that can emerge out of this project is that White norms will find a way to prevail (Leonardo, 2009). Legal scholar Derrick Bell wrote that racism is a permanent feature of the U.S. landscape (Bell, 1992). Some chided Bell for a lack of faith, for extremism, or for surrender (Bell, 1993). These critics missed the analytical argument Bell made about the nature of racism and White dominance. Racism’s permanence does not come from its fixed nature or its top-down domination that resists any challenge. Instead, it comes from its ability to shift and to absorb racial discontent in hegemonic fashion, a process Bell (1980) coined elsewhere as interest convergence. The malleability of racism—the different forms that White dominance can take in different historical moments—is what constitutes it as a stabilizing, and therefore, in Bell’s words, permanent, force in U.S. society

The notion that racism is not going away any time soon should not discourage the antiracist teacher education project. It should only serve as a warning to not underestimate the problem. Doing so will lead to practices and policies that, while pursuing equity on the surface, will only re-inscribe White norms and place the burden of overcoming racist structures in schooling on the backs of children of color (Leonardo, 2009). Whites need to find ways to work in solidarity with people of color on the issue of racism (De Lissovoy & Brown, 2013). Whites make up the most isolated racial group in the US (Orfield & Lee, 2005) and often lack meaningful interaction with people of color. Media, family, and a host of racial stories (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) bombard future teachers with messages and stereotypes that cluster around their understandings of racialized individuals and groups. While teacher education has great potential as a site to engage in antiracist work, it must not be seen as a panacea. Rethinking antiracist teacher education is not an exercise in futility, but it should be viewed as only one aspect of a larger struggle.

Several academic projects have sought to address the development of antiracist dispositions during teacher education over the past three decades. Although the organizing frameworks—and some of the scholars—of these groups overlap, I list them separately here. The multicultural education movement (Banks, 1993; Gay, 1994; Sleeter & Grant, 1987) seeks to reform curriculum, teacher knowledge, and education policy so that students of color can experience a more equal opportunity to learn alongside White students. Scholars of critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) analyze education through a racial lens, interrogating the material and

discursive ways that racism impacts the educational experiences of communities of color. Scholars advocating culturally relevant teaching approaches encourage teachers to appreciate the mismatch between home and school culture experienced by many students of color and ask teachers to access the cultural capital of historically marginalized student groups to enhance student learning (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzales, 1992; Nieto, 2000). A fourth intellectual project, critical Whiteness studies, also aims at disrupting racist school practices. Research in Whiteness studies seeks to identify the overt and covert ways White racial identity grants privileges denied to individuals of color (Harris, 1993; Lipsitz, 1995; McIntosh, 1989). As a steppingstone to more race-conscious teaching, Whiteness studies calls for White teachers to develop an awareness of themselves as racialized and privileged beings so they can act to disrupt the institutional racism within US schools (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Leonardo, 2002; Sleeter, 1995).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Although much scholarship addresses the impact of Whiteness on education (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Leonardo, 2009; McIntosh, 1989) there is still a need for more empirical work that analyzes the experiences of White teachers as they begin to interrogate their own racial identities (Bell, 2002; Marx, 2006; Picower, 2009). In particular, there is a need to examine how White preservice teachers with commitments to social justice interact with the topic of race in teacher education. The stories of the teachers in this study widen our understanding of the White preservice teacher and further complicate the project of antiracism. If even these teachers experience setbacks in

their learning and engage in techniques that distance themselves from the workings of racism, then engaging in antiracist work is perhaps even harder, and more pressing, than some imagined. Leonardo (2009) notes that while Whites' structural position "is informed by and depends upon a *fundamentally superficial grasp* of its history and evolution," (p. 110, italics in original) this position does not preclude Whites from developing an awareness of that privilege. In keeping with Leonardo (2009), I approach this as a pedagogical task of teacher education. This study is guided by the following questions:

1. In what ways do White preservice social studies and language arts teachers with commitments to work in diverse, urban environments make sense of critical understandings of race and racism during their teacher preparation?

2. In what ways do these White preservice social studies and language arts teachers' understandings of race and racism fall short of critical perspectives?

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

This study speaks to the existing educational scholarship in three primary areas: critical Whiteness studies, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education. First, through the use of a critical Whiteness studies framework, I add to the ongoing conversation about the normalized, oppressive aspects of Whiteness (Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 1998; Leonardo, 2009) and their implications for the project of education. In particular, this inquiry adds to conceptions of White racial identity as a complex, conflicted social construction (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999) that is both stabilized and reconfigured during critical conversations about race. As noted above, the teachers in this study entered their teacher preparation with openness toward talking about race and other social justice issues in education. This analysis will detail

how critically-oriented White preservice teachers negotiated their racial identities in the context of antiracist discussions. While the teachers generally engaged with the topic of race in a thoughtful manner, they also found ways to maintain innocence and to distance themselves from the reproduction of racial hierarchies. Their interaction with race, through its distinctions from the portrayals of White resistance in the literature (Marx, 2006; Picower, 2009), enriches the field of critical Whiteness studies.

The experiences of these ten White preservice teachers also add to the antiracist teacher education literature (Pollock, Deckman, Mira, & Shalaby, 2010; Sleeter, 2001). Far too often, studies that investigate White preservice teachers learning about race portray their subjects as unreflective "carriers of privilege…stock characters in a social play" (McCarthy, 2003, p. 131). In these accounts, White preservice teachers respond to discussions about race with anger (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2012), denial (Trainor, 2005), avoidance (Gay & Kirkland, 2003) or silence (Mazzei, 2008). I contend that the negative assumptions many teacher educators carry about the ability of White teachers to learn about race impacts this pedagogical space (Lowenstein, 2009). Sharing the transgressive aspects of my participants' perspectives on race pushes back against these negative conceptions. Additionally, by discussing the pedagogical approaches used with these preservice teachers, I hope to provide a critique of the "White privilege pedagogy" (Lensmire et al., 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2000) many student teachers receive. In its place, I argue for compassionate pedagogical orientations (Conklin, 2008) that appreciate the discomforting (Kumashiro, 2004) aspects inherent in White teachers' learning about race.

Finally, this study fills a substantial need in the field of social studies education. Despite the importance of race in US history (Roediger, 2008) and in structuring who is allowed the rights and privileges of citizenship (Tyson, 2003), the field of social studies has failed to center race as an analytical framework in both research and practice (Chandler & McKnight, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2003). The commitments of social studies education to promoting greater historical and civic literacy (Ladson-Billings, 2004; Parker, 2003) necessitate a more critical theorization of the role of race. Even as race scholarship in the social studies has increased in recent years (Brown & Brown, 2010; Epstein, 2009; Howard, 2004; Salinas & Castro, 2010), very little literature considers issues of Whiteness in the social studies (Chandler, 2009). In the area of social studies teacher preparation, explicit attention to Whiteness is virtually non-existent. More so than any other discipline, social studies teachers have access to curricula with limitless potential to address issues of race. If teacher educators do not help White social studies teachers interrogate the implications of their racial identities, these future teachers will perpetuate the racial blind spots that plague the field today.

OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

To examine White preservice teacher learning about race, I will use a critical case study methodology (Rossman & Rallis, 2003), which will be explained in greater detail in chapter 3. This critical case study is collective in that it draws from the experiences of ten participants and instrumental in that the goal of the inquiry is to maximize what can be learned about the phenomenon of White preservice teachers learning about race. Qualitative data will be collected in the form of observations, interviews, artifacts, and

written reflections from the participants (Merriam, 2008). These multiple data points will serve as triangulation, not necessarily to validate findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008), but to provide thick description (Geertz, 1973) of the phenomenon under investigation to promote greater understanding. Data analysis involved a constant comparison method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), which led to the development of two overarching themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) of transgressive White racial knowledge and conventional White racial knowledge. I elaborate on these two themes with a series of specific findings detailed in chapters 4, 5, and 6.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

In the remaining chapters, I will introduce my conceptual framework and methodology and then detail how the Urban Cohort members displayed both transgressive and conventional White racial knowledge. In chapter 2, I will provide an overview of critical Whiteness studies. This overview will describe the foundational assumptions of critical Whiteness studies, elaborate on the normalized nature of Whiteness, and discuss the use of critical Whiteness studies as an analytical lens. I will then move into a review of the literature related to White preservice teachers and race. In particular, I will focus on how White resistance to antiracist pedagogy is portrayed in both empirical and conceptual work. To close chapter 2, I discuss the conflicted nature of White racial identity and suggest pedagogical approaches that can support White preservice teachers as they learn critical racial knowledge. Chapter 3 outlines the methodological approach of this critical case study. I explain my reasons for choosing a qualitative approach and the assumptions that come with conducting research within the

critical paradigm. I also detail the context of the study, including the research site and participants, as well as the sources of data and my methods for data collection and analysis. I also include a statement on my positionality as a researcher.

In chapters 4, 5, and 6, I share the findings from the study. Chapters 4 and 5 share findings related to the theme of transgressive White racial knowledge. Chapter 4 discusses how the Urban Cohort talked about students in urban schools, including their desires to combat deficit discourses and resist notions of the White teacher as savior. Chapter 5 details how the Urban Cohort members talked about their own racial privileges and the operation of racism in society. The cohort members used their race privilege as an asset in understanding structural racism and they commented insightfully on the workings of Whiteness upon their lives. For chapter 6, I share data from the theme of conventional White racial knowledge. In particular, I discuss some of the cohort's background experiences with race, the ways they subtly resisted some of the implications of racism, and how they sometimes used critical racial discourses in problematic ways. Collectively, the data shared in these three chapters capture the complicated nature of how social justice-minded White teachers discuss the topic of race. To conclude, chapter 7 discusses the study's implications for critical Whiteness studies, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education. I also share some final thoughts on the Urban Cohort's engagement with the topic of race.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

In order to frame this investigation into the experiences of ten White preservice social studies and language arts teachers, I will explore the extant literature related to White preservice teacher learning about race as well as describe my conceptual framework, critical Whiteness studies. The need to prepare the predominantly White teaching force for positions in schools with increasing numbers of students of color has led many scholars to urge greater discussion of race and racism in teacher preparation (Banks et al., 2005; Sleeter, 2008). White preservice teachers have displayed mixed responses to the centering of race in teacher education classrooms (Picower, 2009; Schick, 2000). Critical Whiteness studies (CWS) offer a useful analytical lens for exploring the literature around White teachers and race as well as investigating the experiences of the ten preservice teachers in this study. I will begin with an explanation of some of the major tenets of CWS and then move to a review of literature that explores White teachers engaging with the topic of race.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: CRITICAL WHITENESS STUDIES

> *"But what on earth is whiteness that one should so desire it?" Then always, somehow, some way, silently but clearly, I am given to understand that whiteness is the ownership of the earth forever and ever, Amen!* (DuBois, 2003/1920, p. 53)

> *In a parallel universe it could have been Yellowness, Redness, Brownness, or Blackness. Or, alternatively phrased, we could have had a yellow, red, brown, or black Whiteness: Whiteness is not really a color at all, but a set of power relations* (Mills, 1997, p. 127)

As the above quote by DuBois displays, many decades before its rise in mainstream academic discourse, scholars of color discussed the workings of Whiteness and its impact on people of color (Roediger, 1998). Despite this earlier work, Wynter (1979) expressed dismay over the lack of emphasis on White racism in scholarly research:

> Yet almost no serious in-depth studies have been carried out into the complex levels of this pathology; into the history of its social constitution. This is linked to the fact that *whiteness* is taken as a given, rather than as a striking phenomenon calling for extensive research (p. 150).

Wynter's concerns, although not new among scholars of color, now seem prophetic, as almost two and a half decades later, Kolchin (2002) would note in a review of Whiteness studies that, "Suddenly whiteness studies are everywhere. The rapid proliferation of a genre that appears to have come out of nowhere is little short of astonishing" (p. 154). While it did not exactly "come out of nowhere," work in the field of what will be referred to as critical Whiteness studies (CWS) has grown substantially over the past two decades.

Over that time, scholars in the fields of history, sociology, philosophy, literary studies, American studies, political science, psychology, cultural studies, critical race theory, feminist theory, and education produced works that constitute a "new history of race in America" (Kolchin, 2002). CWS marks its difference from previous treatments of race by placing critical scrutiny on White people, rather than people of color (Apple, 1998). It is more appropriate to say that CWS scholarship represents the first concerted attempt to critique Whiteness by White folks, as scholars of color have done so for many decades (Baldwin, 1985; Ellison, 1986). Rather than deconstructing the negative attitudes constructed by Whites toward people of color, CWS focuses on the superior attitudes

Whites construct of themselves and how those attitudes both reflect and re-inscribe a racial hierarchy. This focus asks Whites to critique their own privilege along with developing more positive dispositions toward non-Whites (Chubbuck, 2004). The purpose of scrutinizing White privilege as an unexamined component in the lives of White people is not merely to expose Whites as racists, but to increase awareness of White participation in race relations (Leonardo, 2009). CWS calls White people to understand themselves as racialized beings and as ongoing constructors of a racial hierarchy.

In order to discuss this field of research and its implications for my study, I will begin by noting some of the foundational assumptions and goals of scholars who engage in CWS work. Second, I will discuss the various ways that Whiteness is defined in the literature. Third, I will discuss how Whiteness operates as a form of social power in both discursive and material ways. Then, turning to a concerted review of the literature, I will note the ways that CWS is used in educational research, placing an emphasis on how CWS analyzes the racial understandings of White preservice teachers. Finally, I will discuss a specific body of CWS research within education that provides suggestions for how the antiracist teacher education project might approach work with White teachers in a more compassionate, constructive manner. Not all authors discussed in this review necessarily proclaim their research as coming from a CWS framework. I include their work here because it speaks to the field of CWS in important ways. As one example, Joyce King's (1991) study of dysconscious racism makes no mention of Whiteness or CWS, but her analysis of the racial views of predominantly White preservice teachers

uses many of the same principles that undergird CWS, making her study relevant for a review of Whiteness studies in education.

Foundational Assumptions of Critical Whiteness Studies

CWS operates from the starting point that race represents a socially-constructed category of difference rather than "an inherently meaningful category, one linked to relations of power and processes of struggle, and one whose meanings change over time" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 11). Despite its constructed nature, however, race enacts real implications for those racialized under its gaze and therefore serves as a meaningful analytical tool for understanding power relations in society (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994). CWS, with an emphasis on Whiteness, scrutinizes the construction, maintenance, and reproduction of White racial identities. Rather than viewing race as something possessed only by people of color, CWS views White people as racialized as "an oppressor ethnicity that has consolidated its appearance of superiority at the cost of others" (Thompson, 1999, p. 146). To illustrate this, some of the most foundational work in CWS came from historians who traced the evolution of White racial identities for European immigrants arriving in the United States (Ignatiev, 1994; Roediger, 1991). This work displayed the contingent nature of Whiteness, as groups such as the Irish attained Whiteness over time despite existing outside of the White community initially (Ignatiev, 1994). This "foundational gesture" (Wiegman, 1999) of CWS provided the blueprint for subsequent analyses of Whiteness as a form of social power (Leonardo, 2009; Mills, 1997). By demonstrating the fluidity of White racial identification and detailing the social

benefits that accrue to those deemed White, this research centered Whiteness as a construct in need of critical analysis.

The centering of Whiteness and, consequently, White people constitutes another key assumption of CWS. This centering occurs in the context of a critique of Whiteness and in an attempt to illuminate and then reconstitute the attributes of White racial identities (Thompson, 1999). Some have noted that CWS research runs the risk of re-centering White voices and perspectives at the expense of "[ignoring] the voices and testimony of those groups of people whose dreams, hopes, lives, and very bodies are shattered by current relations of exploitation and domination" (Apple, 1998, p. ix). This concern is an important one for any work undertaken in a CWS framework. Leonardo (2009) suggests that accessing the perspectives of people of color forms a crucial element in CWS, as White norms are often invisible to the White individuals who enact them on a daily basis. The role of these "invisible" practices in Whiteness leads to the final key assumption of CWS.

CWS research generally operates from the standpoint that making Whiteness visible plays an important role in dislodging White-dominated power structures (Wiegman, 1999). Although I will discuss the "invisibility" of Whiteness in greater detail below, it is important to note here that a fundamental goal of CWS is to highlight how White norms permeate US society. While these norms appear as value neutral to many White people, they create standards by which others receive judgment, often to the detriment of people of color. CWS seeks to detail these oppressive practices so that they can be reconfigured in antiracist ways. As Leonardo (2009) suggests, "whiteness

becomes the center of critique and transformation" (p. 91). As one example, CWS research within teacher education typically identifies the unexamined racial worldviews of White teachers in order to demonstrate how those worldviews damage the educational experiences of the children of color in their classrooms and to suggest new ways for the field of teacher education to develop antiracist dispositions in White teachers (Bell, 2002; Picower, 2009). Throughout CWS research, this technique is repeated: naming harmful White practices with the goal of dislodging those practices and replacing them with antiracist approaches.

Defining Whiteness

Ellsworth's (1997) description of Whiteness displays the complex and diffuse nature of the term. Rather than residing exclusively in the realm of the ideological or the structural, Whiteness exists simultaneously as

> a practice; a form of property; a performance; a constantly shifting location upon complex maps of social, economic, and political power; a form of consciousness; a form of ignorance; a privilege; something those of us who "are" white must unlearn; something we whites fear, something that gives us pleasure, something we desire; something we must name and describe and…change; an invisible something that we must make visible (p. 264).

Importantly, Ellsworth makes no attempt to make Whiteness synonymous with Whites as a racial group or with an individual White racial identity, meaning Whiteness does not refer to the state of being White. Rather, Whiteness more closely represents what Leonardo (2009) calls a racial worldview or racial discourse that serves to maintain a White-dominated racial hierarchy. Whiteness is not completely separate from White people, however, as individuals who are phenotypically recognizable as White benefit from Whiteness whether they seek out those benefits or not.

A stronger connection exists between Whiteness and racism, defined as a "system of advantage based on race" (Tatum, 2003, p. 5). Whiteness comprises the "ideologies, attitudes, and actions of racism in practice" (Chubbuck, 2004, p. 303), therefore racism is a system that sustains Whiteness as the dominant racial worldview (Hyland, 2005). DiAngelo and Allen (2006) note that Whiteness is really a constellation of practices, never reducible to one discrete act such as telling a racist joke. This constellation of practices and prejudices creates the material conditions under which people of color suffer and White people experience a litany of unearned advantages. Scholars often refer to these unearned advantages as White privilege (McIntosh, 1989), another term closely linked to Whiteness. While White privilege exists as a reality for many White people, it is not synonymous with Whiteness. It serves as a manifestation of the social, cultural, and discursive production of difference between racial groups created by Whiteness as a racial logic (Levine-Rasky, 2000).

The distinction between White people and Whiteness is important for understanding Whiteness and pushing back against it effects because it gives White people agentic potential. It suggests that White people can choose to act in a variety of ways that may or may not reproduce status quo race relations (Leonardo, 2009). Without this distinction, the state of being White would trap one within the oppressiveness of Whiteness. Antiracist work with White teachers would seem rather pointless. However, it is also crucial to remember that White people do not have the ability to renounce the benefits of Whiteness completely. The privileges of Whiteness often accrue in ways outside of the control and/or awareness of a White person (Allen, 2004; Leonardo, 2009).

This creates a tricky situation for White folks who engage in antiracist work. Whites cannot fully disown their Whiteness through a series of thoughts or actions because they maintain their White skin and will continue to be treated in a particular way (Bailey, 1998). The difficulties of refusing White privilege (McIntosh, 1989) should not absolve White people from considering how they benefit from their race, however. Instead, it should serve as a reminder of the complicated nature of Whiteness.

Despite the distinction between Whiteness and White people, it is also important to understand White people as a racial group, as they enact many of the cultural practices of Whiteness on a daily basis. Haney Lopez's (1994) defines a race as, "a vast group of people loosely bound together by historically contingent, socially significant elements of their morphology and/or ancestry" (p. 7). White people fit this classification. First, membership in the White race has a historically contingent aspect. Certain groups pass into Whiteness at certain times, such as Jewish, Italian, and Greek immigrants in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the US (Roediger, 1991). Other groups pass out of Whiteness, such as Arab Americans, who might classify as White on the census but whose presence often raises suspicion in the current geopolitical context (McLaren, 1998). Second, morphology and ancestry also play a role in constituting membership in the White race. The perceived racial group membership of an individual might arise from morphological characteristics or through his or her ancestry as known by members of the community (Gross, 2009). Yet these racial markers are also fluid, meaning different things and enacting different implications depending on the time and space. Morphology can eclipse ancestry or ancestry can eclipse morphology, depending upon the context.

Lopez (1994) sees attaining membership in the White racial group as a combination of chance (ancestry and morphology), context (social setting where raced behaviors are performed), and choice (conscious acts that identify or do not identify with White community).

Another crucial element in defining Whiteness involves an acknowledgement of the historical trajectory of White as a racial category. One cannot separate the creation of Whiteness from the ascendancy of European-style global capitalism and the exploitation of resources and non-White bodies it required (Brown & De Lissovoy, 2011; Winant, 2001). Whiteness did not exist prior to this historical process and the qualities associated with Whiteness have remained fluid and contextual as the terms of racial domination shifted over time (Omi & Winant, 1994). Marx (2006) notes that, "Whiteness is often understood by what it is not rather than what it is" (p. 6). This statement highlights how the term is produced out of a process of negation. Frankenberg (1993) suggests that Whiteness is fundamentally a relational category. Its content arises through its ever-shifting, yet constant, rejection of Black-ness, Brown-ness, Yellow-ness, and Red-ness. Again, the Irish experience in the US proves instructive, as they ultimately attained membership in the White community through aggressively distancing themselves from the Black community (Ignatiev, 1994). Attaining Whiteness in this way required the Irish to engage in performative contrasts that highlighted their anti-Blackness (Baldwin, 1985). In hegemonic fashion, Whiteness, as an imagined racial collective, absorbs groups willing to participate in the racial domination of groups deemed outside of Whiteness. In this way, Whiteness can simultaneously be nothing in particular and a stark contrast to

groups of color, whose customs and habits become marked as deviant through the normalization and valorization of whatever cultural practices White people engage in during the current historical moment (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Thompson, 1999)

Whiteness as social power

Mills (1997) discusses Whiteness as a set of power relations that govern the lived experiences of White people and people of color. One can easily see how power functions in a racialized system of oppression like Whiteness by looking at historical practices such as slavery, the genocide of Native Americans, or, as a more contemporary example, the excessive incarceration rates of Black males (Alexander, 2012). Leonardo (2002) suggests that "whenever Whiteness, as an imagined racial collective, inserts itself into history, material and discursive violence accompanies it" (p. 32). As mentioned above, the material violence of Whiteness is linked to the development of global capitalism (Winant, 2001). Material exploitation continues in the present not just as a residual effect of past exploitation, but also as a direct product of the social democratic reforms of the mid- and late-twentieth century that maintained economic segregation and created a possessive investment in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995). Meanwhile, the discursive violence of Whiteness acts through a series of "social practices of assimilation and cultural homogenization" (McLaren, 1998, p. 66). These practices negate the social worth of non-Whites while elevating the status of Whites and normalizing White modes of being.

While one must not lose sight of the overt nature of racial domination, Whiteness functions as perniciously through its invisibility and its creation of behavioral norms that

mark the boundaries between acceptable and deviant behavior (Chubbuck, 2004). As *de jure* policies of White supremacy such as slavery and Jim Crow eroded over time through the struggles of people of color and their White allies, *de facto* realities took their place. The civil rights courtroom victories of the 1950s and 1960s created a substantial breach in White domination (Winant, 2001), yet they did not undo Whiteness in society. Instead, Whiteness morphed into a less overt system, gaining stabilizing power from its normalization and its lack of an identifiable seat of control (Winant, 1997). As Wiegman (1999) noted, Whiteness functions with a sort of panoptic power, always present but never fully visible. For the purposes of this study, the normalizing function of Whiteness helps to explain how White teachers respond to antiracist teacher education and provides insight into the complex nature of White racial identity (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999).

Whiteness serves as the "unmarked marker of others" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 198) or "the unnamed, universal moral referent" (Giroux, 1997, p. 286), a mode of cultural behavior by which others are judged. Thompson (1999) refers to Whiteness as a "normalized condition of racelessness, every other 'race' being treated as a departure from that condition" and "the assumed backdrop against which all other meaning takes shape" (p. 149). This colonizing violence of Whiteness collides with the pervasive myths of meritocracy and equal opportunity in the US. Proclaiming the legal, economic, and educational systems as neutral arbiters of merit disguises the White norms that undergird those institutions and perpetuate Whiteness as the racial status quo (Chubbuck, 2004). Such a system necessitates the cultivation of ignorance and self-deception among White

people in order to justify the maintenance of an unequal society founded on principles of equality. Mills (1997) situates this stilted understanding as integral to a larger *racial contract*, noting that it

> Prescribes for its signatories an inverted epistemology, an epistemology of ignorance, a particular pattern of localized and global cognitive dysfunctions (which are psychologically and socially functional), producing the ironic outcome that whites will in general be unable to understand the world they themselves have made (p. 18).

This "structured blindness," as Mills calls it, serves to maintain the power that Whiteness creates for the White population. It allows Whites to exploit, denigrate, and discriminate backed by a racial ideology that obscures its own existence. Citing Freire (1970), Leonardo (2009) suggests that this type of power relationship exists when any group is involved in relations of oppression. The system created by the oppressors ultimately absolves them of any holistic understanding of the system's processes. In similar fashion, Laughter (2011) suggests that replacing Whiteness with Christian, heterosexual, male, able-bodied, or any other dominant subjectivity provides the same result. In all cases, oppressive identities willfully avoid specific knowledge of how oppressive systems operate.

Focusing on the normalization of Whiteness does not completely remove oneself from looking at the material effects it creates, however. The establishment of acceptable and unacceptable patterns of behavior creates structural White privileges (McIntosh, 1989) throughout society. When Whites take advantage of those privileges, they do so at the expense of people of color. Whether Whites seize those advantages consciously or dysconsciously (King, 1991) matters little. In a dysconscious instance, an unfair

advantage may be gained but is obscured by its appearance as normal and appropriate. In a conscious instance, the White individual may feel she is exercising her right to choose or cashing in some of the cultural capital she earned in the ostensibly meritocratic system. The White norms that pervade school curricula and standardized testing (Allen, 2004) provide an instructive example. When White students experiences academic success as a result of familiarity with the language and content that appears in these environments, these students do not notice or consider that their level of comfort perhaps arose from the cultural congruence of their home and school experiences. Furthermore, when White students score well and secure admission to a university, the reason for their acceptance can readily be attributed to quantifiable academic measures, which they likely view as natural arbiters of ability. These particular students perhaps worked very hard, but CWS reminds us that the students' success also occurred as a result of a system that systematically privileges Whites and creates obstacles for students of color.

Another crucial element of the normalizing power of Whiteness involves its diffuse nature. As mentioned above, one cannot reduce Whiteness to the actions of White people, but individuals do act upon the dominant ideologies that sustain White dominance. Power does not reside in a small group of individuals, but rather in what Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998) call the White power bloc, "the loose alignment of various social, political, educational, and economic agents as well as agencies that work in concert around particular issues to maintain white power" (p. 18). This group does not work in concert nor with the stated goal of advancing White supremacy. Yet their actions perpetuate White norms and create opportunities for White folks to succeed. In the

educational context, this power bloc might contain curriculum writers, standardized test creators, textbook adoption committees at the state level, state legislatures, district policymakers, classroom teachers, and a host of other individuals. These spaces, even if not dominated by White people, are dominated by White educational norms and—often in the name of equity—they create and carry out policies that secure White interests (Leonardo, 2007). Writing about the United Kingdom context, Gillborn (2005) details how ostensibly race-neutral educational policies worked to the detriment of students of color. While the vast inequities between White students and students of color suggests some sort of conspiracy, the power bloc does not have to collude. Although they work from a variety of social positions, they draw upon a set of similar assumptions. In this sense, proving conspiracy is not the point (Gillborn, 2008). Educational outcomes speak loudly about whose interests education serves.

Critical Whiteness studies as an analytic lens

Research undertaken with a CWS lens requires knowledge of the operation of Whiteness and an appreciation for the difficulties many White individuals experience in viewing themselves as participants in race relations. When Whites engage with the topic of race, the researcher must contextualize that engagement within Whiteness as a racial worldview (Leonardo, 2009). Rather than conducting a surface analysis of the ways that White participants reject antiracist pedagogy, the researcher must consider that the "structured blindness" of Whiteness (Mills, 1997) mediates the way Whites talk about race. Without this understanding, the researcher can misinterpret the intentions of the participants and view them as autonomous racial agents who reject antiracist pedagogy in

an effort to re-invest in their Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995). This analysis positions White resistance as a malady of the individual (Ringrose, 2007) and places the burden of understanding racism solely on the White teacher (Conklin, 2008). CWS research should distinguish between Whiteness and White people (Leonardo, 2009). White individuals may draw upon the discourses of Whiteness when presented with the topic of race, but these tactics should not close off their antiracist possibilities. In the forthcoming review of literature, I provide an overview of common discourses of resistance utilized by White teachers while also discussing the role of an ambivalent White identity (Lensmire, 2010) in structuring White racial dialogue.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

CWS entered the field of educational research in the late 1990s, most notably with the release of two edited volumes, *White Reign: Deploying Whiteness in America* (Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 1998) and *Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society* (Fine, Weis, Powell, & Mun Wong, 1997). Many prominent scholars of critical theory, feminism, and postmodernism—Joe Kincheloe, Michael Apple, Peter McLaren, Shirley Steinberg, Henry Giroux, Lois Weis, Deborah Britzman, Cameron McCarthy, Elizabeth Ellsworth, and others—filled these volumes with a diverse body of work that analyzed the production and maintenance of Whiteness in the realm of education. Both works pursued the foundational goal of CWS research mentioned above: making Whiteness visible in order to dislodge its power. Since these foundational works, numerous conceptual and empirical pieces have contributed to our understanding of the workings of Whiteness in the educational context. The bulk of CWS research in the field

of education can be placed in one of four broad categories: detailing the negative impact of the unexamined racial views of White teachers on students of color (Hyland, 2005; Sleeter, 1993), highlighting White norms that pervade teaching and learning (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Rodriguez, 1998), analyzing how education policy perpetuates White supremacy (Gillborn, 2005; Leonardo, 2007), and charting the biographical journeys of White educators grappling with the implications of Whiteness in their lives as teachers (Howard, 2006; Kohl, 1967; Landsman, 2001; Paley, 1989). For the purposes of this project, I focus on research examining the racial views of White teachers, particularly preservice teachers that experience antiracist pedagogy during their teacher training.

White Teachers and Resistance

> *White teachers' dispositions toward race may create internal obstacles to the implementation of both effective pedagogy and curriculum and a transformative response to inequitable policies. Paying attention to those dispositions brings educational researchers face to face with the question of racism* (Chubbuck, 2004, p. 302).

Most studies that examine or advocate for increased racial or multicultural awareness in the US teaching force are situated within the context of demographic crisis in the nation’s schools (Banks et al., 2005; Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Gay & Howard, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The demographic crisis results from a racial incongruence between the overwhelmingly White teaching force and the ever-increasing population of students of color in the nation’s schools. History suggests that the cultural mismatch between these two groups has negative results on the educational opportunities of students of color (Noguera, 2003; Spring, 2004). The normalization of Whiteness, along with the deficit views many White teachers hold toward children of color

(Valencia, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999) create unequal access to quality, compassionate education. As a remedy, some scholars advocate increasing the number of teachers of color in the teaching force (Villegas & Davis, 2008; Zeichner, 2009). While this effort should represent one aspect of preparing a culturally responsive teaching force, teacher educators must also address the problematic racial views of the predominantly White teaching force currently walking the halls of colleges of education.

Before moving into some of the important empirical and conceptual work on how White teachers respond to antiracist teacher education, it is important to say a bit more about this demographic crisis in education. The invocation of the demographic imperative, while well intentioned and timely, makes some problematic assumptions about the character of the White teacher and, consequently, may open the door for unproductive pedagogical approaches. In a review of multicultural teacher education efforts, Lowenstein (2009) contends that framing calls for reform within these demographic terms homogenizes the White teacher and positions White teachers as deficient learners in terms of studying diversity. She suggests that if teacher education efforts begin from these assumptions, it becomes easy to place the burden on preservice teachers for not "getting it" when confronted with multicultural or antiracist pedagogies. This allows the pedagogical approaches of teacher educators, and the orientations they take toward their students, to avoid scrutiny. Teacher educators should appreciate the discomforting nature (Kumashiro, 2004) of critical racial knowledge for White teachers. This allows them to interpret resistance as a natural part of the learning process (Pitt, 1998) rather than as a move to preserve White supremacy (Ringrose, 2007). Furthermore,

the pedagogical approaches used by teachers should be interrogated to examine whether they present over-essentialized views of Whiteness that might be productive of resistance (Lensmire et al., 2013; Trainor, 2002). Lowenstein's suggestion is an important one for teacher education to consider, and I will return to it in greater detail later.

From the earlier discussion on the nature of Whiteness, one should understand that paying attention to the normalized racism in the thinking of White teacher candidates is important, but also that Whiteness does not necessarily preclude White individuals from reorienting their worldviews in antiracist ways (Leonardo, 2002). Such is the goal of many pedagogical projects undertaken with White preservice teachers. Leonardo (2009) suggests that

> Whites forego a critical understanding of race because their structural position is both informed by and depends on a *fundamentally superficial grasp* of its history and evolution. This fact does not prevent whites from realizing their position of privilege, which is a pedagogical task (p. 110, italics in original).

The attempt to make Whiteness visible during teacher education can help White teachers understand the impact of their collective racial ignorance on both individuals and institutions. Returning to the demographic imperative, this recognition becomes crucial as White teachers will likely work in classrooms with significant diversity. Without a critical understanding of their own racial identities, White teachers can commit a myriad of aggressions upon students of color (Delpit, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995). In the language of critical pedagogy, White teachers need to undergo a process of racial *conscientization* (Freire, 1970). Before they can acquire and enact a style of teaching that values children of color, White teachers must consider how they participate in race relations. Without doing so, White teachers could enact culturally relevant teaching styles

in a colonizing (Memmi, 1965) fashion or view themselves as “White Knights” (McIntyre, 1997) or “White Saviors” (Titone, 1998) who seek to rescue children of color from their own cultural deprivation.

Several scholars echo the sentiment that an awareness of White privilege on the part of White educators must precede effective engagement with students of color. Lawrence and Tatum (1997) note that “when White teachers fail to acknowledge their own racial identity, this lack of acknowledgement becomes a barrier for understanding and connecting with the developmental needs of children of color” (p. 163). Bell (2002) notes that White teachers’ preparation for multicultural classrooms is often held back by their inability to talk about the workings of race in society. Teachers prefer to utilize a colorblind discourse—which they perceive as anti-racist—that works against deeper engagement on the topic of racial difference and perpetuates racial hierarchies. This unwillingness or inability to engage in critical dialogue about race and racism on the part of White teachers is well documented (Hyland, 2005; King, 1991; Marx, 2006; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). Engaging White teachers in an analysis of the normalized and harmful nature of Whiteness can improve their ability to engage in productive dialogue around the topic of race and to engage in effective teaching of students of color.

The Tropes of White Resistance

In a review of research on White teachers and their ability to work productively with students of color, Sleeter (2008) noted four key findings, all of which align with CWS research. First, White teachers generally possess a dysconscious (King, 1991)

understanding of how racism works in schools and society, failing to consider the workings of power and ideology. Second, White teachers are unable to make sense of social inequality or racial difference outside of a deficit framework, leading them to have lower expectations for children of color. Third, White teachers have little knowledge of communities of color and often experience fear or apprehension when operating in those communities or in situations with few White people. Fourth, White teachers tend to view their own ways of thinking and acting as natural and view other ways of being as deviant and suspicious. Antiracist teacher education faces substantial challenges when trying to push back against the problematic assumptions White teachers often bring with them to teacher training. It should not be a surprise that White teachers resist such pedagogy in a variety of ways.

My review of the literature produced several identifiable "White tropes of resistance," which I detail below. As with any attempt to delineate categories, the results are messy and overlap exists between the different resistance discourses. Additionally, while each category includes empirical data from studies explicitly utilizing a CWS or other race-based framework, I have also included analysis from various conceptual pieces throughout. As an example, the first category—a retreat to individualism—includes numerous empirical studies involving White teachers (Solomon et al., 2005; Young, 2011) as well as analytical arguments for why this "retreat to individualism" occurs (Scheurich, 1993; Sleeter, 1993). Finally, I use the term resistance to refer to the ways that White teachers push back against antiracist pedagogy. I talk about this resistance not to place blame upon the teachers or the teacher educators, but rather to document what

happens in these educational settings so that I might argue for alternative conceptions of White racial identities (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999) and more compassionate pedagogical approaches (Lowenstein, 2009; Trainor, 2005) in the final section of this review.

A retreat to individualism

One might argue that this first resistance trope explains all of the others. Quite easily, one could pull examples from the forthcoming categories and relate them to this opening idea of the individual. However, I feel this category deserves separate treatment for two reasons. First, many researchers explicitly note as one of their findings that their subjects clung to individualistic discourses when talking about race (Hytten & Warren, 2003; Solomon et al., 2005; Young, 2011). Second, a focus on individualism as a defense mechanism also highlights a problematic pedagogical orientation of much antiracist teacher education. Sleeter (1995) notes that far too many teacher educators approach their student teachers with a psychological understanding of racism. This approach supposes that racism occurs as a result of a lack of information or exposure to people of color on the part of their students and that, by obtaining more knowledge, they could rise above their unexamined racism. However, by approaching teachers in this way, teacher educators invite their students to resist by using the same individualistic understanding presented to them.

White preservice teachers tend to frame their resistance to antiracist pedagogy in individualistic terms stems due to their socialization in a society steeped in liberalistic notions of the primacy of the individual and meritocracy (DiAngelo & Allen, 2006;

Levine-Rasky, 2000). Moreover, due to the insidious workings of Whiteness on their lived experiences, many Whites feel that that their success flows from their abilities and effort alone, a belief Causey et al. (2000) refer to as "naïve egalitarianism." Solomon et al. (2005) drew data from more than 200 teacher candidates and many of them utilized individual or meritocratic discourses in order to push back against the notion of White privilege. Crowley & Smith (2011) also noted that many of their participants accessed individualized narratives to push back against the notion of White privilege (McIntosh, 1989). Drawing from these ideas of abstract individualism (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) allows individuals to assert the primacy of personal characteristics such as savvy, diligence, and perseverance in predicting success rather than one's social position relative to race, gender, sexuality, ability, or religion. Positioning oneself as an individual also moves to decontextualize and depoliticize race in favor of an analysis of one person's experience (Ellsworth, 1997).

Young (2011) found significant persistence in her participants' understanding of racism as an individual pathology rather than a structural entity. She identified four ways in which her teacher participants discussed racism at the level of the individual: the conscious perpetrator, the unconscious perpetrator, the deceived perpetrator, and the partially enlightened perpetrator. While all eight teachers noted their lack of immunity to racial prejudice, several noted that, by not acting on those prejudices, they remained outside of racism. This analysis displays a close attachment to racism as existing only in purposeful, discrete acts rather than in normalized cultural practices or institutional policies. These teachers, as in those in many other studies (Applebaum, 2008; DiAngelo

& Allen, 2006; Levine-Ravsky, 2000; Marx, 2006; Picower, 2009) rely on individualized discourses because they lack an appreciation for racism outside of individual prejudice. Sheurich (1993) comments insightfully on this issue:

> In our society everyone is racially located and experiences the inequitable distribution of resources and power by racial group, even though a belief in individualism conceals this inequitable distribution. It does not matter whether we are a "good" or a "bad" White; all Whites are socially positioned as Whites and receive social advantages because of this positionality. No individual White gets to be an exception because of his or her antiracism (p. 9).

It will be difficult to challenge structural racism as long as Whites, in particular, hold fast to a belief in racism as a malady of the individual. While one might consider the belief in individual agency embedded in the teachers' comments laudable, the uncritical approach toward structural obstacles could lead these teachers to place the burden of success or failure on the backs of their students of color. Moreover, this attitude does not consider that a cultural disconnect between the White teacher and a student of color might lead to misinterpretations of student engagement or appropriate classroom behavior (Delpit, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Marx, 2006).

Accessing alternative identity elements

In order to distance themselves from claims of White privilege and White racism, White preservice teachers often emphasize marginalized elements of their identities. DiAngelo and Allen's (2006) study features a White female who highlighted her Jewish ancestry to disassociate herself from Whiteness. By highlighting identity elements other than race, Whites seek to highlight ways in which they face oppression in their lives. Crowley and Smith (2011) experienced pushback from a White male teacher who emphasized his identity as a member of the Mormon faith, which brought him ridicule at

various points in his life. This same teacher also accessed his class identity, noting that his family grew up with little financial resources. Gay and Kirkland (2003) noted a similar strategy from preservice teachers who shifted conversation about race towards issues of class or gender. Hytten and Warren (2003) relayed the story of an openly gay White teacher in their study who avoided discussions of race privilege by drawing from the marginalization of his sexuality. Fellows and Razack (1998) refer to these processes as the "race to innocence," as Whites draw upon stories of personal marginalization in order to disavow complicity in hierarchical power structures.

Another manner in which White teachers access this alternative identity trope is through what Haney Lopez (1994) refers to as the immigrant analogy. This method equates the present day experiences of people of color with those of European ethnic groups who immigrated to the US in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Several scholars noted that the White teachers they studied used European immigrant groups as examples of people who succeeded in US society despite facing significant obstacles or even initial identification as a racial other (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Levine-Rasky, 2000; Picower, 2009). As mentioned above, the experience of European ethnic groups and their transition into Whiteness represents the "foundational gesture" (Wiegman, 1999) of CWS. However, these White teachers do not access these stories to display the fluid and contextual nature of Whiteness as a system of dominance. They draw upon them to assert that "members of diverse groups voluntarily came to America to partake in its freedom and opportunity; while systems were not always fair in the past,

opportunity has gradually been extended to everyone" (Sleeter, 1995, p. 38). This trope places the burden of success or failure in US society solely upon people of color.

Another reason for highlighting White ethnicity may be that students look for "opportunities for Whites to articulate their racial identity in positive terms" (Levine-Rasky, 2000, p. 279). Rather than experiencing guilt over the plight of people of color, Whites can place their historical record of suffering during immigration alongside that of racial minorities. Rearticulating this history positions Whites as oppressed and as possessing culture, rather than being cast as oppressors devoid of culture. Regardless of the intent, when White teachers access alternative identity elements, they either explicitly or implicitly contend that marginalized groups can obtain success from hard work and that everyone experiences oppression in some way. They seek to remove blame from Whites for the societal position of people of color, to deny the existence of White privilege, and to assert the meritocratic nature of the US. In doing so, these strategies avoid engaging with structural racism and its impact.

White victimization

Another common trope of White resistance involves assertions of reverse racism or White victimization as a result of the preferential treatment now accorded to racial minorities (Apple, 1998). This discourse comes from a belief that the racial remedies of the Civil Rights Era created a system of reverse discrimination in which people of color now receive preference in terms of hiring or college admissions (Winant, 1997). This rhetoric distorts the facts and fails to recognize the retrenchment (Crenshaw, 1988) that has occurred in the enforcement of civil rights legislation in the past three decades. As an

example, school integration slowed as a result of court rulings that favored the maintenance of neighborhood schools even at the risk of re-segregating the student population (Bell, 1980). This lax enforcement of school desegregation rulings effectively allowed for *de facto* segregation to reign in US schools (Orfield & Lee, 2005). Contrary to the claims of preferential treatment for racial minorities, the primary benefactors of affirmative action policies in hiring and college admissions have been White women, not individuals of color (Ladson-Billings, 2004). These feelings of White victimization stem from the feeling that those courtroom victories in the 1950s and 1960s leveled the playing field and removed the overt White privilege that existed in the Jim Crow era and earlier. The victimization discourse forms an integral part of the ideology driving the conservative restoration in US politics since the 1980s, which calls for an end to special treatment for historically disadvantaged groups (Apple, 1998, 2000). Cabrera (2014) adds that feelings of victimization can make Whites feel justified in further isolating themselves from people of color. In these majority White spaces, a destructive cycle occurs. The lack of contact with people of color perpetuates stereotypes and mistrust, which then further entrench the desire for White-dominated spaces.

Although White claims of victimization attempt to argue that the structural shifts of the past half century now benefit people of color over Whites, these stories of victimization typically avoid statistical evidence and use isolated examples (Marable, 2002). Bonilla-Silva (2010) refers to these victimization discourses as racial stories, or ideologically driven narratives that seek to minimize the impact of racism. Through his extensive interviews with White professionals, Bonilla-Silva identified two racial stories,

in particular, that display this sense of White victimization: “I didn’t get that job because of a Black man” and “I didn’t get into college because of a minority.” The narrators of racial stories rarely have specific details to offer. The story is often told with ambiguous elements and missing information. The point of the racial story is not to convey what really happened, however, as its intent is ideological. These stories bemoan the notion that Whites must atone for racial sins of the past. The racial storyteller typically does not consider the possibility that the person of color in the story received the job or the college admission on his or her own merit or that the White person was not qualified. Crowley and Smith (2011) documented a racial story of this nature during their study of White preservice social studies teachers. Katherine[2], a White female, noted that a Latina friend from high school received a scholarship over Katherine despite having lower grades. Katherine offered no details about the nature of the scholarship or other attributes her friend might have possessed. Nor did she consider any of the foundational justifications for affirmative action (Tatum, 2003). Instead, it seemed that she shared the story for the purpose of highlighting a situation of victimization to challenge the ideas of White privilege and structural racism she and her fellow students discussed in the classroom that day.

White discourses of denial

Another resistance trope utilized by White teachers is to deny the existence of White privilege or to suggest that they did not participate in the perpetuation of racism. Denial discourses take a variety of forms. Picower (2009) identified several common

[2] Pseudonym

phrases of denial used by her White student teachers to disavow complicity in racial inequality. These discourses involved the phrases “I never owned a slave,” “stop trying to make me feel guilty,” “now that things are equal,” and “it’s out of my control.” Collectively, these denial discourses locate racism in the past and as disconnected from the actions of Whites in the present. They also distract from discussing more nuanced forms of racism by drawing attention to egregious racist practices such as slavery (Brown & Brown, 2010) and by making generic statements about the existence of formal equality (Crenshaw, 1988). The discourses suggest that racial discussions are designed to assign blame and to generate guilt rather than to discuss Whiteness or White privilege in a productive fashion. These ideological forms of denial reinforce ways of thinking that remove White culpability for social inequity.

Solomon et al. (2005) termed this process of denial a “negation of white capital.” An important component of this rhetorical strategy involved placing emphasis on the advantages that people of color enjoyed in terms of hiring practices and college admissions. Crowley and Smith (2011) noted that references to affirmative action occurred again and again in the preservice teachers’ written responses regarding their thoughts on the notion of White privilege (McIntosh, 1989). It may be that preservice teachers’ close proximity to the college admissions process makes them more likely to reference this perceived bias in university admissions. However, their knowledge about these matters appeared very limited. Much like the racial stories referenced above, they rarely provided specific details or considered moments in their lives when they received privileges based on their racial identity. Leonardo (2009) also noted how many of his

White students preferred to point out "exceptions to the rule" in order to deny the prevalence of White privilege. These exceptions might include people of color who succeeded or instances when White people face perceived discrimination. President Obama serves as a powerful exception to the rule in the current racial landscape. A related discourse White teachers utilized was the "generalization card" (Leonardo, 2009). This tactic denies the implication that Whiteness bestows uniform privilege upon individuals or that all people of color experience oppression or hold particular views of society. By engaging in this trope of resistance, White teachers do not deny the existence of racism. Instead, they acknowledge it and then quickly move to diminish its salience (Chandler, 2009; Segall & Garrett, 2013). Rather than engaging with the idea of structural racism, they seek out small examples to discredit its explanatory potential.

Another component of the denial discourses involved the intransigence of many of the preservice teachers' racial worldviews. Even with exposure to evidence of structural inequality along racial lines, Vaught and Castagno's (2008) White teachers stood firm in their resistance to the notion of a racialized social order. The researchers noted that, "awareness did not lead to empathy amongst teachers, but resulted instead in a reinvention of meaning that reified existing, culturally constructed, racist frameworks" (p. 110). Other teachers in the study proclaimed that their awareness of racial issues prevented them from participating in such a system. They denied complicity and positioned themselves as standing outside of racism. Scholars have also suggested that White teachers who proclaimed strong racial knowledge often clamored the loudest about how they did not participate in racism (Cockrell, Placier, Cockrell, & Middleton, 1999;

Young, 2011). These teachers positioned themselves as "good Whites" (Case & Hemmings, 2005), confident that their enlightened actions did not perpetuate White racial dominance. Schick (2000) noted that her participants' "White liberal" identities were threatened by the existence of overtly racist Whites. To maintain their personal image as "good Whites," they aggressively denied participation in racism and distanced themselves from racist Whites.

Whiteness and personal experience

Although closely related to the "retreat to the individual" trope, the use of personal experience to push back against antiracist pedagogy merits its own discussion. While proclaiming meritocracy (Sleeter, 1993) or telling racial stories (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) both relate to personal experience, this trope is distinguished by specificity rather than vague generalities. The tactic typically represents an honest attempt by the preservice teachers to communicate an aspect of their reality that does not synch with what they are learning about Whiteness and White privilege. While using personal experience in race discussions can be problematic for Whites, it can also serve as a potential point of access for thinking critically about race. Crowley and Smith (2011) found that the use of personal experience served as an opening to thinking about structural racism for a small number of their participants. One male participant claimed to have first considered his White privilege by growing up in expatriate communities in the Middle East. By seeing the differences in living conditions between the White families in his compound and those of the locals, he saw White privilege in stark relief. Despite its possibility for creating openings, this trope typically disregards the experiences of people

of color by asking a simple question: “Doesn’t my experience count?” (Applebaum, 2008). By asking this question, White teachers re-center Whiteness. This occurrence creates murky waters for teacher educators committed to student voice and democratic dialogue (Ellsworth, 1989). Teachers may want to provide a platform for White students to share these stories, but they can also function as an oppressive force in a conversation geared toward opening up an understanding of structural racism.

In feminist theory, the epistemology of experience pushed back against androcentric worldviews, allowing women to share their own perspectives on the social world (Alcoff & Potter, 1993). Encouraging individuals to share their feelings and perspectives also plays an important role in dialogic process of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970). However, in settings where individuals from the dominant group feel that their worldviews or the legitimacy of their social position is threatened, the use of personal experience can operate as a rhetorical strategy to diminish the stories of subjugated groups. DiAngelo and Allen (2006) noted that their White participants protected their dominant interests “by positing a white participant’s interpretations as the product of a discrete individual, outside the realm of socialization, rather than as the product of multidimensional social interaction” (p. 13). Many preservice teachers used their personal experience as a way to shut down rather than open up conversations, often ending a statement with “but that’s just my personal experience.” Such a strategy places a protective coating over their statements because only that individual knows the reality of those experiences. This places the telling of the story beyond critique.

Applebaum (2008) notes that educators must communicate to their students that experience is always mediated by an individual's social positionality. Experience should be deconstructed and mined for its analytic potential. In antiracist teacher education, the deconstruction must occur through frames that consider the normalization of White modes of being and that take up the plight of the least advantaged in society. If done properly, nearly any personal experience can be interpreted in a way that highlights power structures. When a White student asks, "doesn't my experience count?" the response should direct the student to analyze what that experience conceals and what it reveals. When White preservice teachers draw from personal experience, they are not necessarily telling falsehoods, they are just avoiding an engagement with the experiences of people of color. Ellsworth (1989) suggests that any productive conversation across differences must begin with the following understanding:

> If you can talk to me in ways that show you understand that your knowledge of me, the world, and 'the Right thing to do' will always be partial, interested, and potentially oppressive to others, and if I can do the same, then we can work together on shaping and reshaping alliances for constructing circumstances in which students of difference can thrive (p. 324).

When White preservice teachers use experience discourse to distance themselves from an understanding of racism, they violate Ellsworth's principle and shut down conversations across difference.

Silence, fear, and finding 'the right words'

In the face of difficult conversations that question whether or not one has earned the advantages they enjoy in life, remaining silent is a common response for many White preservice teachers. Gay and Kirkland (2003) noted that many White teachers did not

participate in antiracist conversations to resist narratives they perceived as casting unfair judgment on their lives. DiAngelo (2012) identified a range of discourses used by White preservice teacher to justify remaining silent in conversations about antiracism. These discourses included, “I don’t know much about race, so I will just listen,” “I don’t feel safe/don’t want to be attacked, so I will be silent,” and “I don’t want to be misunderstood/say the wrong thing/offend someone.” While DiAngelo notes that there are appropriate times for Whites to remain silent and focus on listening, many of these discursive strategies serve to maintain White privilege by rejecting an antiracist analysis. Ladson-Billings (1996) also noted the silence of many of her White students during multicultural teacher education courses. She considered this silence in light of her status, not only as an instructor in a position of authority, but also as a female of color with experiential knowledge of racism. She suggested that teacher educators of color might experience silence more often than White educators as students may feel that people of color speak about race from a political position that biases their perspective.

Fear also plays a role in these moments of silence. Mazzei (2008) uses the term “racially inhabited silences” to suggest that White students communicate their views on race even through silence. Most White teachers have been socialized to feel that noticing or talking about race is not part of polite conversation (Thandeka, 1999). Race inhabits the silences because a stunted understanding or confusion of how to talk about race creates the reticence. Many Whites stay away from these discussions for “fear of offending, fear of being wrong, fear of appearing stupid, and fear of being marginalized by peers” (Mazzei, 2008, p. 1132). As a cultural practice of Whiteness, this silence

prevents engagement in discussions about racial inequality and allows Whites to avoid asserting a racial positionality. Whites remain race-less and avoid the political nature of antiracist discussions.

Haviland (2008) found that her participants had similar difficulties talking about race. Aside from the moments of silence, the teachers also hesitated frequently, made false starts in their speech, and went to great lengths to avoid certain words. These rhetorical moves, similar to those Bonilla-Silva (2010) documented, displayed how the fear of saying the wrong thing or being judged a racist stifles dialogue. In response to this fear, Whites often proclaim that they require a safe space in order to engage in racial dialogue (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2012). Leonardo and Porter (2010) suggest that these calls for safety disregard the lack of safety always present for people of color in discussions of race. When these teachers ask for safety, they are really asking that the group accept their opinions and experiences as valid. Rosenberg (1997) contends that the fears White teachers confront in discussions of race come from a sense of loss they experience when they begin to explore the meanings of Whiteness. These feelings can produce silence as Whites struggle to find "the right words" to express their desire for innocence or to reject the claims of racism they perceive being cast upon them.

Colorblindness

No discussion of White resistance to antiracist pedagogy would be complete without some comment on the role of colorblindness in structuring White discourse about race and racism. Along with the retreat to individualism, colorblindness could serve as a catchall to describe the way White teachers resist. Frankenberg (1993) defines

colorblindness as “a mode of thinking about race organized around an effort to not ‘see’ or at any rate not to acknowledge race differences” (p. 142). Colorblindness functions through a series of evasions. Colorblind discourse evades discussions of the contours of racism, avoids identification with a racial experience or group, and minimizes the legacy of racism through discourses of meritocracy and equality before the law (Leonardo, 2002). Colorblind rhetoric promotes a surface antiracist agenda that allows Whites to ignore structural racism and disavow personal responsibility for challenging racist practices. This logic does not consider race a salient category for understanding inequalities, suggesting that the legal victories of the Civil Rights Era removed the necessity for race-based legislation or racial consideration in institutional practices (Winant, 1997). The intent of this rhetorical move is to depoliticize Whiteness. In place of *de jure* White superiority, *de facto* White superiority can emerge without an author. Preferential treatment for Whites no longer exists in institutional rules, allowing Whites to assert the meritocratic nature of US society. This evasiveness is sometimes done with equity concerns in mind. Rattansi (1999) noted that British teachers often viewed colorblindness as a type of professionalism that prevented them from making prejudgments about students of color. While some position colorblindness as an antiracist logic, one must keep the reactionary nature of this rhetoric in mind during analysis (Thompson, 1999).

Bell (2002) offered rich descriptions of the colorblind tactics her teachers employed. These detailed analyses provide insight into the discomfort colorblindness causes for many White teachers. The teachers asserted colorblindness to position

themselves as innocent and free from racial biases. They felt that the race of a person of color was something one had to “get past” when making judgments about them. Bell (2002) stated that, “If we take people at their word, they mean to see beyond the stereotypes and assumptions tied to race, to the real person within. But because they ignore so much that is meaningful, they cannot get very far” (p. 239). Colorblind advocates view discussion of race as tantamount to racism. As a result, these teachers saw race but pretended not to see it. They made judgments but attempted to withhold judgments at the same time. This attachment to colorblind discourses stifled meaningful discussion across difference and prevented them from recognizing their own participation in race relations.

While colorblindness implies an ignorance regarding race and racism, it can also function as a cover for the problematic racial views held by many Whites (Gordon, 2005; Leonardo, 2009; McIntyre, 1997). Bell (2002) asked her teacher participants what advice they would give to a foreigner of color who was traveling to the US for the first time. Despite their proclaimed attachments to colorblindness, the participants had little trouble advising this hypothetical person of color. They suggested the individual should dress well so they would not look like a drug dealer or violent person, avoid emphasizing their cultural background in an effort to fit in, and not challenge authority figures, especially if the police became involved. This advice shows that, despite an insistence on colorblindness, these teachers are capable of discussing the racial rules of society. In similar fashion, Thompson (1999) provided the example of a television reporter who asked Whites how much money they would require as payment if they agreed to live the

rest of their lives as Black. Some suggested that $50 million would not be an unreasonable sum. Others claimed they would require $250,000 per year. These responses are reminiscent of a Chris Rock stand up routine:

> There ain't a white man in this room that would change places with me. None of you would change places with me. And I'm rich! That's how good it is to be white...There's a white, one-legged busboy in here right now that won't change places with me. He's going, 'No, man, I don't wanna switch. I wanna ride this white thing out.'

Chris Rock's analysis is sound. White folks know the value of Whiteness, whether they are willing to talk about it or not. Colorblind language often serves as cover for this type of racial knowledge and pedagogical tactics that draw this knowledge out help make Whiteness visible.

White tropes of resistance as White racial knowledge

Although the tropes of resistance detailed above are often used to evade a critical analysis of White participation in racism, it would be a mistake to classify the Whites who access these tropes as lacking racial knowledge. Framing Whites as ignorant on the topic of race can have the unintended consequence of "construct[ing] them as almost oblivious to the question of race and therefore obscur[ing] their personal and group investment in Whiteness" (Leonardo, 2009, p. 107). Instead, Leonardo suggests that all White discourse on the topic of race—even discourses of silence and evasion—should be understood as a body of "White racial knowledge." This conceptual approach removes White claims of innocence, making them accountable for how they interact with their racial worlds. Viewing resistance as a form of White racial knowledge also provides a different analytical approach for the researcher. Rather than searching the comments of

White teachers for signs of overt or covert racism, one can consider what these resistant strategies communicate about Whiteness as a racial worldview (Ringrose, 2007). The next section will provide an overview of alternative conceptions of White racial identity. These conceptions, along with Leonardo's (2009) notion of White racial knowledge, inform my analysis of the ten White preservice teachers in this study. I viewed these teachers' comments as communicating their racial knowledge—in both problematic and progressive ways. I also considered that their engagement with the topic of race was mediated by a Whiteness imbued with ambivalence (Lensmire, 2010).

RETHINKING WHITE TEACHER RESISTANCE

In an essay titled *On being 'White'… and other lies*, James Baldwin (1998) closed with the following attack on the oppressive fiction of a White identity:

> Because they think they are white, they do not dare confront the ravage and the lie of their history. Because they think they are white, they cannot allow themselves to be tormented by the suspicion that all men are brothers. Because they think they are white, they are looking for, or bombing into existence, stable populations, cheerful natives and cheap labor. Because they think they are white, they believe, as even no child believes, in the dream of safety (Baldwin, 1998, p. 180).

Baldwin's insight is important for what I discuss next for two reasons. First, he offers a poetic, powerful, and concise analysis of Whiteness that is echoed throughout the CWS literature and described in the previous section. He noted the structured blindness or epistemology of ignorance (Mills, 1997) that characterizes Whiteness. He discussed the role of White identity in squelching cross-racial and class struggles—what DuBois (2003) called the psychological wages of whiteness. He also noted the discursive and material violence perpetrated upon people of color with the backing of notions of White

superiority and infallibility (Winant, 2001). In short, he offered an synopsis of some of the major tenets of CWS.

Baldwin also speaks to this project when he suggests that Whites act the way they do because of an imagined identity that contains an imagined righteousness. Baldwin homogenizes White folks in this analysis, but his doing so is easily justifiable from his vantage point and very important to the message he wants to send to his audience. I feel that antiracist teacher educators have a tendency to homogenize White preservice teachers in ways that may work against the goals of their practice (Lowenstein, 2009). Rather than meeting their students where they are on the issues of race and racism, it is my opinion that many teacher educators view their students as receptacles into which they must place critical racial knowledge (Laughter, 2011; Trainor, 2005; Winans, 2005). Paulo Freire (1970) called this process banking education. Teacher educators view White preservice teachers as devoid of the type of experiences and dispositions that could serve as scaffolds for a critical understanding of racism. So, "because *we* think they are white," I feel that teacher educators often bypass opportunities to develop future teachers and instead resort to criticisms about their resistance to antiracist pedagogy (Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997, Sleeter, 1993). Audrey Lensmire (2012) ends the introduction of her book on White teachers in urban settings by saying that she shares in the hopes of scholars like Delpit (2006) and Ladson-Billings (1995) when their work conveys that, "it is not only possible for white teachers to teach students of color well, it is necessary" (Lensmire, 2012, p. 5)

The preceding review of literature about the nature of Whiteness as a racial worldview or ideology (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Leonardo, 2009, Mills, 1997), paints a rather dire picture about the ability of teacher educators to help their students rise above the dominant racial views of White society (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Lipsitz (1995) writes that White folks have a possessive investment in Whiteness that emerged as a result of decades of benefits that accrued to Whites from the government and other institutions of civil society. Harris (1993) categorizes Whiteness as "the characteristic, the attribute, the property of free human beings" (p. 1721). The protections offered by Whiteness are so great that even into the mid twentieth century, individuals went to court to claim legal status as White (Gross, 2009). If the material benefits of Whiteness are so systematic, then why would Whites choose to cast their lot with people of color? In fact, it may be impossible for Whites to refuse many of the privileges they receive as a result of their perceived identity (Allen, 2004; Leonardo, 2002; Thompson, 1999).

Moreover, the literature reviewed above shows that White preservice teachers access a variety of tropes of resistance in order to push back against antiracist pedagogy. Collectively, these can be understood as varying forms of what McIntyre (1997) calls White talk—the use of discourses to deflect or avoid a critical racial analysis. While this research plays a crucial role in an analysis of the workings of Whiteness in teacher education, I think it should be viewed as a starting point rather than an end point. As suggested above, this White talk should be understood as White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009) and White preservice teachers should be viewed as racial agents. White talk often contains multiple meanings that, rather than being the smooth representation of

racism, represent confused attempts at integrating difficult knowledge (Trainor, 2005). In order to approach this issue differently, one must consider the nature of White identity and whether or not the pedagogical approaches taken toward White teachers might produce some of the resistance those teachers display.

Approaching White preservice teachers with complexity and compassion

Sleeter (1993) suggests that the foundational reason for White teachers' inability to engage with antiracist teacher education is that they seek to defend their position in the social order. While this may represent the response of some Whites when they perceive a challenge to their social position, I find it more convincing that White resistance stems from a place of uncertainty. This uncertainty arises as a product of the discomforting nature (Kumashiro, 2004) of learning "difficult knowledge" (Pitt & Britzman, 2003). One must consider "the complicated ways in which learning must take a detour through psychic resistance" (Pitt, 1998, p. 551). Far too often, White resistance is understood as a form of false consciousness (Ringrose, 2007) with a circular logic that traces every rhetorical device accessed by White teachers back to the Whiteness they possess as their racial worldview. White teachers have no platform to express themselves outside of the White, racist subject. A monolithic view of Whiteness provides no space for Whites to resist Whiteness or for future teachers to take steps towards antiracism. Frankenberg (1993) suggests that Whiteness is always "contingent, historically produced, and transformable through collective and individual human endeavor" (p. 233). If teacher educators hope to nurture competent and compassionate teachers of all students, then

teacher educators must also be competent and compassionate teachers of all student teachers (Conklin, 2008).

White racial identity

Rather than relying on psychological identity models that posit steps or phases that Whites must endure on the path to becoming allies with people of color (Helms, 1990; Tatum, 2003), I prefer to theorize the deeply conflicted nature of White identity. This conflict emerged out of the way in which White identity was produced historically, which involved a constant process of negation (Baldwin, 1998). European ethnic groups passed into privilege by distancing themselves from the cultural practices of people of color, primarily Black Americans during slavery and in its Jim Crow aftermath (Ignatiev, 1994; Roediger, 2005). This fictive White identity relied heavily upon a conflation of Whiteness with nationhood, democracy, and egalitarianism. However, despite the fusion of these noble attributes with Whiteness, White people never allowed for these ideals to exist in practice. Moreover, the disconnect between ideals and reality could readily be seen, initially in the law (slavery, Jim Crow) and then later in persistent inequality (access to health care, wealth gap, access to quality education). A conflicted White identity arose out of this dissonance (Ellison, 1970; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Lensmire, 2010), and that stunted sense of self plays an integral role in producing the tropes of resistance referenced earlier.

One technique Whites use to reconcile this disconnect between ideals and practice involves the production and maintenance of stereotypes of people of color. As an insight into this process, Wynter (1979) discusses how Whites produced the opposing constructs

of Sambo and Nat and thrust them upon enslaved people in order to justify slavery. The Sambo stereotype played the role of the deferential, obedient, even appreciative slave whose simple mindedness justified the paternalism of the plantation system. Nat, on the other hand, represented the threat of rebellion that constantly lurked just beneath the surface of slavery. The Nat construct legitimized the use of psychological and physical violence against enslaved people. This dual stereotype solved the contradiction embedded in a system that proclaimed egalitarianism yet practiced slavery. Sambo, childlike, required paternal control, and Nat, prone to passion, required "reminders" that the plantation system served him well. This system also bound Whites together, as poor Whites found "their claim to equality with the rich whites…to be based on their claim to equally exercise forms of mastery over the Black" (Wynter, 1979, p. 150). DuBois (1985) suggested that Whiteness paid "psychological wages" to poor Whites in exchange for refusing solidarity with people of color. The Nat/Sambo construct of the plantation system proves instructive for the ongoing production and deployment of stereotypes by Whites to justify their societal position.

Thompson (1999) notes how stereotypes are essential to the workings of Whiteness:

> Because whites in the U. S. needed to be able to "explain" their advantages as natural or earned—as legitimate under the terms of a democracy—they vilified blackness and brownness as emblematic of inferiority. Whiteness, in short, was invented to justify racial inequities by linking color with undesirable character traits (lazy, unmotivated, sexually voracious, slow-witted), whites were able to shift the burden of explanation regarding inequitable social conditions from themselves to people of color (p. 147).

Again, stereotypes serve an essential function in remedying the contradictions between how White people think the world works and how it actually works. As historical conditions changed over time, different or more nuanced stereotypes were required for cover. Colorblindness, although not a stereotype, serves as another example of how White folks rectify this dissonance. Winant (1997), speaking specifically about White identity in the post-Civil Rights Era, claimed that a "White racial dualism" had emerged. Without explicit legal backing for White supremacy, Whites sought alternatives—such as colorblindness—to allow White norms to remain un-interrogated. As a result, "white identities have been displaced and refigured: they are now contradictory, as well as confused and anxiety-ridden, to an unprecedented extent" (Winant, 1997, p. 41).

Lensmire (2010, 2011) theorizes this "anxiety-ridden" identity as fundamentally ambivalent. Lensmire built upon Bonilla-Silva's (2010) suggestion that the Whites in his study displayed difficulties in discussing racial issues because of a hidden racism they could not express. Lensmire (2010), however, suggested that "the surface contradictions and ambiguity" in his interview respondents "might be less a weak cover for an *underlying, straightforward racism* in need of hiding, and more the expression of a *deeply conflicted, ambivalent white racial self"* (p. 162, italics in original). For Lensmire, who borrows from Ralph Ellison, the ambivalence arises from the knowledge—sometimes spoken and sometimes kept hidden—that the cherished, egalitarian ideals of the nation conflict starkly with the nation's racial past and present (Allen, 2004).

Thandeka (1999) adds to this theorization of the conflicted nature of White identity by noting the role of White shame, an emotional and psychological response

produced by the implicit and explicit policing of the boundaries of the White collective by White people. Rather than guilt, which is a feeling that stems from a wrongful deed, shame represents not something that one did, "but rather from something wrong with oneself" (Thandeka, 1999, p. 13). Many of Thandeka's interview participants recalled childhood memories in which they learned through the responses of their White communities that cross-racial interaction served as a threat to their place in the White collective. As an example, a White participant shared a story of bringing two friends from his neighborhood, who were Black, to his birthday party as a young boy. Walking them into the party, he recalled feeling the stares of his parents' White friends and having a sense of making an awful mistake. Again, White identity is formed out of a process of negation and is associated with negative feelings. Thandeka also positions White racial identity as one of loss, a loss of the potential for experience with difference due to community policing. This analysis does not mean to excuse White folks from holding racist views or from denying the existence of a normalized Whiteness that oppresses people of color. Instead, it offers a more nuanced explanation for the resistance tropes used by White preservice teachers. This provides a starting point from which educators can develop more compassionate and productive pedagogies.

Compassionate pedagogical approaches with White teachers

Trainor (2005) provides an exemplar of a more nuanced analysis of White engagement with antiracist pedagogy. Rather than searching her student teachers' comments for racism, Trainor noted the potential for multiple meanings in White discourse about race by focusing on the connections between the emotional and political

dimensions of White talk. Trainor contended that a statement such as "my ancestors didn't own slaves"—reminiscent of the denial trope referenced above—actually carries a variety of discursive meanings. Although the phrase appears to exonerate oneself from culpability in the racial hierarchy, it can also be seen as "a way of expressing, ironically, racial solidarity, by suggesting that they are on the 'right' side" (Trainor, 2005, p. 146). Rather than only serving as an example of denying racial inequities, the discourse might also express an appeal for racial solidarity across a confusing and seemingly insurmountable sociohistorical divide. Trainor's analysis reminds us to remain open in how we interpret White teachers' responses to discussions about race and to resist the tendency to homogenize White teachers and view their racial knowledge only from a deficit lens (Lowenstein, 2009). Segall and Garrett (2013) also comment on how White engagement with race can be misread:

> What we have identified thus far is that the avoidance that is so well documented in the literature might not be an avoidance of race at all. To think of it as avoidance in its strictest sense means that white teachers will simply not discuss the topic. What we have found, though, is that avoidance is more complicated. Indeed, race is time and again acknowledged in order to be used strategically to protect the speaker from implication in the difficult understanding that race makes radical differences to the ways people experience and understand the world (p. 22).

Rather than viewing the White tropes of resistance as forms of avoidance, Segall and Garrett concur with Leonardo (2009) in his suggestion that these discourses represent White racial knowledge. Segall and Garrett suggest that White teachers struggle to discuss race because of the way it implicates them in relations of oppression. Wagner (2005) suggests that teacher educators should view this resistance or avoidance as a crucial component of the learning process, and that teacher educators should prepare

themselves for the affective responses that talking about race will bring about in their students.

Another study by Trainor (2002) suggests an alternative reason for why Whites might pushback in discussions about race. Trainor noted that much of the resistance she encountered from her White students resulted from their frustration with the essentialization of Whiteness presented in the class readings on White privilege and Whiteness. Crowley and Smith (2011) also experienced this phenomenon, as they found many preservice teachers who quickly conceded the notion of racial advantage in some situations but rejected the idea of a universal, unchanging White privilege. Trainor's White participants pushed back against her pedagogical agenda because they could not find a White identity they could attach themselves to in order to bring about change. They sought a de-essentialized Whiteness that allowed for the particularities of Whites as individuals. McCarthy (2003) provided a similar critique about most Whiteness research. Rather than discussing the intersections between gender, class, sexuality, English proficiency, and geography with White racial identities, Whiteness emerged as a static category that categorized all Whites in the same manner. It is not surprising that many White student teachers reject or resist this type of pedagogy; it disregards the uniqueness of their individual experiences and does not discuss how those experiences grant privileges at some times and deny them at others.

To push back against this essentialization, Laughter (2011) suggests that researchers pay closer attention to individual definitions of identity, as doing so "hack[s] away at hegemonic systems of privilege by revealing ways in which demographic

definitions are neither monolithic nor natural" (p. 44). In a similar fashion, Jupp and Slattery (2010) argue for life history methodologies of White teachers in order to make visible the ways in which Whites assert racial identifications in the context of their lived experience. Ullucci (2011) provides examples of White teachers who used their experiences with class oppression to understand the workings of racism. Specifically for teacher education, Winans (2005) suggests that local pedagogies can aid White teachers in their antiracist journeys by appreciating the contextual factors that shaped their racial identities:

> Yet students are already so worried about saying the wrong thing that they often say nothing at all, which moves them no closer to understanding how antiracism might function in their lives. Although we do need to help students explore the implications of colorblindness critically, we also need to listen carefully to what they are struggling to express given the contexts in which they grew up and the local contexts in which they are speaking and writing (p. 270).

By resisting essentialization and paying attention to the contextual factors that produce White identity, teacher educators can open themselves to the dialogic process of meaning making with White preservice teachers.

Compassionate pedagogical orientations (Conklin, 2008; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Trainor, 2005; Swartz, 2003) in teacher education create space for White preservice teachers to make sense of racial discourses that run counter to the racial worldview (Leonardo, 2009) they have come to normalize throughout their lives. This experience will be a discomforting one (Kumashiro, 2004), as they struggle to integrate new knowledge and recognize the partiality of their previous understandings. All of this is compounded by the already conflicted nature (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999; Wynter, 1979) of White racial identity, which is held together by stereotypes and an

epistemology of ignorance (Mills, 1997). Their responses might take the form of one of the many tropes of resistance I have detailed above. However, teacher educators must not mistake those tropes as smooth representations of racism Instead, they need to be understood in the context of the local (Winans, 2005) and mined for their potential meaning (Trainor, 2005). Teacher educators must approach their future students in constructivist ways and avoid viewing them from deficit lenses (Conklin, 2008; Lowenstein, 2009).

I drew from these perspectives in my analysis of the experiences of the ten White preservice teachers in the Urban Cohort. As chapter 3 will detail, these individuals do not represent a "typical" group of White preservice teachers. They arrived at the Urban Teaching program aware that they would be engaging in discussions about social justice as part of their teacher training. They were not participating in a mandatory class on multiculturalism that was required as part of their certification program. They joined a program geared toward preparing them for the unique characteristics of working in urban schools. However, as the findings will show, even a group of White teachers with stated commitments to social justice and to talking about race can respond to antiracist pedagogy in problematic ways. By detailing the responses of the members of the Urban Cohort, I hope to contribute to the de-homogenization of the White teacher while also providing insight into the workings of White racial identity in relation to antiracist pedagogy. The data I share from the Urban Cohort speak directly to teacher education with the hope of opening greater understandings towards Whiteness and White racial identity.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD OF INQUIRY

INTRODUCTION

This study explored White preservice teacher learning about race and racism in the context of a multicultural education course in an urban teaching program. As the previous chapter demonstrated, White teachers typically experience a range of difficulties talking about and learning about the topic of race. These difficulties often manifest as varying forms of "White talk," (McIntyre, 1997) or what I have termed the "White tropes of resistance." However, I also contend that White resistance is often misread or oversimplified in most analyses, a failing that leads to an essentialization of Whiteness and a homogenization of the White preservice teacher (Ringrose, 2007; Schick, 2000; Trainor, 2005). This project analyzed White preservice teacher engagement with the topic of race through a CWS framework with the goal of providing a more nuanced portrait of White racial identity. This chapter will discuss the research design used to examine the following research questions:

> 1. In what ways do White preservice social studies and language arts teachers with commitments to work in diverse, urban environments make sense of critical understandings of race and racism during their teacher preparation?
>
> 2. In what ways do these White preservice social studies and language arts teachers' understandings of race and racism fall short of critical perspectives?

To explore these questions, I purposively selected (Merriam, 2009) a group of ten preservice social studies and language arts teachers (9 White, 1 Biracial) participating in the first semester of an urban teaching preparation program.

Due to considerations for how power and ideology permeate the topic of race in the US context, this inquiry occurred within the parameters of a critical paradigm (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002). Research in the critical paradigm centers the notion that oppression and domination characterize the social milieu inhabited by the research participants (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In an attempt to capture the complex and multiple components that comprised the preservice teachers' experiences with learning and talking about race, I employed a case study methodology (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). This methodology informed my approach to data collection and data analysis. In the proceeding pages, I will detail the following components of the research process: a) research paradigm, b) research methodology, c) research context and participants, d) data collection and analysis, e) establishing trustworthiness, and f) researcher positionality.

THE QUALITATIVE CHOICE

Before delving into the details of the study, it is necessary that I explain what I hope to learn from a qualitative investigation. When designing a human subjects research study, a researcher must first begin by reflecting upon what type of understanding she hopes to produce through her inquiry. If the goal is to isolate certain social phenomena as variables and determine causal relationships between those variables, then the researcher will likely pursue some sort of quantitative study. If the goal is to understand the meaning that people give to their social realities, then the researcher will pursue a qualitative study. Qualitative research places an "emphasis on processes and meanings that are not rigorously examined, or measured (if measured at all), in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 4). As a mode of inquiry, qualitative

research focuses on “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (Merriam, 2009, p. 5). Qualitative inquiry does not seek to determine causation between variables, produce universal truths, or create generalizable knowledge. Instead, it aims to increase understanding of a situated social phenomenon, as interpreted by the researcher’s engagement with the research subjects in their natural environment (Merriam, 2009). A qualitative study does not hope to capture reality, only to approximate it. Rather than imparting definitive meaning, the inquiry aims to capture how individuals make meaning of their surroundings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008).

THE PARADIGMATIC CHOICE

Although dividing research along qualitative and quantitative lines represents an important distinction, that delineation is only the beginning. Other pressing issues confront a researcher hoping to undertake meaningful qualitative research. Guba and Lincoln (1994) identify three essential questions that researchers must address in order to guarantee that their research is consistent with their inquiry paradigm of choice. In doing so, they establish what type of legitimate understanding they can hope to create through the research process. These questions ask the researcher about her ontological, epistemological, and methodological beliefs. Necessarily, these questions must be answered in the order listed, as each response delimits the potential responses to the subsequent question (Crotty, 1998). The responses to the questions must be reflective of the paradigm, or “basic set of beliefs that guide action” (Guba, 1990, p. 17), under which the research will occur. Guba and Lincoln (2005) identify four major paradigms in

qualitative research: positivist/postpositivist, constructivist/interpretive, critical, and feminist-poststructural. I will respond to each of the questions from the critical paradigm, the interpretive framework that shaped my study.

The ontological question asks about the nature of reality. What is the nature of reality? And, what can be known about it? Critical researchers view reality from the historical realism perspective (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Historical realism contends that reality consists of a series of structures that are products of political, cultural, economic, gender, and other social forces. These structures are not real in the sense that they are an immutable, normative, neutral way of organizing social life. Instead their real-ness comes from their ability to enact real implications on the lives of those who experience them. The structures can be understood and known, but they only represent a reality that is contingent and historically specific. An example of such a social structure is the racial structure in the US (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Race relations and racial identities, although socially constructed, are nonetheless real in that they impact the life chances of those who are racialized (Leonardo, 2009). Critical research seeks to identify these structures and disrupt their effects (Crotty, 1998).

The epistemological question asks about the relationship between the researcher and what can be known about the subject under investigation. An objectivist epistemology would contend that knowledge exists in the world and is waiting to be discovered (Crotty, 1998), a belief of the positivist paradigm. The critical paradigm holds more problematic notions about knowledge creation. Within the critical world, knowledge is value laden and, therefore, value dependent (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The

knowledge created is guided by the understandings the researcher brings to the subject, referred to as a subjectivist epistemology. The findings of the study are dependent upon the epistemological precepts and of the critical researcher and the conceptual framework used by the researcher. As an example, research in critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) operates from the epistemological understanding that the voices and stories of those who experience racial oppression constitute valuable knowledge. Critical frameworks center the role of power and ideology (Kincheloe, 2007) in shaping social interactions and, therefore, look for the operation of those forces in the phenomena under investigation. Since this research arises from a CWS framework, I viewed Whiteness as an oppressive racial worldview (Leonardo, 2009) that is normalized and often invisible to White individuals (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998). The interpretation of the participants' comments and actions were filtered through this dual awareness of the damaging effects of Whiteness and the difficulties White people have in recognizing the implications of their racialization.

Finally, Guba and Lincoln's (1994) methodological question asks how the inquirer can go about learning what he or she believes can be known about the subject under consideration. Once again, the methodological choices available are informed by the responses to the previous two questions, as the methodology must match the paradigmatic beliefs of the researcher (Crotty, 1998). A researcher could not decide that they operate from a historical realist ontology and a subjectivist epistemology but then decide to implement survey research to analyze the extent of racism present in a particular school system. Rather than pursuing objective forms of measurement or

assessment, critical methodologies engage in dialogue with the research subjects (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Critical researchers often act in solidarity with their participants, aiming to transform how they view the social structures that shape their lived experiences (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002). The methodological goal in critical research is informed by a desire to shed light on the way in which power operates to oppress particular groups of people. This aligns well with one of the fundamental precepts of research in CWS, in which harmful White norms and practices are highlighted with the goal of reorienting Whiteness in an antiracist fashion (Chubbuck, 2004).

THE CRITICAL CASE STUDY

Within the methodological choices available to researchers of the critical paradigm, case study serves as a powerful tool for illustrating how individuals, within a particular setting or context, understand their interactions with one another or with a social phenomenon. Merriam (1998) suggests that case study research is particularly useful for answering "how" and "why" questions about a scenario not necessarily accessible when using a different methodological approach. Yin (2009) identifies two important considerations that make the case study a useful methodological choice. The first involves the scope of study. A case study looks at a contemporary phenomenon in depth and in its natural environment. Stake (1995) refers to the case as a "bounded system" that contains complex, functioning parts. The bounded system, whether it is the institution of a new reading program at an elementary school or a teacher's understanding of the role of using students' home languages for literacy development, contains a variety of integrated factors. The case study analyzes them as a whole, rather than as individual

parts. For this study, the urban teaching program serves as the bounded system within which I analyzed the complex social phenomenon of White preservice teacher learning about race.

The second overarching consideration for case study involves data collection and data analysis methods (Yin, 2009). Data collection in a case study tends to use multiple access points, often involving the triangulation of data from interviews, observations, and the collection of classroom artifacts such as student work or teacher lesson plans. Documents, archival information, and participant-observation can also constitute useful case study data. The purpose of this data triangulation is not to validate findings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008), but to provide thick description (Geertz, 1973) of the phenomenon under investigation and increase the trustworthiness of a case study's analysis. Furthermore, because of the multiplicity of variables at play in case study research, researchers often rely on previously established theoretical frameworks to analyze the data collected (Yin, 2009). Such a process allows data analysis to contribute to a specific body of knowledge rather than merely describing a series of observed phenomena. This study included direct observations, interviews, document analysis, and participant artifacts as data sources. Critical Whiteness studies served as the theoretical framework for data analysis.

Useful case study research also depends upon selection of an appropriate case. Analyzing an individual case with the goal of understanding a broader societal phenomenon is known as an instrumental case study (Stake, 1995). Instrumental case study subject selection should aim to maximize learning about a particular topic.

Researchers often approach this goal by designing a collective case study, in which they analyze a single issue, but utilize multiple subjects and/or research sites (Merriam, 2009). Such a study might involve selecting participants for their similarity or for their difference, depending upon the goals of the researcher. Either way, both selection criteria would adhere to the goal of maximizing what can be learned about a topic *through* the cases under examination (Stake, 1995).

This inquiry was both instrumental and collective (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995), as it examined White preservice teachers learning about race through the experiences of ten preservice teachers within the bounded system of the urban teaching preparation program. These ten participants were purposively selected (Merriam, 2009) based upon their participation in an urban teaching program dedicated to discussing the topic of race and to placing student teachers in racially diverse classrooms. The participants also represent a convenience sample (Yin, 2009) given my role as a university facilitator in the urban teaching program. This role provided me with extensive access to the participants. I was able to build relationships and establish a degree of trust with them. The case study is instrumental in that it illustrates social phenomena of importance in the field of education. The development of critical racial consciousness on the part of White teacher candidates is an important area of concern in antiracist and multicultural teacher education (Banks et al., 2005; Villegas & Davis, 2008). The case study is collective in that it investigates the experiences of multiple participants in regards to the single phenomenon in question: White preservice teachers' learning about race.

Finally, this case study is critical, as it draws from a CWS perspective. This framework is used to examine the power dynamics present when individuals from the dominant racial group learn and talk about the implications of their racial identities for their future careers as teachers. Rossman and Rallis (2003) characterize the critical case study as "grounded in a critique of existing social structures and patterns. [Researchers] assume theoretically that oppression and domination characterize the setting and seek to uncover how patterns of action perpetuate the status quo" (p. 104). My use of CWS centers the oppressive nature of Whiteness as racial worldview (Leonardo, 2009) while also understanding that many White-identified individuals struggle with discussing race and their own racial identities (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). This framework allows me to make sense of their struggles while also framing my White participants as racial actors with the ability to adopt antiracist positionalities as educators.

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Big State University[3]

This study occurred investigated the experiences of ten preservice social studies and language arts teachers in a teacher preparation program at Big State University. The university is located in large city in the southwestern United States and has a large undergraduate and graduate student population. It serves as the flagship university for the state and is well respected for its academic reputation. In particular, the College of Education at Big State University is recognized by US News & World Report as one of the nation's elite schools of education. The prestige of Big State is an important

[3] Pseudonym

consideration for the study. The urban cohort members faced high academic expectations from the faculty members and, in return, they placed high standards on the quality of their teacher education. Additionally, the participants all had to meet high academic qualifications in order to gain acceptance into Big State and the Urban Teaching program.

The Urban Teaching Program[4]

The ten participants in this study were part of the first cohort of Big State's Urban Teaching program. The Urban Teaching program is a two-year, post baccalaureate degree plan in which students earn a Master of Education (M.Ed.) as well as a state teaching certification. The program prepares both social studies and language arts teachers at the secondary level. The Urban Teaching mission statement provides insight into the program:

> [The Urban Teaching Program] prepares English Language Arts and Social Studies educators to build upon the cultural and linguistic diversity of their future students and to work for a better, more just social world. Our students become excellent teachers for young people in any context, but we pay special attention to youth who represent the American majority – those from low-income, racially and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

The mission statement notes the social justice focus of the Urban Teaching program as well as the goal of preparing teachers to work in lower socioeconomic school settings with large populations of students of color. As a result of this focus, the Urban Teaching program placed a premium on cultivating social justice dispositions and critical orientations towards schooling alongside the development of methods for teaching social studies or language arts. The Urban Teaching program emphasized critical multiculturalism (May & Sleeter, 2010; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995), critical pedagogy

[4] Pseudonym

(Freire, 1970; Kincheloe, 2007), culturally relevant teaching (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995) and constructivist pedagogy (Richardson, 2003). The program is administered by four faculty members (two in Social Studies Education and two in Language and Literacy Studies), all of whom specialize in issues related to urban education and social justice in their research and teaching.

The program contains a three-semester professional development sequence. The students spend their first two semesters as interns in secondary classrooms, observing approximately 4-6 hours per week in a cooperating teacher's classroom. Additionally, they teach several lessons of their own during this time. The third semester serves as the student teaching or practicum semester in which the cohort members teach full time in secondary classrooms. The Urban Teaching program personnel went to great lengths to identify cooperating teachers who shared the program's outlook on urban schools and student learning, but the realities of securing placements for the cohort members sometimes trumped these concerns. The characteristics of the school sites were often the primary consideration when assigning the cohort members to the various campuses. All students were placed in schools with large populations of students of color, low-income students, and students with limited English proficiency. The cohort members also earned an endorsement in English as a Second Language (ESL) during the program and discussion of linguistic diversity occupied a prominent place in the Urban Teaching program. My observations of the students during the Multicultural Course occurred in the first semester of the Urban Teaching program (Fall of 2012). I also conducted interviews

and member checking (Merriam, 1998) during the second semester of the program (Spring of 2013).

The willful participation of these ten preservice teachers in a teacher preparation program with a focus on urban educational settings is an important consideration in this study. They seemingly understood that their participation in the Urban Teaching program would require them to have conversations about issues of race, class, gender, language, sexuality, ability status and other identity elements crucial to understanding the workings of power and ideology necessitated by a critical approach to education (Kincheloe, 2007). However, it is not all together clear to what extent they realized that these conversations would delve into their personal biographies in addition to discussions about structures and history. Regardless, these teachers arrived at the Urban Teaching program willing, if not fully prepared, to engage in dialogue around difficult subjects. This differentiates them from many of the portraits of White preservice teachers in the literature (Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009). Many studies that examine White preservice teacher learning about race occur in the context of a mandated multicultural or educational foundations courses during teacher preparation (Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005; Trainor, 2002). In such a scenario, White resistance to discussions of race may be amplified as a result of the compulsory nature of the course.

While the members of the Urban Cohort may not represent the “typical” White preservice teacher in terms of their willingness to talk about race, they do conform to this “typical” narrative in other ways. They all come from middle class or upper middle class, monolingual backgrounds and, for the most part, have not had extensive experiences in

settings with large numbers of people of color (Sleeter, 2008). Very few of the members of the cohort arrived to the program with a radical agenda for urban schooling. In fact, I discovered throughout my time with these individuals that not all of them chose the program specifically for its urban focus. Some desired to move to the city where Big State is located and others selected the program due to the overall prestige of the university. Despite the differing factors in why they chose the Urban Teaching program, all participants arrived with a general openness towards discussing educational issues from a critical perspective. The balance between the cohort's "typical" White preservice teacher elements and their unique elements make them an interesting case of White engagement with the topic of race.

The Multicultural Education Course

The Multicultural Education course (Multicultural Course) served as an introductory course of sorts for the Urban Teaching cohort. The course was conducted in a seminar style, meeting once each week for three hours each session. As noted above, the course involved a field component as well as the readings and project requirements for the course. Dr. Selena Gomez[5], an associate professor of social studies education, served as the course instructor. An excerpt from Dr. Gomez' syllabus provides a brief overview of the course goals:

> The course will provide you with a survey of the field of critical multicultural education/curriculum and act as an introductory methods course for language arts and social studies secondary education. The course will focus upon an essential understanding of the importance of linguistic and cultural diversity in urban teaching and learning contexts and a field component in your content area that will help you begin to develop a working identity of your role as a teacher…As

[5] Pseudonym

> future teachers and public intellectuals you should reject a dichotomy between theory and practice, and instead embody wisdom of teaching that is rooted in a deliberate and reflective enactment of critical multicultural curriculum, instruction and assessment (Gomez, course syllabus, 2012).

Dr. Gomez located the course within the critical multicultural education tradition (May & Sleeter, 2010; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995) and highlighted the importance for members of the Urban Teaching cohort to develop an appreciation for how linguistic and cultural diversity impacted urban schools. The course syllabus (Appendix A) displayed class sessions on topics such as critical pedagogy, critical race theory, culturally responsive pedagogy, the role of power and ideology in shaping school curricula, the importance of teacher identity, and constructivist lesson design. Dr. Gomez used Ronald Takaki's (1993) *A Different Mirror* as the primary text for the course, providing the cohort members with a reconceptualization of US History via a multicultural lens. The course also featured readings from Michael Apple, Jean Anyon, James Banks, Geneva Gay, Henry Giroux, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Peter McLaren, Christine Sleeter and others.

Due to the fieldwork component of the Multicultural Course, many of the class sessions also featured examinations of classroom management techniques or discussions of how to build relationships with students. These sessions were conducted by the university facilitators, a group of six graduate students in Social Studies Education and Language and Literacy Studies who acted as teaching assistants during the class sessions but also administered the fieldwork experiences of the cohort members. As the most senior graduate student, I served as the lead Social Studies facilitator during the Multicultural Education course. In this capacity, I helped to design several of the classroom management sessions. I also facilitated the fieldwork experiences of two social

studies teachers (Nancy and Edward[6]). During the class sessions, I sometimes participated in the whole group discussions with an occasional comment, but most of my interactions with students occurred in smaller group activities or informal interactions before and after class. By the time I began to administer the Race Seminars (described in detail below) during the sixth week of the course, I had interacted with each of the cohort members extensively. I made an effort to build relationships with them throughout the semester with hopes of increasing their comfort level when responding to the Race Seminars, writing prompts, and interviews.

The content covered in Dr. Gomez' course clearly influenced the responses of the Urban Teaching cohort members during my analysis. Many students referenced readings from the course that impacted their understanding of racial issues. Sometimes these comments affirmed the course readings and their analysis of education from a critical perspective. However, some participants criticized particular readings for over-essentializing Whiteness or for discussing educational problems without proposing specific solutions. The way in which the cohort members referenced the readings will appear in the data I share in chapters 4, 5, and 6. Overall, the content of the course aimed to provide the students with a more holistic understanding of the theoretical foundations of multicultural education and what such an approach could look like in practice. This understanding enriched the participants' responses in their written reflections and during

[6] Although Nancy and Edward both gave their consent to participate in the study, I decided to omit them from my final participant group. After observing them in their field placements and having numerous discussions about their teaching over the course of the semester, I realized they might view me in a supervisory role. I felt that this relationship could compromise their responses.

our interviews. Aside from helping to build relationships with the students, my presence in the Multicultural Education course gave me insight into how the students engaged with these ideas and often provided ideas for questions to add to my semi-structured interview protocol (Merriam, 1998).

Description of participants

As noted above the Urban Teaching program cohort (Urban Cohort) consisted of fifteen members at the outset of the fall semester of 2012. Nine of these preservice teachers were part of the social studies program and seven pursued certification in language arts. All members of the Urban Cohort signed informed consent to participate in the project, but I settled upon using ten of the teachers, five from each discipline, for this study. I eliminated three of the teachers from consideration due to my interest in examining the experiences of White preservice teachers learning about race. I chose not to include the experiences of Denise, an African American woman from the South/Southeast US; Joaquin, a Latino from the Southwest US; and Ana, a biracial (Latina/White) female from the Southwest. I strongly considered including Ana in the study due to her biracial background and her self-proclaimed status as a "passer" due to her light skin and blue eyes. Ultimately, I chose not to include her because her primary cultural frame of reference growing up was Mexican-American. Ana spoke Spanish and identified herself as a "woman of color" during our interview. While Ana admitted that she received White privilege (McIntosh, 1989) in many settings, I felt her background complicated inclusion with the other members of the Urban Cohort since I planned to speak about the group in both the collective sense and as individuals. Ana's exclusion is

further complicated by my decision to include Zach, a biracial (Asian/White) male from the Midwest. While Zach does not quite "pass" as White, he repeatedly spoke of himself as receiving racial privilege and acknowledged his comfort in White settings. I will explain my decision to include Zach further in the next section. Finally, I chose not to include Nancy, a White female from the Midwest, and Edward, a White male from the Southwest, due to my status as their supervisor during their first semester fieldwork. Their exclusion is unfortunate because Nancy had very little experience with racial difference or talking about race and Edward was the most resistant member of the cohort in terms of considering the impact of racism. They provided some intriguing reactions to the topic of race.

While I provide more detailed descriptions of participants below, I created a chart to serve as an overview of the characteristics of the preservice teachers. These two charts—one each for the social studies and language arts teachers—are available as Appendix B. They include information about the participants' racial backgrounds, the US region in which they grew up, and a brief mention of their experiences with race. This abbreviated format does not claim to capture the entirety of their "Experiences with diversity" or "Prior racial knowledge," as the column headings suggest. Rather, the chart serves as a useful reference guide for the reader.

Urban Cohort – Social Studies

Grace

Grace grew up in a large, racially diverse metropolitan area in the Southwest. Her family lived within an affluent, predominantly White area of the city with its own school

district. Due to a substantial and longstanding Latino community in the city writ large, Grace's school possessed a somewhat racially diverse student body. However, Whites still formed a majority within the school. Grace's home city has a problematic history of racial and economic segregation, with White communities often barring Latino and African American families from purchasing homes in particular neighborhoods. The racial isolation of the White community, within a diverse city, influenced Grace's thinking about race. Although she was aware of parts of this history, she also resisted framing race relations as problematic. In many ways, the arrangement of the city seemed somewhat natural to her, with groups choosing to live where they live out of tradition and familiarity (Thompson, 1999). As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 6, Grace's family employed a Mexican-American housekeeper and Grace cherished their connection with this woman. Her attention to the positive aspects of this relationship with less consideration for the historical and structural elements at play displayed a structured blindness to race (Mills, 1997) that comprised some aspects of Grace's thinking about race.

However, Grace also displayed an impressive ability to critique her attitudes and behaviors against an antiracist positionality (Tatum, 2003) as she reflected more on the materials presented in the Multicultural Course and the Race Seminars. As Grace learned more about the history of race in the US (Takaki, 1993), and as she read critical accounts of race and education (Ladson-Billings, 1998), she was unable to accept a more passive, status quo approach. Grace realized that abstract commitments to openness and tolerance were useful starting points but fell short of antiracism. Although she did not begin with

strong opinions on the topic of race, Grace quickly emerged as one of the most thoughtful participants in the cohort. She lamented on several occasions that she did not learn more about race in her academic background. Grace took her role as a future urban educator very seriously. Our interviews often turned into extensive conversations about how to apply antiracist and social justice principles in the classroom. At times, Grace asked as many questions as I did, always craving more information.

Samuel

Samuel's family moved around a little during his younger years, but they ultimately settled in a large metropolitan area in the Southwest. Although the city is one of the most diverse in the nation, Samuel lived in an affluent, predominantly White neighborhood and attended majority White private schools. Samuel had few experiences with racial diversity until after college, during which he attended a predominantly White private school. After his undergraduate years, Samuel spent almost three years teaching in two different Asian countries. Through these experiences, Samuel developed an acute awareness of his Whiteness and his difference. He learned that, even in a foreign country, his racial identity brought him extensive privileges. By his own admission, he secured teaching positions in both countries based on his race and English-speaking status. He even secured short-term work at several schools in which he simply sat at a desk and waved to families as they toured the school. These schools felt that having a White face greet visitors made the school more desirable as families believed their children could better master the English language and Western customs. Although Samuel grew up with

extensive class and race privilege, his experiences abroad provided him with a useful framework for thinking critically about Whiteness.

Samuel also possessed the most extensive historical knowledge of any member of the urban cohort. Although he did not necessarily have a radicalized view of US or World history, he was well aware of the histories of colonialism, slavery, patriarchy, and oppression that characterize Western global ascendancy (Mills, 1997; Winant, 2001). Samuel used his historical knowledge to make sense of contemporary racial segregation and oppression. He recognized that institutions such as schools generally operated from a set of White norms that created difficulties for students of color. However, Samuel's commitment to urban teaching was not nearly as strong as other members in the urban cohort. He experienced some difficulties making connections with students in his field placement and I had the sense via our conversations that he perceived a lack of engagement and effort in his students that frustrated him. Interestingly, Samuel did not have a hard time recognizing the structural reasons for the struggles of his students; he was just not quite sure that he wanted to work in an urban school. In contrast with Grace, whose emotional connection to social justice motivated her to take action, Samuel's robust intellectual understanding of racial issues made him a thoughtful respondent in class discussions and interviews but did not inspire him to pursue an activist agenda.

Patrick

Patrick also grew up in the large, extremely diverse metropolitan area in the Southwest. Like other participants, he attended majority White public schools while living in a rather racially isolated neighborhood. However, Patrick experienced more

diversity within these schools than many White students due to his participation on the football team. The team possessed far greater diversity than the overall student body. During our first interview, Patrick shared that his family was fairly conservative, but not close-minded. His parents placed a premium on hard work and generally felt that US society operated in a meritocratic fashion. Patrick experienced much academic and athletic success, ultimately securing admission to an elite private university in the Southwest and playing four years of football at the school. After college, Patrick went abroad, teaching for two years in an Asian country. His choice to teach abroad, similar to Samuel's, represented an intriguing balance of White privilege and a desire to experience difference and to feel vulnerable (Thandeka, 1999). Patrick had many options available to him upon graduation and could easily have chosen a path working in finance or attending law school. By going abroad, Patrick willingly walked away from these opportunities and that choice ultimately led to his participation in the Urban Teaching program.

Patrick learned unique lessons about Whiteness from his time living and working in Asia. He experienced a dual feeling of strangeness and privilege. Patrick was the other during his time abroad, but he received access and opportunities that were denied to natives of the country. Patrick also discovered an interesting bias toward darker skin tones even within the largely monocultural country. His students chided their classmates who had darker skin, which was associated with a lower class status. Individuals completely covered their skin even in hot and humid weather in an effort to protect from tanning. Drug stores contained entire sections devoted to whitening creams. These practices helped Patrick to appreciate the workings of Whiteness and White privilege in

the US. Patrick did not join the Urban Cohort with a critical racial consciousness, but his comments in class and in our interviews suggested that he was beginning to notice race more in the wake of his time abroad. Throughout my time with Patrick, he proved to be very thoughtful in regards to the implications of his racial identity for working in urban schools. He possessed positive dispositions for equity and, as he developed conceptual and theoretical understandings of how race operated, these dispositions were quickly mobilized in an antiracist way.

Zach

As noted above, I struggled with whether or not to include Zach within the pool of participants. I desired to investigate the experiences of White preservice teachers as they learned about race and Zach's biracial background potentially excluded him. In our interview, he suggested that he identified as Asian, claiming that he "checked the Asian box" whenever filling out a form that asked for demographic information. Zach's father has Chinese ancestry while his mother is White. I ultimately selected Zach based upon numerous comments regarding the racial privilege he received. During our first interview, he made the following comment:

> There's nothing that I can change about that kind of privilege and where I am in the system. You know that's a product of other people's actions as to how they see me…I mean there's nothing, that's kind of the weird thing that's still a struggle. Yeah, I don't know. I don't know. I totally accepted that, right, that I'm a benefactor of all this racism and structure and society and all that. I mean it has lead me to where I am now. So it's not something I deny, I guess at all (Zach, interview, 2012).

While I typically framed our discussions of race privileges as associated with Whiteness, Zach applied these ideas to his experience as well. He never suggested that he

experienced discrimination or differential treatment because of his perceived racial identity. In fact, he shared examples of how he used his Asian identity to his benefit in school as a result of the perceptions teachers had about him. Although Zach does not "pass" as White on appearance, he rarely centered his Asian American identity in conversations about race. He also noted that his participation in sports while growing up often placed him in majority White contexts. Furthermore, he attended majority White schools and lived in majority White neighborhoods.

Zach's engagement with race during the Multicultural Course and in his interviews and written reflections aligned closely with the perspectives of Patrick and Samuel. Zach did not arrive with a critical disposition towards race, but he quickly moved toward one as he explored the critical racial frameworks offered in the course and in the Race Seminars. He noted the importance of thinking about race as both a social construction and as a structural force. Zach made insightful comments that critiqued individualized understandings of race. He also considered the role of stereotypes in the maintenance of racism and grappled with what type of actions he could take to push back against such an ingrained system. In short, his learning about race seemed to follow a pattern I observed in other White participants. He used the knowledge he gleaned from the course readings and discussions and applied them to his personal history. Zach drew upon his racial privileges to understand the operation of racism in the US context.

As I mentioned in the preceding chapter, Leonardo (2009) distinguishes between Whiteness and White people. While Whiteness represents a racialized system of reasoning about the world that perpetuates White supremacy, White people, to some

extent, are racial agents that can choose how they engage with the racial world. Although many of the advantages of having White skin cannot necessarily be refused (Allen, 2004), White individuals can choose to adopt antiracist dispositions. Zach's comments throughout my time with him convinced me that he understood many of the elements of Whiteness and how those normalized behaviors benefitted certain individuals. Zach believed that he benefitted within the US racial hierarchy and cast his lot with racially privileged individuals who desired to counter the effects of racism. I included Zach in my analysis for these reasons. His perspectives on race and honesty about his struggles with enacting antiracism served as a rich data source for this project.

Michael

Of all the participants, Michael arrived with the most developed critical racial consciousness. He possessed a strong background in the history of race as well as deep conceptual and theoretical understandings of race. His strengths in these areas arose from a number of factors. He grew up in a medium-sized, industrial town in the Northeast with a diverse and relatively integrated population. During his middle school years, Michael attended a school with a majority Latino population, making him the only White member of the cohort to attend a school that was not majority White during his K-12 years. Michael's high school was also diverse and, although he experienced some racial isolation in his Advanced Placement courses, he also participated extensively in sports and reported positive relationships with his teammates of color. Michael's parents both worked as educators and, while race was not a common subject, he reported that they held progressive views in general, leading him to adopt these views from a young age.

Another contributing factor for Michael's racial knowledge came from his undergraduate studies in sociology, which allowed him to develop an awareness of the impact of social structures on the lives of individuals (Mills, 1959). He seemed to use his sociological knowledge to understand his own Whiteness and the challenges that the students of color in his teaching placement faced.

Although Michael had the most highly developed racial knowledge in the cohort, he was also soft spoken at times. He provided excellent insights during our interviews, but was not a frequent participant during whole class discussions in the Multicultural Course. While he participated more often in small group settings I observed that he tended to adopt a more passive role despite the wealth of knowledge he possessed. Michael had a firm commitment to working in urban schools but also suggested that he felt hesitant about the controversial nature of bringing racial issues into his classroom. During our second interview, he lamented that, even with his knowledge and passion for the subject, the social norms of talking about race might compromise his desire to do so in his classroom. Another factor leading to Michael's more tepid approach was his age. He joined the cohort directly after his undergraduate program and admitted initially feeling some hesitancy about jumping into a graduate program with older students.

Urban Teaching Cohort – English Language Arts

Kevin

Kevin grew up in predominantly White, affluent communities in the Pacific Northwest. He noted that he was raised in a politically progressive environment, but that race rarely emerged as a topic for discussion. Asian Americans, many of them recent

immigrants to the US, comprised the primary group of color in his schooling experiences. As detailed in the forthcoming chapters, Kevin learned interesting lessons about Whiteness by watching the differential treatment of Asian students in his schools. The Asian students' whose families maintained closer cultural ties to their home countries typically occupied a lower social status. Kevin viewed this as a product of the pervasive nature of White norms in his community. Asian students who spoke English without accents and who immersed themselves in American culture became more "White" and therefore more respected within the school. Kevin drew a lot of his racial understanding from notions of the other (Said, 1979) in literature. While he seemed somewhat skeptical of acknowledging the structural nature of race, Kevin understood that power and ideology functioned to produce difference (McCarthy, 1988).

Kevin proved to be one of the more intriguing members of the cohort in terms of his views on race. At times, he critiqued critical views on race and education, but he also made powerful statements about the colonization embedded in White teacher preparation for urban settings. Kevin enjoyed debating ideas and his tendency to problematize the topics discussed in the Multicultural Course sometimes positioned him as combative. I initially felt that Kevin's resistance to discussions of race stemmed from a colorblind perspective (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), but his comments during the interviews and written reflections suggested that Kevin disliked the essentialism embedded in discussions of race. He recognized that race mattered, but he felt it could be a stifling construct that served to divide rather than unite. Ultimately, Kevin desired to discuss, what he termed "questions of purpose," (Kevin, written communication, 2012). He would describe such

questions as having a philosophical element but also displaying an interest in uniting across difference and moving forward toward a common solution. Kevin felt that racial dialogue often did not meet these standards and so he frequently pushed back when he felt individuals only focused on problems or homogenized racial groups.

Litzy

Litzy's family moved around during her early schooling years, but ultimately settled in a community in the South/Southeastern US. Litzy attended a high school with an International Baccalaureate (IB) program. While her high school contained a modicum of diversity, the IB program itself had almost no students of color. Litzy had little experience with racial diversity or talking about race prior to the Multicultural Course. She was a very vocal participant in the class, never hesitating to share her views even when they differed from those of the other cohort members. While many Whites fall silent in discussions about race (Ladson-Billings, 1996; Mazzei, 2008) when their views are challenged, Litzy did not seem bothered by disagreement. A few other cohort members mentioned Litzy's argumentative reputation and suggested that her views ran counter to the goals of the Urban Teaching program. While I do not necessarily disagree with this assessment, I believed that Litzy's views were more complicated than others considered. Furthermore, I respected Litzy's willingness to disagree with other members of the cohort. Her comments often sparked engaging conversations and she often made progressive comments about race alongside her resistant statements. At times, it seemed she argued points that were not fully formed in her mind and her comments sometimes

rambled and even led to contradictions. I do not suggest that Litzy was the only cohort member to make such statements, but that she did so most frequently.

While Kevin was an interesting participant due to his blend of skepticism and idealism, Litzy proved to be so given these frequent contradictions. Sometimes within the span of a few sentences, Litzy would engage in very typical “White talk” (McIntyre, 1997) but also make a statement about the structural nature of racism. Litzy seemed a good example of an ambivalent White racial identity (Lensmire, 2010) due to her conflicted statements on the topic of race. Litzy’s primary point of contention with talking about race involved the over-essentialization of Whiteness. Litzy felt victimized by discussions of racism and she frequently attempted to steer conversations in the direction of class or gender issues (Case & Hemmings, 2005; DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2012; Gay & Kirkland, 2003). Litzy also displayed an interesting attachment to the idea of structural racism. She used this critical take on racism to diminish the responsibility of individual Whites in the perpetuation of racism. This unique aspect of Litzy’s racial knowledge will be discussed further in chapter 6.

Maria

Maria grew up in a very diverse, historic city in the South with longstanding racial tensions and segregation. African Americans formed the largest minority group in the city. Maria attended parochial schools throughout her K-12 years. While these schools were majority White, they had a substantial African American population as well. Maria generally adopted a disinterested stance on the topic of race. She did not suggest that racism did not exist, but she tended to de-emphasize its importance. When speaking

about the race relations in her home city, Maria suggested that the city “had a bad rap” in regards to race. She felt that the close quarters of the city allowed White and Black people to interact quite often, differentiating it from many larger metropolitan areas with greater distance between racial groups. Like Grace, Maria also discussed her family’s relationship with their Black housekeeper as an example of positive race relations. While this relationship was clearly important to Maria, her emphasis on it seemed an attempt to differentiate herself and her family from stereotypical depictions of White southerners. Maria, like Samuel and Patrick, taught abroad in Asia prior to joining the Urban Teaching program. In contrast, however, Samuel and Patrick used their experiences to understand White privilege, while Maria suggested that her experiences provided her with insight into the experiences of those from minority racial groups. I do not share this as a suggestion that her interpretation is invalid, rather to point out the discrepancies between the lessons learned from a similar experience.

Maria had a tendency to remain rather quiet during the Multicultural Course sessions. When she did participate, her comments seemed to be in line with the social justice perspective emphasized in the course. My interviews with Maria uncovered some thinking about race that I found problematic and surprising. Of all the cohort members, I probably had the weakest relationship with Maria. Although I engaged with her somewhat during the Multicultural Course, we never established a great rapport. Her comments during our first interview, in particular, tended to be rather short and I had a difficult time getting her to elaborate on them. Overall, I had the sense that Maria felt hesitancy toward working in urban schools. She could speak the language of social

justice—and appeared to do so sincerely—but she adopted a somewhat passive stance toward enacting these principles.

Paige

Paige grew up in a small Southern community in the South/Southeastern region. Paige's community and schools were predominantly White with African Americans comprising the largest racial minority group. While Paige's elementary and middle schools exposed her to a degree of diversity, her status in Advanced Placement courses in high school insulated her from frequent interaction with students of color in her school. Paige also attended a small, majority White university. It seems possible that Paige experienced the least amount of interaction with people of color prior to joining the Urban Cohort. Despite this lack of experience with diversity, Paige possessed strong dispositions for urban teaching and social justice. She adopted progressive views on race during the Multicultural Course, in her interviews and written reflections, and seemed very willing to learn more about critical interpretations of race relations in the US. As she explored these ideas in the Multicultural Course readings and through the Race Seminars, her passion for the topic appeared to increase.

Paige also demonstrated an impressive ability to make sense of her Whiteness and consider how it would impact her as a teacher in urban schools. Like Kevin, she critiqued the idea of the White teacher as savior. She also openly discussed the hesitancy she felt in the classrooms of her field placement. Paige wanted to impact the lives of her students, but she feared that her Whiteness might act as a barrier in interacting with them. This racial awareness also appeared in other ways. Paige spoke eloquently about the racial

dynamics of her hometown, acknowledging the normative nature of Whiteness (Chubbuck, 2004) and the differential treatment of people of color. Overall, Paige seemed to compensate for her lack of prior racial knowledge with a strong social justice compass and a willingness to learn more about race. As Paige progressed through the Urban Teaching program, her comments on race and urban schools became more pointed and insightful.

Thomas

Born and raised in a racially diverse metropolitan area in the Mid-Atlantic region, Thomas emerged as the most vocal participant on the topic of race during the Multicultural Course sessions and the Race Seminars. Although Thomas lived in an affluent, White area and attended majority White private schools, he possessed a keen awareness of the workings of race in his community. He appreciated the implications of his city's long racial history and could readily detail its legacy of stark economic and racial segregation. Although Samuel—and perhaps Michael—had more knowledge of the history of race in the US, Thomas approached this history from a critical perspective. His knowledge of history seemed less concerned with details and trivia and more concerned with a critique of oppression. Thomas often recounted personal stories that demonstrated the workings of racism. He possessed both a strong intellectual understanding of critical racial views as well as an emotional commitment to working against racism.

In similar fashion to Patrick and Samuel, Thomas served as an example of a White individual who drew from personal experiences with privilege to make sense of the workings of racism. Thomas strongly critiqued a meritocratic view of US society. He

felt that the social context in which individuals lived influenced their outcomes as much or more than those individuals' personal efforts. During the first Multicultural Class session, Thomas shared a story from his time as a GED tutor at a men's drug rehabilitation center. While working with a man about his age in the rehab center, the two realized that they had once played football against each other in middle school. Thomas commented that the divergent paths their lives took—one attending college and volunteering as a tutor, the other undergoing drug rehabilitation—occurred because of the influences in their environment. Thomas commented that this young man "had barely made any choices" and had already endured life-altering difficulties. Perspectives such as this made Thomas a thoughtful participant in class discussions and during his interviews and written reflections.

ESTABLISHING TRUSTWORTHINESS

As a form of qualitative research, this study does not seek to produce generalizable knowledge. Instead, this critical case study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003) strives for trustworthiness in the research process. This refers to my ability as the researcher to faithfully represent the social understandings of the Urban Cohort in relation to the phenomenon under consideration (Erlandson et al., 1993). In order to establish trustworthiness, I paid specific attention to the notions of credibility and transferability. Each can be established through transparency and rigor in terms of the data collection methods, which I will detail in the forthcoming section. For example, credibility, which refers to the internal validity of the study, is determined by prolonged engagement with the research subjects, persistent observation at the research site,

triangulation of data from various sources, collection of artifacts, and member checking with the subjects to discuss the researcher's interpretations of the subjects' views (Erlandson et al., 1993). I detail these methods in the data collection and data analysis sections. My effort to establish transferability, or external validity, arises from creating thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973) of the research subjects and sites as well as through a purposeful selection of cases. I have detailed my reasons for selecting members of the Urban Cohort for this study and I have provided detailed descriptions of the research site and the participants in previous sections. My attention to these factors allows the reader to understand the context of the study and to determine what findings might hold relevance in alternative settings (Erlandson, et al., 1993).

Finally, I hope to add trustworthiness to this study through a meaningful disclosure of my positionality in relationship to the phenomenon under investigation. Banks (1998) suggests that one's interpretation of reality is mediated by a series of social variables including race, class, gender, language, sexual orientation, ability status and a host of others. Researchers must remain conscious of how their social positionality influences their interpretations of others and how it might influence the responses and actions of the research subject (Merriam, et al., 2001). Researchers must carry this awareness with them throughout the design, data collection, data analysis, write-up, and all other parts of the research process (Cary, 2006). After all, the researcher is the instrument in qualitative research (Crotty, 1998). Meaningful knowledge cannot arise without a researcher interrogating how they influence their own research. I will close this chapter describing my methods of inquiry with a positionality statement.

Researcher Positionality: Everybody's All-American?

There is a joke within my family that I am the "Golden Boy." In part, this stems from my late father's statements about me, which have become more exaggerated over time in my family's collective memory. After having three kids, my father was diagnosed with testicular cancer and was given 6-12 months to live. He beat the cancer, but doctors ensured him that he would never father children again. My mother became pregnant with my older sister a short time later and the doctors declared it a fluke. Less than twelve months after my sister was born, my mother was pregnant again, this time with me. At this point, my father's recovery officially became a miracle. My arrival as a boy, in a family that placed different values and expectations on boys, solidified the favored status. My parents would go on to have a sixth child as well but, to hear my siblings tell it, I remained my father's favorite. In a fairly traditional, patriarchal family, that meant quite a bit.

To be fair, the Golden Boy moniker was not too much of a stretch. I had blonde hair, blue eyes, and, by all accounts, I was a very happy-go-lucky child. I was also a quick learner. I walked early, I talked early, I read early and I generally found most tasks asked of me to be pretty easy. I was the teacher's pet throughout elementary school and into middle school. I attended the Catholic schools where my father had served as superintendent when my family first moved to our small Nebraska town. Our family was well known in this community, both from my father's history with the school and his success as a local businessman once he left education. I rarely had a teacher who had not taught an older sibling or who did not know of my family's reputation. Our family's

status evoked jealousy in some people, which I picked up on from time to time, but it typically worked in my favor. As I got a bit older, I started to hang out with a slightly different crowd and I began getting in trouble occasionally. In my community, however, that was not necessarily seen as a bad thing, just "boys being boys." The Golden Boy status was further bolstered due to my athletic success. My high school valued football above all else and my success on the field won me notoriety and status in the community. Ultimately, football helped me to attend an Ivy League school. The Princeton football team recruited me and they worked with the university to help me secure admission. The acceptance to Princeton and my status as a college football player probably served as the pinnacle of this Golden Boy era. Unfortunately, my father passed the summer before I left for school so he did not get to witness those final years.

Throughout this time (and still today), I had an incessant desire to please. Yet, I simultaneously reveled in and recoiled from the praise I received for my academic success, my athletic success, my polite demeanor, my appearance, all of it. I craved the positive feedback, but I almost always shrank from the attention. I felt anxious and uncomfortable when the spotlight shined upon me, but I also felt that I was not doing enough if folks were not looking my way. I only realized later in life that I waged a constant battle between my desire to maintain the Golden Boy image in the eyes of others and my feeling, down deep, that I was far from perfect. This internal tension drove me to accomplish quite a bit, but it also had costs. It made me afraid, even embarrassed, of failure. Additionally, the tension, along with many years of Catholic school, produced a hefty amount of guilt. Although no one ever explicitly told me to feel this way, the

pressure I felt to succeed and to be perfect drove me to doubt myself and even dislike myself for failing to live up to the standards I imagined others had for me. I am confident that no one in my family or anywhere else actually thought I was perfect or that I should act perfectly. It was a way to pay a compliment, to joke, to encourage, and to show love. Another person would likely have responded very differently in my situation. This response was mine alone.

I do not share this story to ask for any sort of sympathy for my life has been far too charmed for such a request. I share this story because it is deeply implicated with my positionality as I approach this project. In many ways, the Golden Boy is my positionality. The Golden Boy status is bigger than being a favored son in an upper middle class family in a small town in the middle of Middle America. On a bigger level, perhaps I am All-American, or even some sort of global Golden Boy. I come from our society's dominant racial group and my racial identity is unambiguous. I am a male in a deeply patriarchal society. I am heterosexual in a society that marginalizes other sexual orientations. I come from a Christian background in a country with skepticism toward atheists and non-Christian religions. I am able-bodied. As noted above, I come from a family with a comfortable economic status and connections to the white-collar world. If I ever needed to borrow money or to find a job, I could call my brother, my mother, one of my sisters, or a number of friends and acquaintances. My friends from college are doctors and lawyers. They are stock analysts and senior vice-presidents and heads of corporate development. They are not quite the 1%, but they are pretty close. I also have US

citizenship, which grants me protections in many places around the world. In short, I occupy nearly all of the dominant subjectivities of this society.

While my status as a member of many dominant societal groups clearly shapes my worldview and my engagement with this research project, my positionality is much more complicated. I do not want to simply share a confessional narrative of privilege as a *mea culpa* that will allow me to pursue this analysis in an unencumbered fashion. Instead, I want this process to be rife with encumbrances. Any moment in which I feel that I "know" my participants or that I can intuit the hidden messages embedded in their comments is a moment in which I forget myself and become unfaithful to the research process. I hope to attend to Cary's (2006) critique that, "Positionality [is] in danger of becoming a 'quick and easy' fix to the problem of the responsibility and the inherent problem of the colonizing power of the researcher" (p. 50). Cary also suggests that this confessional style can serve as a way for White researchers to reassert their "privileged raced knowing in the research process" (p. 53). Although I explore the experiences of these White preservice teachers as they learn critical racial knowledge, I do not want to position myself as the "knower" in this process. I do not have a monopoly on knowledge about race and I am far from fully actualized as an antiracist actor. I view my personal journey as one of struggle to maintain awareness of how I enact my race on a daily basis and how that enactment interacts with the lives of others and the long history of racism. While I have learned quite a bit during my journey toward racial conscientization (Freire, 1970), I feel like I am just beginning the process. By engaging in this research, in

solidarity with my research subjects (Kincheloe, 2007), I hope to help them progress along their personal journeys.

In thinking more deeply about my stake in the antiracist project, I return to the Golden Boy days and the internal tension that label created for me throughout my life. My constant attempts to maintain this status, often to the detriment of my own mental well being, created a struggle that mirrors some of the peculiar anxiety that accompanies the construction and maintenance of White racial identity. Lensmire (2010) suggests that Whites are fundamentally ambivalent on the topic of race. These conflicted feelings arise from having awareness—sometimes acute and sometimes dulled—that Whites espouse democracy and fairness but knowingly benefit from an unequal system. Thandeka's (1999) work extends this notion by suggesting that the process of "learning to be white" often involves rebukes from the White community for displaying interest in racial others. In my personal life, I felt that I needed to behave in a particular way and perform at a certain level because I learned that those standards were my identity. These accomplishments defined me, but I also knew that the whole thing was a sham. I made mistakes and fell short of perfection all of the time, but I could not admit as much otherwise I would lose my identity and disappoint those around me.

In looking back, I now realize that this anxiety spilled over into how I understood myself in relation to the world. I slowly began to feel that I did not deserve the things I had or the subjectivities I inhabited. I can remember trying to explain to my mother at a young age that Catholicism could not be the only true religion, as I had learned in school, because a person born in India did not even have a chance to be Catholic. Although it was

a gross simplification, it just started to seem like all of the things that other people wanted or that gave people status and opportunity, I already had. Yet I had not done anything to earn those things. I did not pursue anything particularly traitorous towards my Whiteness at these earlier stages, perhaps because doing so might tarnish the Golden Boy image, but I started to feel that I should use the privileges I had to help others. While these feelings developed over a number of years, they finally started to spill over into the life decisions I made at the end of my time at Princeton. While my classmates prepared for law school, medical school, consulting firms, or the financial world, I experienced a malaise that ultimately led me to take a different path.

In many ways, I entered the teaching profession in order to reject the opportunities that had been laid before me. However, even in this rejection of privilege, more privilege emerged. By becoming a teacher, even in an elite private school, I was "giving back" and "acting nobly." The Golden Boy lived on. Within the two schools I worked, I was immediately given credibility in the classroom because of my Ivy League background. I adopted an identity as a liberal educator in a conservative space, a kind of pseudo rebel. As a coach on the athletic fields, I was still the former collegiate athlete. I played catch with the football players and shot baskets with the basketball players. My talents in these areas only increased my cache. I had a positive reputation in the school as both a teacher and a coach. The privilege persisted. Although many factors contributed to my decision to begin graduate school, a significant element was my desire to leave these spaces that had granted me so much privilege. I wanted to do something different. Again, however, I seemed only to walk into more privileges. I could attend graduate school full

time by borrowing money from family members and working part time for the company of a college friend. I was also quickly brought on to a grant-funded project that paid for five years of my graduate work. Again, privilege seemed to follow me.

Even as I gravitated towards the study of race in my graduate work, a topic that many find peculiar or uncomfortable, privilege was there. I pursued race scholarship and, in particular, critical Whiteness studies, because these theories allowed me to make sense of my life and the opportunities I had. I did not experience resistance or hesitation when I read Derrick Bell, Zeus Leonardo, Charles Mills, Lani Guinier, or Joyce King. Their work, along with others, seemed to explain things about the world that I had been skirting around the edges of for quite some time. From my undergraduate background in history and from eight years of teaching a variety of social studies topics, the analysis of these scholars synched with how I was beginning to see the world. These race scholars fit with the template I learned from folks like James Loewen (2007) and Howard Zinn (1980). More importantly, they encouraged me to place my own racial identity under scrutiny. Rather than thinking of race as only possessed by people of color, I started to think about my own Whiteness and how it influenced my life chances. As noted earlier, I had been undergoing a long process of sensing that much of what I possessed was unearned. The critical racial perspectives of these authors allowed me to think about my racial identity with a sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). Exploring these theories was emotional, but it did not create anger or defensiveness. Instead, I felt a sense of loss. It was a loss of innocence that created a sense of purpose. I felt that I could do something meaningful by exploring the topic of race.

Although I felt some initial hesitancy in speaking publicly about the topic of race as a White person, I quickly found that my racial identity granted me privileges in this area as well. Whereas scholars of color can be positioned as “angry” or “biased” when they talk about race (Ladson-Billings, 1996), Whites can be viewed as more objective and reasonable on the topic. After giving presentations at professional conferences, I found that numerous individuals would approach me to speak about their antiracist work with White teachers. Again, the privilege followed me. Finally, as I entered the academic job market this past fall, I experienced some anxiety that my research focus might be considered too problematic for some campuses. However, during interviews at the University of Kentucky, where I will serve as a faculty member this coming fall, I found that many faculty members viewed me, in a very odd way, as a form of diversity. They felt that I possessed expertise in an area of need in the college. They felt that I could help their teacher candidates become more knowledgeable about and sensitive to racial issues. Once again, the privilege followed me.

At a fundamental level, I use these experiences and the affordances they granted me to make sense of how Whiteness impacted my ontological reality. My material existence is inextricably tied to the status that my identity provides. These experiences taught me that the value of my subjectivities was so embedded in daily life in the US that escaping from them is likely impossible. I also learned that, because of this value, I do not undertake the same risks that other folks do when they make decisions. I always seem to have a safety net. Despite the good intentions with which I attempt to pursue research

on Whiteness, I cannot undo the benefits of Whiteness I enjoy. Yancy (2004) reminds me that

> After all, after a day of theorizing, the white theorist rides back to the suburbs, escapes being profiled, walks up and down the streets of all-white neighborhoods without fear of being harassed or labeled a problem, and finds it easy to hail a cab if necessary. It is not enough that whites, with good intentions, thematize their whiteness and attempt to render it harmless. (p. 17)

My perceived racial identity carries a "surplus of significations" (Yancy, 2004, p. 17) over and above whatever antiracist intentions I have. Bailey (1998) points to the impossibility of renouncing White privilege, suggesting that even if Whites transgress against the racial scripts of Whiteness in overt ways in a particular setting, their White privilege re-emerges as soon as they enter a different setting. In response to this, Bailey suggests that Whites must cultivate privilege-cognizant identities (Frankenberg, 1993) that remain vigilant towards the workings of Whiteness in their lives. Mayo (2000) extends this analysis with her suggestion that White antiracist efforts must eschew comfort and safety such that "the heart of whiteness…maintain[s] vertigo as its impetus for positive action against the structures of its own dominance" (p. 319).

Mayo's imagery of a positive White identity as one that frequently feels "off balance" resonates with the peculiar sense of anxiety that has grown within me over the last fifteen or so years. While the work of race scholars has provided me with historical and theoretical understandings of how my privileges came about, this scholarship does not necessarily provide a plan for what one should do with that information. Although I feel that antiracism is a process rather than a destination, I also feel that pursuing this research with White preservice teachers on the topic of race is an important step in that

process. I want to use the words of my participants to help others learn something about how the workings of Whiteness interact with White desires for something different (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999). I understand that the risks my participants take in pursuing these conversations are mediated by their social locations. When I applaud their efforts—as I do often in chapters 4 and 5—I do so with an appreciation for this level of risk. When I critique their efforts—as I do in chapter 6—I try to do so with humility, empathy, and compassion (Conklin, 2008). In addition to maintaining a state of vertigo regarding race and Whiteness, I also feel that one of the best things I can do is to listen to others and learn from their experiences, particularly those experiences of oppression. While I cannot completely know the ways that my biography shapes my worldview, I know that I must try to counter its privileges with humility and empathy, along with a critical vigilance towards the racial scripts that animate my life.

DATA COLLECTION

The data collection for this study occurred in four phases. I will detail my data gathering procedures for each while also commenting on how these various elements informed my understanding of the experiences of the urban cohort learning about race. In my data collection, I attended to Yin's (2009) three principles of data collection: 1) use multiple sources of evidence, 2) create a case study database, and 3) maintain a chain of evidence. I drew from four primary sources of evidence, which are detailed below. I created a database to house all case study materials on my personal computer and kept paper backups of these documents. All identifying information of participants was removed. I also maintained a chain of evidence for ensuring consistency between my

research questions and my interview questions as well as informing my decisions regarding gathering particular pieces of data for analysis. This process aided in establishing validity and reliability of the study.

Data Collection Phase I: Observations in Multicultural Course

During the fourteen class sessions of the Multicultural Education Course, I engaged in direct observation and participant observation of the members of the Urban Cohort. As a facilitator for the course, I was expected to be present so my observations occurred within the normal course of class events. During times when Dr. Gomez addressed the cohort or when they participated in whole group discussions, I made direct observations (Yin, 2009), taking fieldnotes in an ethnographic style (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011). I jotted down observed behavior or bits of classroom dialogue that I deemed relevant to my research questions. During small group activities in the Multicultural Course I often engaged in participant observation (Yin, 2009), involving myself in the activities alongside the cohort members. Typically, I listened to the small group conversations and occasionally added a comment or asked a question of the group members. I did not take direct fieldnotes during the participant observation. Instead, I attempted to make note of any significant comments. I then added those comments to my fieldnotes once I left the smaller group setting. The primary benefit of including both direct and participant observation in the Multicultural Course was a greater familiarity with my research participants. I made note of how they engaged with the critical multiculturalism present in Dr. Gomez' lectures and reading list. I learned the basic biographies of the individuals and noted events I felt might be significant for my analysis.

These observations helped me to adapt my interview protocol for each individual, providing useful data for my project.

Data Collection Phase II: Race Seminars

With the permission of Dr. Gomez, I led the urban cohort through three 90-minute seminars on the topic of race during three consecutive class sessions. These sessions occurred during class sessions six, seven, and eight. At Dr. Gomez' suggestion, we scheduled the seminars for this point in the semester to allow the urban cohort to become familiar with each other and me. This was an important consideration in light of the sensitivity many individuals have toward talking about race (Bolgatz, 2005). In advance of each of the three Race Seminars, the cohort members read a series of chapters from Takaki's (1993) *A Different Mirror*. The selected chapters served as historical background for our class discussion on race.

The Race Seminars produced four significant pieces of data. First, I audio recorded the sessions and transcribed the proceedings. The transcripts were analyzed alongside other data during analysis. Second, I collected artifacts (Yin, 2009) produced by the cohort members during the various activities. These activities will be described in greater detail below. Third, I transcribed student comments during whole group discussions onto blank Power Point slides that remained projected during the discussions. These slides served as fieldnotes (Emerson et al., 2011) that I referred back to during my analysis. Fourth, I engaged in reflexive journaling (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993) after each seminar session. Shortly after the conclusion of the session, I looked back through the Power Point slides and other notes I took and crafted my initial thoughts

on the seminars. In this reflexive journaling process, I engaged in some preliminary analysis of how the cohort members engaged with the topic of race. I also used my reflections from the sessions to alter my plans for subsequent seminars and develop questions for my semi-structured interview protocol (Merriam, 1998).

The design of the seminars drew from literature in CWS (Leonardo, 2009; Mills, 1997), previous studies that investigated the responses of predominantly White preservice teachers to discussions of race (Marx, 2006; Picower, 2009; Ringrose, 2007; Schick, 2000), race literature that theorizes more complicated notions of White identity (Lensmire, 2010; Thandeka, 1999), and scholarship promoting more compassionate pedagogical orientations towards White teachers (Conklin, 2008; Swartz, 2003; Trainor, 2002, 2005; Winans, 2005). The seminars were also informed by previous experience working with White preservice teachers in the teacher education setting (Crowley & Smith, 2011). Many studies fail to illuminate in detail the pedagogical approaches teacher educators use with student teachers (King, 1991; McIntyre, 1997; Sleeter, 1995). I hope to be more transparent with that aspect of my project.

Seminar I: Definitions and conceptual understandings

The first seminar aimed to provide foundational knowledge about race, racism, and Whiteness in order to disrupt any misinformation that the students may possess (Tatum, 2003) and build common understandings. Developing common terminology is crucial in discussions of race and racism (Bolgatz, 2005). As an example, when I used the term "race," I wanted all cohort members to understand that I spoke about race as a social construction that enacted implications on the lives of all raced individuals rather than a

biological trait that could predict an individual's abilities or otherwise define their essence (Jhally & Hall, 1996; Omi & Winant, 1994). To this end, much of the first Race Seminar was devoted to defining racial terms and building towards a conceptual understanding of racism as a structural rather than individual force (Marable, 2002; Schmidt, 2005).

At the opening of the seminar, the Urban Cohort watched a video of Chimimanda Adichie's (2009) TED talk, *The Danger of a Single Story*. In the lecture, the Nigerian novelist discussed the power of stories in shaping understandings of individuals or groups. Adichie also discussed the role of power, or nkali, in the production of stereotypes. She suggested that dominant groups use their power and influence to produce damaging single stories about subjugated groups. Her talk aligns well with a critique of deficit thinking in education (Valencia, 2010). I used the video as a starting point in order to open up a conversation about the stereotypical views associated with urban students and urban schools. I also hoped that Adichie's discussion of power and ideology would help the cohort members think about the role of stereotypes in maintaining White supremacy (Lensmire, 2011).

After the video and a quick debrief, the students worked in small groups to define the following terms: race, racism, White privilege, colorblindness, and racialization. I created a Google Doc for each group to use in crafting their definitions. I asked the groups to take notes on how they built the definition on the Google Doc and to craft a final definition. The Google Docs served as artifacts (Yin, 2009) to document the cohort's engagement with race and as a data triangulation source (Merriam, 2009). We

debriefed the definitions as a whole group and then I posed a series of questions to the group for discussion. The first question asked that cohort members provide an example of racism based on Tatum's (2003) definition of racism as a system of advantage. I scribed the student responses on Power Point slides. This question aimed to reinforce racism as a structural force rather than an individual force. The second question asked whether or not all White people benefitted equally from racism. The students shared answers in both the affirmative and negative. Again, I scribed their responses onto the projection screen. With this question, I hoped to provide an opportunity for students to speak back against the perceived essentialization of Whiteness in conversations about White privilege (Lowenstein, 2009; Trainor, 2002).

The final activity of the first Race Seminar, drew from Tatum's (2003) use of racial metaphors to demonstrate the operation of racism in both passive and active forms. Tatum uses the metaphors of smog and the moving walkway to represent the workings of passive racism, active racism, and antiracism. The smog metaphor helps to demonstrate the pervasive, almost invisible nature of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), while the moving walkway metaphor illuminates how White individuals can benefit from racism even when not engaging in overt racist acts, i.e., standing on the moving walkway but still moving forward. For the activity, I displayed an image of a smoggy Los Angeles skyline and asked the students to define and provide examples of the terms passive racism, active racism, and antiracism in light of the smog metaphor. The cohort then repeated the activity with the example of the moving walkway. Each group shared their definitions and interpretations of how the metaphor demonstrated these types of racism.

The groups wrote their responses on the Google Doc, again allowing me to use the artifact during my analysis.

Seminar II: The sociological imagination and racial case studies

My goals for the second Race Seminar were twofold. First, I revisited the idea that White individuals could participate in race relations in differing ways but still benefit from their racial identities. Second, I wanted to introduce the notion of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959) as a framework for thinking about race and to provide some case studies for the cohort members to evaluate in light of their developing racial knowledge. To accomplish the first goal, I shared the following quote from Gillborn (2010) that addresses White participation in race relations:

> While all White people are not uniformly racist or privileged by a racist social structure, all White-identified people are implicated in relations of racial domination. In other words, White people do not all behave in identical ways and they do not all draw similar benefits – but they do all benefit to some degree, whether they like it or not (p. 3).

I shared Gillborn's quote with the Urban Cohort because I hoped it would address the issue of White essentialization. The quote explicitly addresses the lack of homogeneity in the way Whites function within and benefit from racism, but still identifies Whites as participants in a racialized social structure. Each group was tasked with creating an illustration that demonstrated their understanding of the quote. This activity produced another key artifact for analysis but, more importantly, the task of creating the illustration caused the cohort members to discuss the quote in a critical fashion and carefully interrogate its meaning.

After sharing the illustrations, I shared a number of Power Point slides that introduced Mills' (1959) notion of the sociological imagination. I will explain this concept in greater detail in the opening of chapter 4. I used Mills' construct because it asks individuals to consider the intersection of biography and history when engaging in social analysis. Often in discussions of race, Whites center their personal experiences as a way to discount the workings of racism (Applebaum, 2008; DiAngelo & Allen, 2006). While I did not want to discourage individuals from drawing upon their personal experiences, I hoped that they would interpret those experiences in light of historical forces such as racism. After talking through an understanding of the sociological imagination, the cohort moved back into groups to read and discuss two race-related case studies I crafter for the seminar (Appendix C).

Seminar III: Historical racial case study of US voting rights

For the final seminar, I hoped to provide the social studies members of the Urban Cohort with an opportunity to bring their developing racial knowledge into the classroom setting.[7] While gathering pilot study data, I consistently heard complaints that the discussions we had about race did not relate closely enough to what they taught in their classrooms. To address this issue, I decided to help the preservice teachers apply critical racial knowledge to the social studies curriculum. In small groups, we engaged in a lesson planning activity related to the history of voting rights in the US. I felt this topic provided a useful example of how structural barriers impact people of color. It also demonstrates how the rights of people of color are always contingent upon their ongoing

---

[7] The English Language Arts cohort members conducted an activity with another facilitator in which they critiqued the Advanced Placement English reading lists.

interaction with the interests of Whites (Bell, 1980; Crowley, 2013). I began with a brief historical overview of the expansion of voting rights in the US over time, culminating with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Grofman, Handley, & Niemi, 1992). I then provided the cohort members with a packet that contained newspaper articles and links to short video clips that discussed the recent onslaught of voter identification laws (Hasen, 2012; Levitt, 2007) in the US. I positioned these laws as a veiled attempt to disenfranchise large numbers of people of color and people with limited financial resources. After exploring these documents and video clips, we discussed the implications and intent of the voter identification laws. After the group discussion, the students worked in pairs to craft a basic outline of what their lesson would look like. I provided the following guiding questions for their planning:

1. What questions might you pose to your students regarding this issue?
2. What understanding would you want to help them construct about this issue?
3. In what ways does this issue open up discussions about race and racism in the classroom?

Once again, the cohort members wrote their responses on the Google Doc I created for them, providing me with access to this crucial artifact.

Data Collection Phase III: Written reflections

Another crucial data source for this project came in the form of the written reflections of the Urban Cohort members after each Race Seminar session. The participants emailed these reflections directly to me and they were not shared with the whole group. I asked the students to complete these reflections for two purposes. First, I wanted to provide a more private platform for them to express their views in relation to

the Race Seminars. Due to the sensitive nature of talking about race, I hoped to provide them a place where they could share their thoughts and concerns or, perhaps, share personal stories they did not want to share with the entire group. Second, I wanted the cohort members to reflect more deeply on the content of the seminars and what they meant for their development as teachers. I established high expectations for their reflections by engaging in dialogue with them over email after they sent the response. For each individual, I replied to their written reflection and posed new questions for them to consider. Sometimes this response created a series of emails. Other times, the questions I posed arose during interviews or in other interactions I had with the students. Overall, however, it appeared that my engagement with their ideas encouraged them to be more thoughtful in their responses. The reflections grew in length throughout the three seminars. Overall, the reflections averaged around 400 words each with some over 1000 words, providing a wealth of data for analysis.

The prompts for each seminar were as follows:

> Race Seminar I: What roles do race and racism, your students' racial identities, and your racial identity have on your daily activities as a classroom teacher?
>
> Race Seminar II: What is your first memory that involves racial difference or the feeling of being racialized? What feelings were associated with that memory? What lessons did you take away from that memory?
>
> Race Seminar III: Reflecting on the past three seminars related to race, racism, racial identities, and the racial case study, what elements of the seminars surprised you? What are your major takeaways, if any, for your own teaching? What comments or suggestions do you have on how the seminars were conducted and what topics were discussed?

These prompts served a variety of purposes, including how I approached the individual cohort members during interviews. I used their responses to build questions specific to

their understandings of race, hoping to push them to provide further explanation or to develop a more critical understanding of race. With the first prompt I hoped to assess a basic understanding of how the cohort members viewed race as operating in a secondary classroom. The second prompt targeted the early memories the cohort members had of race, drawing upon Thandeka's (1999) notion of White shame, which will be discussed in greater detail in chapter six. I felt these memories were crucial to the development of the teachers' racial identities, but might also be too personal to discuss in a whole group setting. The third prompt served as an open-ended opportunity for the cohort members to share their thoughts about the process of participating in the Race Seminars. They used this prompt to speak on a range of topics, noting which activities they liked and critiquing the way that I framed some of the concepts discussed in the seminars.

Phase IV: Interviews

The final phase of data collection proved the most essential for my overall analysis of the Urban Cohort's process of learning about race. Merriam (1998) suggests that, "Interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them. It is also necessary to interview when we are interested in past events that are impossible to replicate" (p. 72). I approached the interviews with the Urban Cohort with three primary goals in mind and posed questions related to these three areas. First, I desired to learn some background information about the participants. In particular, I asked about their experiences with diversity and assessed their prior racial knowledge. I also asked about their earliest memories of race, a topic that Thandeka (1999) discussed with her interview participants. Second, I asked about

their experiences in the Multicultural Course and in the Race Seminars. In particular, I was interested in their responses to some of the racial discourses presented in the seminars and what type of emotions they experienced while participating in the seminars. These questions provided insights into their learning about race and to what extent they engaged with or resisted the ideas presented to them. Third, I asked about how the racial knowledge they had gained would impact them as teachers in urban schools. Through these questions, I hoped to gauge how the preservice teachers envisioned translating this knowledge into practice. These questions provided insights into what elements of their learning they found to be the most important and, generally, how they imagined that race and racism operated in the context of an urban school.

I used a semi-structured interview protocol (Merriam, 2009) for my initial interview with each participant (Appendix D). I conducted these interviews during a two-week period after the completion of the multicultural course. Due to my role as a facilitator in the course, I felt it ethical to wait until the course had ended before engaging in the interviews. Although I was not responsible for assigning grades to the cohort members, I still operated in a supervisory role in the course setting. I hoped to minimize the impact of the power differential—whether real or perceived—between myself and my participants (Merriam et al., 2001). As noted earlier, another important aspect of breaking through these barriers involved my prolonged engagement (Erlandson et al., 1993) with the Urban Cohort during their first semester in the Urban Teaching program.

Although I created a somewhat detailed interview protocol (Appendix D), I did not hesitate to move away from the interview questions in pursuit of an intriguing idea

presented by one of the participants. While I hoped to cover some basic aspects of my three topic areas in the interview, I was more interested in discussing any topic related to race that the respondent felt was important. This technique aligned with Merriam's (1998) description of a semi-structured interview:

> In this type of interview, either all of the questions are more flexibly worded, or the interview is a mix of more and less structured questions. Usually, specific information is desired from all respondents, in which case there is a highly structured section to the interview. But the larges part of the interview is guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time (p. 74).

I preferred to have a list of carefully worded questions that I could turn to if the interview went too far astray from the topic at hand or if the participant acted in a reticent way toward any of my questions. As long as the conversation flowed and the participant shared relevant information, I maintained a more conversational approach (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), asking probing questions and listening intently. I made note if the participant addressed topics related to other questions in the protocol, crossing them off so as not to revisit the topics and disrupt the stream of the conversation.

The interviews ranged in length from 75-150 minutes, with the average interview lasting around 95 minutes. I listened to the recording of each interview shortly after conducting it and wrote initial observations and analysis of the views shared by the participant. I transcribed each interview in its entirety, including pauses, hesitations, and the use of filler words such as "um" or "like." I felt that including these words in the transcript would better convey the tenor of the participants' responses, particularly with a topic such as race that can often produce hesitant, stilted speech (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Haviland, 2008; Lensmire, 2010).

I attempted to conduct face-to-face follow-up interviews with each participant for purposes of member checking (Merriam, 2009) and to discuss aspects of their initial interview in greater detail. However, due to scheduling conflicts, four of the follow-up interviews occurred over email. For these interviews, I used a technique employed by Marx (2006) in her study of White preservice teachers and race. Marx provided her participants with several excerpts from crucial parts of their initial interview transcript prior to the second interview. This method allowed for member checking as the participants could clarify their meaning in case their words seemed to portray something different that what they originally intended. Additionally, the excerpts served as powerful talking points for the second interview. Rather than asking the participants to speak more on a specific topic, they were able to read their previous words and reflect more deeply on their views. For those who completed this process over email, I also included a few additional clarifying questions and a general statement of how I interpreted their views on race based on the initial interview. The participants responded to the questions I posed while also commenting on their transcript excerpts.

For each of the follow-up interviews—both face-to-face and over email—I provided anywhere from 4-6 excerpts from their initial interview. I sent these transcripts to the participants over email with the instructions to read them and note any reactions they had to reading their own comments. Some participants brought typed responses to the interview with them, providing an additional data source. As mentioned above, those who could not attend in-person interviews emailed responses to me. For the face-to-face interviews, using the excerpts as talking points allowed our second interview to take on a

very conversational tone (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The topics were largely generated from the participant commenting on the excerpts rather than from my questions. I also shared some of my initial analysis of the participant's comments in the initial interview as a source of member checking. These interviews would classify as unstructured using Merriam's (1998) categorization system. I repeated the aforementioned procedure of listening to the interview recording shortly after the interview, engaging in some initial analysis, and then transcribing the interview in its entirety. The face-to-face follow-up interviews ranged in length from 60-90 minutes, with the average interview lasting about 70 minutes. As the final phase of my data collection, these interviews were completed by February of 2013, and transcribed shortly thereafter.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

I engaged in data analysis with the following data gathered: fieldnotes from the Multicultural Course; audio recordings and transcripts of the three Race Seminars; participant-generated artifacts from the Race Seminars; three written reflections on the Race Seminars from each participant; and audio recordings and transcripts of participant interviews. As case study methodologists (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009) suggest, the data analysis process did not begin upon the completion of data collection. Strauss and Corbin (1990) state that data collection and analysis are, in fact, interrelated rather than separate processes. To this end, I engaged in constant analysis of the data as I collected it. During this initial phase, I read through smaller amounts of data (1 or 2 interview transcripts, a few written reflections) and made analytic notes in the margins. I also wrote short memos to myself that fleshed out "tentative themes, hunches, ideas, and

things to pursue" (Merriam, 1998, p. 161) as I continued my data collection and analysis. Many of these initial hunches formed key components of the study's findings. For example, I noticed from reading the written reflections immediately after the Race Seminars that many of the cohort members used experiences with racial privilege to understand the workings of structural racism. I later developed this into a finding within the theme of transgressive White racial knowledge (detailed in chapter 5). While these initial investigations and reflections helped me to develop ideas, my formal line-by-line coding of the data brought these tentative hunches to a fuller expression supported by multiple points of data.

The line-by-line coding process began with open coding, in which I read through all data pieces and "identified and named specific analytic dimensions and categories" (Emerson et al., 2011, p. 175). The open coding process involved a constant comparison (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) between codes, ultimately leading to the combining of codes with one another or the collapsing of codes into larger categories. During the open coding phase, I also wrote extensive theoretical code memos (Emerson et al., 2011) to elaborate upon the ideas gleaned from the coding process. Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest that without writing theoretical code memos, "[the researcher] will end up with a series of concepts with nothing reflective said about what the data are indicating" (p. 163). As an example, I noticed during the open coding process that many participants made comments about stereotypes during their written reflections and in interviews. While they displayed strong aversions to stereotypes, their analysis of the function of stereotypes in the larger social structure of racism seemed incomplete. In a theoretical code memo, I

elaborated upon my concerns that their engagement with this topic did not consider the workings of power and ideology (Thompson, 1999). This analysis ultimately formed an example of what I termed as conventional White racial knowledge and an example of a misappropriation of a critical racial discourse. This finding is discussed in detail in chapter 6.

The second phase of coding involved what Corbin and Strauss (1990) call axial coding, or the process of developing broader categories out of the concepts identified in the open coding process. The axial coding process creates categories and makes conceptual connections with the data pieces that constitute its subcategories. During the axial coding process, I identified six major findings, all of which contained sub findings. As an example, I found that the members of the cohort displayed a sociological imagination toward the students of color in their field placements. Within this finding, I detailed two sub findings: combatting deficit thinking and critiquing the trope of the White savior. The final coding stage involved what Corbin and Strauss (1990) call selective coding. During this process, I developed themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) or core categories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) that integrated the findings from my axial coding into an overarching storyline that described the phenomenon under investigation. I settled upon two major themes that related to the White preservice teachers' acquisition of racial knowledge: transgressive White racial knowledge and conventional White racial knowledge. I returned to the data with these themes and further elaborated on the ways the participants' comments illuminated either progressive or problematic views on race. I

detail transgressive White racial knowledge in chapters 4 and 5, while chapter 6 is devoted to conventional White racial knowledge.

CHAPTER FOUR: TRANSGRESSIVE WHITE RACIAL KNOWLEDGE AND WORKING WITH STUDENTS OF COLOR

INTRODUCTION

Rather than naming and categorizing White preservice teacher resistance to antiracist pedagogy, this study seeks to identify the characteristics of the teacher education space as it moves into the complicated area *beyond resistance*. The participants in this study demonstrated a range of responses to the critical representations of race they experienced in the Multicultural Course, the Race Seminars, and in other aspects of the Urban Teaching program. Some of those responses suggested transformation while others suggested a more complicated re-inscription of White norms and a White worldview. This chapter, along with chapter 5, will detail aspects of the progressive racial attitudes and dispositions displayed by the Urban Cohort, which I refer to as *transgressive White racial knowledge*.

As a whole, the White teachers in the Urban Teaching cohort displayed an impressive ability to consider the implications of race and racism when discussing their personal histories, talking about the lives and abilities of students of color, analyzing the workings of schools, and critiquing society as a whole. Their dispositions towards engaging with the topic of race provide a powerful contrast to the resistant White teacher that appears in much educational literature (Haviland, 2008; Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997). While they still displayed moments of racial anxiety and inauthenticity (Leonardo, 2009) in their statements, they largely avoided the dysconscious racism of many White teacher candidates (King, 1991).

Detailing the positive elements of these teachers' racial imaginations is not an attempt to disrupt an over simplified view of White teachers as passively racist and to replace it with another simplified view of them as committed antiracists or as laudable racial-works-in-progress. Instead, I hope to de-homogenize the White preservice teacher by displaying progressive manifestations of White racial knowledge in relation to antiracist pedagogy. The teachers in this study do not represent the "typical" White preservice teacher (Lowenstein, 2009). As participants in the Urban Teaching program, they arrived to these conversations with different goals and faced different expectations from faculty and from one another. The progressive dispositions they displayed toward race set them apart but, as chapter 6 will show, their antiracist journeys are still in progress. I highlight their transgressive White racial knowledge because,

> It is unwarranted to argue that these deep layers of persistent racism represent the core of all apparent white antiracism. Although it is important--and often easy--to expose the persistent racism in avowedly antiracist efforts, we need also to affirm that *some* of the time, in *some* respects even when not in *all*, whites empathize and identify with nonwhites, abhor how white supremacy has distorted their social interactions, and are willing to make significant sacrifices toward the eradication of white privilege. (Alcoff, 1998, p. 6, italics in original)

The members of the Urban Cohort displayed commitments to the antiracist project, and it would be "unwarranted" to suggest that such commitments merely represented hollow gestures or naiveté. Lensmire (2010) noted that "the very way that we have imagined and conceptualized white people and their racial identities is contributing to our critical education failures with them" (p. 169). The data presented here aim to contribute to a reconceptualization of the White preservice teacher by detailing the progressive elements of a group of White teachers' attitudes about race.

TRANSGRESSIVE WHITE RACIAL KNOWLEDGE

As mentioned previously, Leonardo (2009) positions White discourse on race as representative of a body of "White racial knowledge" (p. 108). The positioning of Whites as knowledgeable—albeit in problematic and often oppressive ways—about race and racism positions Whites as subjects that engage with antiracist or multicultural pedagogy. This removes their claims of innocence when discussing race and holds them accountable for race-based decisions and judgments. Scholars often interpret White pushback to antiracist pedagogy as a discourse of resistance produced by an unexamined racial consciousness (Picower, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). While such an analysis is not incorrect, it often fails to acknowledge that a key component of White racial knowledge is what Mills (1997) refers to as an epistemology of ignorance. Whiteness depends upon a superficial grasp of race relations in order to justify an inequitable racial order. This justification resolves the contradiction between the prevailing ethos of egalitarianism alongside the glaring racial inequalities observable in society (Lensmire, 2010).

When White preservice teachers access the various White tropes of resistance, as detailed in chapter 2, they speak from the body of White racial knowledge they have gleaned from their time as White-identified participants in a racialized society. One acquires this knowledge in a variety of ways, but perhaps most indelibly and insidiously from the policing of Whiteness by the White community (Thandeka, 1999). Hurtado (1996) notes that "white privilege depends on its members not betraying the unspoken, nonconscious power dynamics socialized in the intimacy of their families" (p. 149). To

police these unspoken power dynamics, the community discourages cross-racial interaction, discussions of racial difference, or White performance of practices associated with communities of color. This process sustains notions of Otherness and inferiority towards people of color, which in turn justifies the privileged social status of Whites. When White individuals engage in race discourse that runs counter to established norms of White racial knowledge, they cross tacit boundaries and risk marginalization from the White community.

For these reasons, I have labeled the progressive, critical discourse about race demonstrated by members of the Urban Cohort as *transgressive White racial knowledge*. To "transgress" means to cross boundaries or to go beyond the established bounds of a moral principle. The White teachers in this study engaged in dialogue and displayed racial knowledge that went beyond the strictures and structured blindness (Mills, 1997) of White racial knowledge. They committed transgressions against their Whiteness by acknowledging the workings of racism on structuring societal opportunities and on shaping the school experiences of students of color. The violations of White racial knowledge displayed by the participants de-essentialize the idea of the resistant White teacher (Lowenstein, 2009). In this chapter, I will detail the Urban Cohort's transgressive White racial knowledge related to their views of the students of color that await them in urban classrooms.

Their knowledge related to students contained three elements. First, in discussing the students of color these teachers imagine themselves working with in the future, the members of the cohort expressed an appreciation for the role that broader sociocultural

forces play in structuring student achievement and student engagement in schools. Second, they discussed the implications of the trope of the White savior, recognizing its existence but searching for a way to avoid its colonizing stigma. Third, they expressed desires to engage in the topics of race and racism in their teaching, suggesting that their students of color (and White students) needed to experience a history that accounted for race as an organizing principle in society. Both of these elements run contrary to more established White racial knowledge about students. Rather than the appreciation for sociocultural factors in students' lives in schools, most White teachers express deficit views (Valencia, 2010) regarding students of color and—when imagining themselves working with such students—conjure images of themselves as White saviors (Titone, 1998) who assimilate students of color into the White mainstream. In regards to explicitly talking about race and racism in classrooms, most of the literature details elements of fear and anxiety in White teachers (Bolgatz, 2005; Levstik, 2000). In both how they viewed their students and imagined themselves teaching about race and racism, these preservice teachers displayed transgressive White racial knowledge.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

In order to describe the development of transgressive White racial knowledge in the Urban Cohort, I draw upon Mills' (1959) notion of the sociological imagination. In his classic work, *The Sociological Imagination,* Mills levied a powerful critique of social science researchers' obsessions with what he termed "abstract empiricism" and "grand theory." Mills claimed the empiricists focused too much attention on extracting generic public opinion on topics without an effort to situate the results in a broader social or

historical context. In Mills' mind, the empiricists failed to account for either the specificity of the individual or the impact of broader structural forces on the individual. In effect, their analyses offered no social mooring (Grant & Wieczorek, 2000) for the social problems they identified. The grand theorists, too, suffered from a methodological structure that limited their ability to speak to the lived social and historical experiences of people. Rather than being too specific, however, the grand theorists resided only in the realm of the abstract. The theorists fetishized concepts and used jargon rather than defining problems of social importance in plain language and guiding efforts to solve those problems. Mills chided the grand theorists for speaking from "useless heights" (p. 33), calling on them to ground their efforts.

In place of the unmoored empiricists and the ungrounded theorists, Mills (1959) suggested that research should be guided by the sociological imagination. This approach tasks researchers to consider the interaction between biography and history, as "neither the life of an individual nor the history of a society can be understood without understanding both" (p. 3). As a methodology, it asks researchers to delve into the lived realities of their participants and to historicize their participants' experiences in an effort to create understanding. The sociological imagination serves as a methodology for research, but it can also serve as a habit of mind for any individual hoping to make critical sense of their place in society. It responds to the scholars of critical Whiteness studies who call upon preservice teachers to develop awareness of their racial positionality (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998). Mills stated that,

> The first fruit of this imagination—and the first lesson of the social science that embodies it—is the idea that the individual can understand his own experience

> and gauge his own fate only by locating himself within his period, that he can know his own chances in life only by becoming aware of those of all individuals in his circumstances. (p. 5)

This habit of mind allows individuals to draw connections between their personal problems and broader social issues. It pushes back against the tendency of individuals, "in the welter of their daily experience, [to] become falsely conscious of their social positions" (p. 5). The sociological imagination works well with the goals of antiracist teacher education, as teachers learn to understand themselves and their students in the context of broader sociohistorical forces.

TRANSGRESSIVE WHITE RACIAL KNOWLEDGE AND WORKING WITH STUDENTS OF COLOR

The Urban Cohort demonstrated transgressive White racial knowledge through their comments about working with students of color in urban schooling environments. They pushed back against three powerful narratives of White racial knowledge that prevent productive engagement with students of color in urban schools. First, White racial knowledge views the student of color as lacking in some fundamental way, necessitating instructional approaches that help assimilate her or him into the White mainstream (McIntyre, 1997). The cultural or home knowledge that students bring to the classroom acts as a barrier rather than a foundation for instruction. Second, White racial knowledge positions the White teacher as a reformer, one who enters a chaotic educational space and injects common sense educational practices that help students learn (Titone, 1998). Third, White racial knowledge views issues of race and racism as separate from the education of the student of color (Sleeter, 2008). In this view, acknowledgement of racial differences or discussion of racial inequities only serves to discourage the

student and impede the apolitical nature of teaching. These narratives damage both students of color and White teachers, as they perpetuate a cycle of mistrust, failure, and frustration.

All three problematic elements of White racial knowledge reinforce one another in a destructive cycle. The process begins with the deficit orientation with which White teachers often approach students of color (Valencia, 2010). This mindset prevents teachers from recognizing the cultural assets of their students and instead promotes assimilationist pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995) that impose White, middle class ways of knowing and learning upon all students. When these assimilationist strategies fail and the student of color does not experience school success, the deficit orientation is reinforced and a culture of blaming the victim (Ryan, 1976) prevails. This, in turn, perpetuates the construct of the White teacher as savior or, as writer Teju Cole (2012) terms it, “the white-savior industrial complex,” a process that is less about justice and more about Whites “having a big emotional experience that validates privilege.” White preservice teachers acting as saviors position themselves as just, caring individuals working in chaotic, uncaring settings (McIntyre, 1997). Finally, the colorblindness embedded in the White savior discourses also leads White teachers to avoid explicit discussion of the workings of race and racism in their teaching. This avoidance negates the lived experiences of their students and limits opportunities for their students to identify themselves with the curriculum, a process that feeds into the deficit orientation and allows the cycle to continue.

The members of the Urban Cohort largely resisted this White racial knowledge in relation to working with students of color. In its place, they displayed transgressive White racial knowledge that considered the impact of sociocultural forces on the school experiences of students of color, eschewed White savior models, and positioned discussions of race and racism as integral to the functioning of their classrooms. This transgressive knowledge is firmly connected to their development of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959), as will be demonstrated throughout the findings.

Combatting deficit discourses towards students of color

The members of the Urban Cohort combatted deficit discourses when talking about the students of color they worked with in their field placements. One of the most prominent ways they refused to engage in this line of thinking came through their abilities to consider the ways in which outside forces influenced the academic interest and academic success of their students. Of all the members of the cohort, Michael expressed his views about the role of outside forces most eloquently:

> I just very much like understand that people's influences have determined a lot for them and so with my students, just realizing where they might be coming from with their own personal background, their knowledge…and, just how successful they are in school, all those factors are not contingent upon their ability solely or on their interest. I think often, especially with low-achieving students, you jump immediately to they're either not capable or they're not interested. But we often probably don't think that they have been influenced towards disinterest or that their family structure or their friends or just their social environment or their greater understanding of where their race group fits in society, that a lot of that is probably at play and so just for me, I guess a lot of my interests in urban education and most low SES schools is that they're just as capable, they're just as potentially interested. (Michael, interview, 2012)

Michael considered the influence of factors such as personal experiences, background knowledge, family and friend networks, and racial awareness of the student as impacting

student performance and engagement rather than simply labeling the student as under-achieving. Most importantly, Michael did not suggest that the social milieu of the student of color is one that discourages academic achievement, a common trope of deficit thinking. Instead, he suggested ways that students could be "influenced towards disinterest" through the lack of congruence between their experiences in schools and outside of schools (Ladson-Billings, 1995). He also hinted at the impact of racialized oppression in referencing their "understanding of where their race group fits in society," but he did not essentialize that experience or present students solely as victims of racial prejudice.

Michael's ability to engage with these topics using a sociological imagination undoubtedly arose from his background as a sociology major during his undergraduate studies. Michael referred to his undergraduate coursework frequently during classroom conversations, in his written responses, and in our two interviews. His analysis consistently considered the ways that individuals were shaped by outside forces. During the first race seminar, Michael commented that "we can't go into those schools with an idea of what these students are, we need to have a sense of a bigger story about them" (Michael, interview, 2012). This comment spoke specifically to the dangers of deficit thinking and, in calling for an appreciation of the "bigger story," suggested the need for the sociological imagination. Michael also considered how a teacher's expectations of a student can produce low academic achievement: "If I as the teacher assume academic characteristics or abilities onto my students because of their race, then they become that, either in my mind or more significantly in their own minds" (Michael, interview, 2012).

Michael’s critique of deficit thinking considered not just how such thinking impacts his approach, but also how it structures and constrains the schooling experiences of students of color.

Grace also offered a critique of deficit thinking and an appreciation for the role of outside forces on influencing student achievement:

> And so I feel like I’ve started to notice that I care a lot more about listening to my students and what they want to talk about and kind of work through and also just thinking about you know a lot of what we talked about in class is how a lot of times we view, you know, certain students and specifically minority students as deficient when in reality they’re not. They’re just…there’s so much more going on. Either what we’re giving them in the curriculum is counter to what they’ve been told about their own identity or they want to act upon certain things that are going on in their lives and they’re not getting the space to do that in school. So I think that I just see just in general that there’s so much potential to be tapped into in my students that I think sometimes gets overlooked in the classroom. (Grace, interview, 2012)

Similar to Michael’s comment, Grace noted that the lack of congruence between her students’ cultural backgrounds and the environment they experience in schools could influence them to disengage from academic work (Gay, 2000). In her mind, the achievement of these students is less about their abilities and more about how they are positioned to fail by a non-inclusive schooling system. The curriculum they experience does not provide “space” to act upon the problems in their lives and de-values their cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005).

Patrick echoed Grace’s sentiments about having a more open perspective toward students’ behaviors or abilities. He noted the importance of withholding judgment on a student’s capabilities based on their actions in a classroom. He suggested that his greater awareness of racial factors in education encouraged this way of thinking:

> And that helps in, you know, a 90% Hispanic school, you know, very different upbringing from what I had. You know, so for me to have those tools to look at race and the way it interacts I just feel like it opens me up more. Like I'm more, I'm going to be more okay with a situation that maybe wasn't similar to my upbringing. I may consider possibilities, maybe it's possible that this kid, this particular kid, is just having a really bad day and I need to be kind of open to [pause] I don't know, in that vein. (Patrick, interview, 2012)

In this example, Patrick referred to an unpleasant interaction he had with a student during one of his field observations. Rather than allowing this interaction to feed into stereotypes about students of color in urban schools as hostile or disrespectful, Patrick recognized that his own biases likely colored his interpretation of the event. His suggestion that the student could just be "having a really bad day" was an act of resistance to the self-fulfilling nature of racialized stereotypes (Lensmire, 2010). Patrick's ability to appreciate the way those stereotypes—a crucial element of White racial knowledge—impacted him displays his active resistance to deficit discourses. Referring back to the situation later on in our interview, he also noted the potential impact of broader social forces impacting the student's behavior: "He might be having trouble integrating with the system, with the type of schooling he is receiving…there's a clash there" (Patrick, interview, 2012). Through the use of the sociological imagination, Patrick noted the potential "clash" between the home and school cultures of his students.

Samuel offered a similar analysis that stemmed from his difficulties in interacting with particular students in his field placement:

> I could definitely feel a reticence the first several lessons when I would come up to students' tables and they…I just kind of got the brush off, like, we're fine, go away. So, I can see that in a circumstance where I didn't have the knowledge that I have learned that I would misinterpret that as rudeness, which, to be fair, it is kind of rude but I can see the reasons behind that. And, know that I have to work

> a little bit more to make that relationship rather than just getting ticked off by it. (Samuel, interview, 2012)

Much like Patrick, Samuel resisted his initial temptation to make judgments about the character of these students based upon their reception to him. Instead, Samuel appreciated "the reasons behind" the students' actions, alluding to his Whiteness and the possibility that the students initially viewed him with mistrust due to his outsider status in the school community.

Samuel further explained his interpretation of how sociocultural forces impacted the school experiences of students of color during our second interview. When I asked Samuel about the impact his growth in racial knowledge would have on how he viewed his students, he suggested it would be helpful "for being able to recognize different issues that students may be having in the classroom that affects their performance, whether it's racial or socioeconomic or gendered or ethnic or whatever it might be" (Samuel, interview, 2012). Samuel continued by contrasting this way of thinking with how he typically interacted with students during his time teaching in an English-language school in an Asian country:

> I know that when I taught in [Asia], I did not have this sort of training at all. You're just kind of kicked into a classroom. And I think not having any experience with it and combined with being pretty overworked, it became pretty easy for you to write off a student. And looking back on some of my practices then I know I was not a good teacher in the way that I should have been. (Samuel, Interview, 2012)

Samuel's experiences in Asia demonstrate the importance of preservice teachers developing an awareness of how racialized factors can influence student performance and

teachers' interpretations of student behaviors. Samuel's growing knowledge about race and racism changed his outlook on working with students of color.

Referencing his prior inclination to "write off" an under-performing student, Samuel noted his change in perspective:

> I can definitely see how I would have, I could have that same attitude or mindset about some of the students I have taught this semester like, you're not trying. Why aren't you trying? This is so easy, like I'm giving [you the answer] right here! But, then um knowing that the curriculum hasn't really been designed for their history, it's been designed for a history of the country that they live in but it's not the history that they're coming from necessarily. And, that there is, you know, massive inequality for socioeconomic reasons and for political reasons and kind of what they experience day-to-day and what I experienced day-to-day growing up are very different. (Samuel, interview, 2012)

Rather than viewing his students' efforts from a deficit perspective, Samuel noted the disconnection between their personal and familial histories and the official knowledge (Apple, 2000) of the school curriculum. He referenced structural factors that discourage student achievement and expressed awareness of the differences between his background and the backgrounds of his students. While Samuel's appreciation that outside forces and institutional barriers might impact the performance of certain students is an important critique for him to internalize, Samuel's acknowledgment of the "day-to-day" differences between him and many of his students is also a significant component of the sociological imagination. Samuel came from a privileged economic background and attended elite private schools for much of his life. For him, moving away from "you're not trying" when thinking about his students involved making the imaginative leap of considering how his students' day-to-day lives impacted their responses to him and their engagement with the course material.

Paige also commented on the importance of recognizing the influence of her normative assumptions of what an educational setting should look like. When reflecting on her initial reaction to the participation patterns of the students in her field placement, Paige displayed the sociological imagination in action:

> It's like okay, they're not really being disruptive. I'm like [pause] I've come from a culture that views school in this one kind of way and that's not necessarily how it has to be. A classroom doesn't have to be this quiet kind of thing. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Paige's sentiments were echoed by other members of the cohort as well, most notably Grace and Ana. All three noted the importance of appreciating the different communication styles and learning styles of the students they encountered in their field placements. A recognition that school does not have to be "this one kind of way" represents an exercise in the sociological imagination. Paige resisted some of the negative associations made by many teachers and students in Lei's (2003) study, and instead worked to reimagine what a classroom might look like. Paige went on to reference her interest in reading about "how White teachers, White women teachers do this, and they're very passive and we read how like Black students are more likely to do this and I…it was really helpful" (Paige, interview, 2012). Although Paige alluded to essentialized understandings in this statement, she also suggested that an appreciation for cultural difference allowed her to avoid attaching deficit notions to her students.

Discussion

The ability of the members of the Urban Cohort to espouse anti-deficit views towards students of color represents transgressive White racial knowledge. Most importantly, the preservice teachers did not engage in their anti-deficit talk with

platitudes about the potential of "all" children to succeed if only give the proper opportunities and attention (Haviland, 2008). Such discourses would only position themselves as saviors for students of color who are trapped in chaotic educational environments without structure or support. Instead, the preservice teachers went to great lengths to note the structural forces that impeded their students' ability to succeed. They discussed the lack of congruence between the students' home and school cultures, they noted the impact of a curriculum that did not consider all students worthy of inclusion, and they considered the impact of racism on their students' school experiences. By employing their sociological imaginations (Mills, 1959), the preservice teachers considered the implications of sociocultural forces on the lives of their students without resorting to over-essentializing discourses of pity and without placing blame on students for their level of achievement. They reflected upon the level of engagement and academic achievement of students of color in urban schools within a broader sociohistorical context yet also allowed space for individual agency. In short, they took pains to consider the intersection of biography and history called for by Mills. In contrast with the colorblind and meritocratic discourses that dominate White racial knowledge (Bell, 2002; Ullucci & Battey, 2011), the members of the Urban Cohort demonstrated transgressive White racial knowledge.

A critique of the White savior model

One of the most powerful tropes in urban education involves the White teacher as savior, the enlightened, energetic, and rational actor who injects inspiration and order into the chaotic educational space of the failing urban school. The critical acclaim and box

office success of films such as *Freedom Writers* (LaGravenese, 2007) and *Dangerous Minds* (Smith, 1995) testify to the appeal of the White savior narrative. White preservice teachers who operate from this narrative imagine themselves rescuing students of color from the low standards and uncaring environments they experience on a daily basis (McIntyre, 1997; Schick, 2000; Titone, 1998). As mentioned previously, the idea of the White savior is an important element of White racial knowledge about students of color. The success of a program such as Teach for America (TFA) and the social capital it provides for current and former members of the program demonstrate the pervasiveness of this narrative. As Samuel noted in our interview, “When I talk to people about what I am doing they’re like, oh, you’re doing Teach for America? That’s so noble” (Samuel, interview, 2012). The suggestion that a White teacher who teaches in an urban setting is acting nobly makes implicit statements that condemn the character of urban schools and students of color (Watson, 2012). By resisting this trope, the members of the urban teaching cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge. Similar to their resistance to deficit discourses, the White preservice teachers deployed their sociological imaginations when considering their role in urban schools.

The members of the cohort offered critiques of the savior narrative in a variety of ways. Some addressed the notion quite explicitly while others did so indirectly. In one of his writing responses, Michael took specific aim at TFA:

> We've talked in class about the potential ills of a program like Teach for America, that despite great intention, may have inherent issue from the fact that these teachers view themselves as saving, fixing, or coming to the aid of low-income, minority students and schools. (Michael, written communication, 2012)

Michael referenced a rather brief conversation that occurred during one of the earlier class meetings of the semester. During this discussion, initiated by negative comments about TFA from Thomas and Paige, several members of the cohort critiqued TFA due to the lack of preparation the organization provides teachers prior to placing them in schools. A consensus formed around the idea that TFA does not provide teachers with a proper theoretical understanding of why students of color in urban schools underperform on most academic measures. Michael felt TFA desired to fix urban schools but did not have an appreciation for the systemic factors that contribute to their academic struggles.

Other members of the cohort offered less direct critiques of the White savior narrative, doing so by expressing their feelings of hesitation in cultivating a culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) style of teaching:

> Can they really trust me, a white person, who has no sense of their community or their heritage? Perhaps I'm being too sensitive to racial differences, but I don't want them to think that I'm imposing my whiteness on them in the classroom. Or, even worse, what if I try to connect to them through something from their culture (such as a text by a Latino or black author), and they feel like I'm appropriating their cultural experience, or that I'm being phony? I mean, I don't WANT to be Michelle Pfeiffer (and pretty much every friend—all white—that I talk to about my program makes that comparison). (Paige, written communication, 2012)

Paige's desire to avoid associations with Michelle Pfeiffer, the White teacher from *Dangerous Minds,* highlights her awareness of the power of the White savior narrative. Her comments critiqued the White savior model through a desire to access her students' cultural backgrounds in her teaching while also remaining conscious of the "appropriation" that might entail. Paige feared "imposing [her] whiteness" upon students, suggesting that she appreciated the insidious ways in which her perceptions of

school and learning might negatively impact her students. At the same time, however, Paige feared that attempts at cultural relevance might also ring hollow to students.

Paige’s competing fears of appearing “phony” in enacting culturally relevant pedagogies and of imposing Whiteness by teaching in a style more similar to what she experienced speak back to the White savior narrative. Paige does not speak from a place of confidence in knowing what her students will need, nor does she speak with a naïve sense that utilizing multiple perspectives in her lesson planning will provide easy connections with her students. Much like Michael’s comments above, Paige considered the cultural and racial complexity of her teaching assignment and resisted positioning herself as an expert in what her students needed to succeed academically. Both Paige and Michael’s comments displayed the sociological imagination at work by understanding the impact of the White savior narrative. Kevin’s comments on this topic, however, provide the most complete example of understanding the narrative’s implications for urban teacher preparation.

Of all the members in the cohort, Kevin articulated the critique of the White savior model most extensively. Throughout my interactions with Kevin, he proved to be very adept at taking a broad perspective on the idea of urban teaching. He problematized his role as a White teacher in schools populated predominantly with students of color and displayed an awareness of the colonizing potential of such an endeavor:

> When I decided I was going to apply to programs that would be geared toward teaching "urban" (a term I'm very conflicted about—why don't we just say "black and Hispanic"—why do we have to use this euphemism? Another case, I think, of avoiding race, just call it "urban") youth, I felt some guilt and hesitancy. I almost felt like I was taking on what Kipling called "the white man's burden." I really thought about trying to avoid a conception of myself as some kind of savior for

> people of color--I mean, what a ridiculous idea. Yet, it is still there. It is still a powerful narrative in our culture that we don't like to bring to the surface and confront. (Kevin, written communication, 2012)

Kevin crafted this comment in response to the first writing prompt I provided the cohort prior to our first Race Seminar. The prompt asked them to consider what role their racial identities would have on their experiences as teachers in racially diverse environments. Kevin overtly problematized his role by drawing on the "powerful narrative in our culture" of the White teacher as savior. He described feelings of "guilt and hesitancy" in entering such environments. However, these feelings do not arise out of fear or from deficit notions about the students he will teach. Instead, they arise from an appreciation for the way in which he might be viewed as an outsider working in schools quite different from those he attended. Kevin knows that he will have difficulty acting outside of this narrative due to the long history of White paternalism towards communities of color. Kevin critiqued the idea of the White savior as "ridiculous," not to refute the claim that White teachers often view themselves in this manner, but to suggest the fallacy of such a narrative. Kevin also suggested that the use of the term "urban" to describe our teaching cohort served as a code word that obscured the racial demographics of the schools in which the preservice teachers would work. Kevin's contention that the use of the term "urban" connotes an environment consisting almost exclusively of students of color represented a break from the typical avoidance of such direct race talk by White teachers (Watson, 2012).

Kevin continued with his critique of the White savior narrative in his final writing response after the third Race Seminar. This prompt asked the members of the cohort to

reflect on ideas from the seminars that surprised them or challenged them and asked them to put forth questions they still had regarding the impact of race on their development as teachers. Kevin returned to his critique, this time a bit more forcefully:

> We have talked a little bit about this idea of colonization. I find this to be an interesting topic in the context of urban teaching. It's like we want to help those who are less advantaged, but by assuming a position of power (as a teacher) in their community (by the means of school), we are—in a way—perpetuating this system of advantage. We are assuming a leadership position within what one could define as a culture of disadvantage. What does this all mean? Sometimes I find this enterprise to be a bit absurd. Around the country, professors and students (mostly white, often coming from pretty nice areas) are talking about how to increase achievement in areas they didn't grow up in, with black and Latino students they didn't grow up with, in contexts they are largely unfamiliar with…Like I said, kind of an absurd and tragic state of affairs. (Kevin, written communication, 2012)

In this response, Kevin addressed the notion of colonization directly and levied a staunch critique of the paternalism embedded in efforts to prepare White teachers to teach in communities of color. His critique aligns with Alcoff's (1998) suggestion that "White support for antiracism is often…flawed: riven with supremacist pretentions and an extension at times of the colonizer's privilege to decide the true, the just, and the culturally valuable" (p. 6). Although Kevin ended this comment on a very pessimistic note, he suggested later in the response that he desired to "use [his] advantage to possibly benefit those who do not have the same kind of advantage" (Kevin, written communication, 2012). Kevin clearly feels the problematic nature of this endeavor but, again, he does not offer this critique as a way to remove him from blame or reject the validity of the program. He does so to highlight the importance of remaining cognizant of larger social and historical forces in which he takes part.

Kevin's comments display elements of the sociological imagination. Kevin took a critical view of his role in the broader project of White teachers working in racially diverse urban schools. Kevin situated his desire to work in such schools within a history that has often entailed Whites bringing a colonizing (Memmi, 1965) mindset to working in communities of color. Importantly, Kevin did not access this problematic history, or Kipling's "White man's burden," in order to distance himself from such associations. Instead, he squarely implicated himself in the ongoing production of those narratives by noting the inherent tensions that arise from entering "areas [he] didn't grow up in, with black and Latino students [he] didn't grow up with." While Kevin did not enjoy the feelings of "guilt and hesitancy" that marked his endeavors into working with communities of color, he did not shy away from them either. For Kevin, the sociological imagination helped him to find a space to operate within that did not exonerate his complicitness in this system but that also did not leave him on the sidelines, unable to act.

Double bind of the 'White ally'

The sociological imagination helped Kevin appreciate how the cultural narrative of the White savior would always shape his role as a teacher in such schools. This understanding helped him to navigate within what Ellsworth (1997) calls the double bind of the "White ally." This double bind occurs from two conflicting forces. First, it stems from the inability of the White savior to enter into communities of color on an equal playing field. This inability is produced by the privileged nature of Whiteness that allows for the positioning of Whites as saviors in the first place. Second, it stems from the notion that most antiracist efforts entail taking action in communities of color to help those

victimized by racism, a process that re-insribes the notion of the White savior. This double bind creates a scenario in which there is no room to act outside of the innocent-guilty binary. In this binary, the individual who desires to be a White ally cannot take action to disrupt racism without becoming complicit in one of the modes of its reproduction. Taking action and maintaining innocence—which would require entering on a level playing field—is not possible, yet refusing to take action in the face of obvious inequities also removes claims of innocence. This causes a significant predicament for White preservice teachers hoping to do antiracist work, as they often imagine themselves as the "good Whites" (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Fellows & Razack, 1998; Ringrose, 2007). When White preservice teachers are forced to confront the ways in which they are complicit in the reproduction of racism, it serves as a significant attack on the "White, middle class helper" (Schick, 2000) identity they often construct for themselves.

Discussion

While the sociological imagination does not allow the White teacher to exit the innocent-guilty binary completely, it does allow for an understanding of why the White savior narrative is problematic and why their presence in communities of color might arouse suspicion. Seidl and Hancock (2011) use the term "double image" to refer to a White identity structure that appreciates the historical reasons for mistrust of White teachers:

> Perhaps one of the most important understandings that a mature double image provides those of us who are White is the knowledge that we may have to work to earn trust and respect rather than just assume these conditions. We earn this trust and respect through our behavior and by demonstrating our commitment to supporting and loving our children and the communities in which we work. Ultimately, it is our behavior that will communicate who we really are as people

> and as teachers and that will begin to dispel the negative expectations that may be attached to our skin color. (p. 706)

Many of the members of the Urban Cohort developed this appreciation for the notion of the White savior. They knew they did not enter urban schools with a blank slate and that they might have to work harder to make connections with students of color. They knew that they would have to challenge themselves in how they designed their lessons and encouraged student engagement. They considered that their version of what a classroom should look like was not the only version of what a classroom could look like.

The comments of Michael, Paige, and Kevin demonstrated an awareness of the larger sociopolitical context in which they operated. They did not have answers for what they should do and they were not shy in expressing their concerns about how effective they could be in working with students of color. While it might be possible to interpret their hesitation and misgivings as signs of resistance or of deficit thinking, I find it more persuasive that they tread cautiously out of an appreciation for the complicated nature of their teaching assignments. These teachers did not have simplistic views of themselves as saviors of students of color. In this way, they demonstrated transgressive White racial knowledge regarding their roles as White teachers in communities of color.

Teaching about race and racism

The final aspect of White racial knowledge relevant to how the members of the Urban Cohort talked about students of color involves the reluctance to address race and racism in the classroom. The reluctance to acknowledge the salience of these issues comes from a number of areas. At perhaps the most fundamental level, adherence to colorblind perspectives on race blocks such classroom discussions. Colorblind discourses

regard any discussion of race as perpetuating racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) and suggest that treating children differently based upon their race promotes inequality (Cochran-Smith, 1995). However, many teachers who espouse colorblind perspectives often make statements that reveal the ways in which they very much notice race and make judgments based upon the race of a student (Bell, 2002; Lewis, 2008; Pollock, 2009). With this in mind, it is much more compelling to understand White reticence about racial issues as arising from a range of insecurities related to their own racial identity and their position in a racialized society (Mazzei, 2008). White teachers might feel that they lack knowledge about race due to the often invisible ways in which their racial identities mediate their interaction with the world (McIntosh, 1989). White teachers might also feel afraid of portraying themselves as racist by saying the wrong thing or by upsetting others (Winans, 2005). Many White teacher candidates might felt confused about how to talk about race or how to acknowledge the existence of racism in a positive manner (Dickar, 2008).

Whether White teachers honestly feel that a colorblind approach to their students promotes equity or if they evade racial discussions out of fear and insecurity, the unwritten rule of White racial knowledge remains the same: discussions of race and racism have no place in the classroom. The members of the Urban Cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge through their consistent assertions that talking about race and racism promoted equity and should occupy a prominent place in their classrooms. The cohort members expressed their desire to address racialized incidents when they occurred in the classroom; to talk about race as a social concept and racism as

a social force; and to design lessons in their disciplines that explicitly address racial issues. As future social studies and language arts teachers, the Urban Cohort members felt their subject areas provided numerous opportunities for overt discussions of race and racism. I organize their willingness to address race in their teaching into the categories of the public transcript of race and the hidden transcript of race. These categories borrow from Scott's (1990) work on the ways that subaltern groups interact with dominant groups differently in public and private spaces. After providing examples of the Urban Cohort members' thinking about addressing race in their teaching, I will make connections to the ways the sociological imagination influenced their approach.

The public and hidden transcripts of race

The members of the Urban Cohort imagined a range of ways in which an explicit discussion of race and racism would occur in their teaching. While many of their comments, particularly those of the social studies teachers, noted their desire to teach about racialized historical events in the formal curricula such as slavery or the Civil Rights Movement, they also suggested an interest in addressing race in ways not prescribed by their course materials. They spoke of using racialized moments that occurred in the normal course of classroom events (e.g. use of racial stereotypes by students, student assertions of racial identity) as platforms to help students explore race as a social force and to deconstruct its effects. Many also commented that they hoped to serve as advocates for students of color by finding ways to acknowledge the structural obstacles that exist in schools and society. The distinction between the public transcripts (curricular) and hidden transcripts (extracurricular) of race provides a nuanced view of

how the Urban Cohort members sought to address race and displays their transgressive White racial knowledge in action.

Scott (1990) coined the terms public transcript and hidden transcript in his study of how subordinate groups resisted subjugation by dominant groups. Scott uses the public transcript to refer to the "open interaction between subordinates and those who dominate" (p. 2). He notes that subaltern groups use a public transcript of deference and acceptance of domination in hopes of ensuring physical safety and avoiding contested encounters with those in positions of power. Outside of this public stage, however, subordinate groups engage in a counter discourse that consists of "speeches, gestures, and practices that confirm, contradict, or inflect what appears in the public transcript" (Scott, 1990, pp. 4-5). The hidden transcript acts as a form of agency and resistance to the unequal power relations that subordinate groups experience in societal interactions. Scott uses these constructs to analyze the impact of domination on public discourse, but I find them useful for categorizing the Urban Cohort's views on addressing race in their teaching.

By bringing race-based instruction into the formal aspects of their instruction, the preservice teachers operated somewhat within the bounds of their curricular standards and course content. Even if they adopt a more critical perspective on a historical event or a piece of literature, they still act largely within the parameters of a public transcript. They talk about race within their discipline and, therefore, do so in a public transcript fashion. However, when they make extracurricular decisions to address racialized moments in their classrooms or when they engage students in discussions about the structural constraints they face in society, they engage in the hidden transcript of race

discussion. Scott (1990) notes that the “hidden transcript is produced for a different audience and under different constraints of power than the public transcript” (p. 5). The Urban Cohort felt a need to make this hidden transcript of race a prominent part of their classroom, displaying transgressive White racial knowledge. Fundamentally, this desire came from their belief that race mattered and from a position of wanting to help students navigate the racial terrain of their social worlds.

The public transcript of race instruction

Many members of the cohort felt that accessing the public transcript of race in their instruction played an essential role in working with students of color. For one of the final questions in the first interview with each participant, I asked them what they would want a student who spent a year in their classroom to know about race and racism. This question provided powerful insights into what the members of the cohort found significant in teaching and in learning about race. Zach responded by suggesting that he wanted his students to build frameworks for understanding race and other forms of societal difference:

> I guess understanding [race is] very critical like in the foundation of pretty much everything. I mean whether you see it obviously or not, you can find it there. At least in some shape or form. So I don’t mean [pause] obviously race goes with class and power and all those types of things so I guess what I would want my students to take away is to look for those relationships, those struggles that are in between groups and individuals and interests more so than like colorblindness. (Zach, interview, 2012)

Zach’s goals for his students suggest that he wants them to develop an understanding of race as a structural force that stratifies society. Zach did not lean on individualistic understandings of race, as many White teachers do (Sleeter, 1993). His statement that

race is essential "in the foundation of pretty much everything" showed his appreciation for the systemic nature of race and how it structures all aspects of society. Grace echoed Zach's comments on the pervasive nature of racism in society, a central tenet of critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), when she desired that her students understand that, "race is something that is normal in our society" (Grace, interview, 2012).

Members of the cohort also discussed the strategies they would use when teaching the public transcript of race. Zach and Michael, in particular, discussed how they would approach this knowledge with students. Zach discussed how a teacher could present critical renditions of racialized historical events while also addressing state curricular standards and meeting the demands of standardized testing:

> You can manipulate the curriculum in a way that still presents you know the necessary historical facts and things that are necessary for standardized tests but still convey a broader message and a bigger understanding of the big topics. Rather than being like, oh, Columbus or whoever, you can still rip them apart but I just don't want to be a part of the class that is ripping apart the system. I'd rather be like, here's the evidence, here's this or that, and let them kind of craft it more. Rather than being like, alright, guys, all of this is wrong or this stuff is not true, I guess that's what I was trying to get through. (Zach, interview, 2012)

Zach resisted resorting to a banking style (Freire, 1970) of teaching and asserted his desire to craft constructivist learning opportunities that allow students to create their own understandings of historical events. His "manipulation" of the curriculum allows for him to address required content from a more critical perspective. Zach used Christopher Columbus as an example of a common historical topic that contains overt racial elements and that often serves as a target of revisionist historians (Bigelow & Peterson, 1998; Zinn, 1980). Zach's suggestion that he "[doesn't] want to be a part of the class that is ripping apart the system" lends itself to a few different interpretations. On the surface, it

might suggest that he feels the teacher should not insert personal views into his or her teaching. However, Zach made this comment in response to looking over our initial interview transcript. In the first interview, Zach suggested that he wanted to act as "an inside man" (Zach, interview, 2012) as a teacher, providing students access to critical interpretations of history. By the time of the second interview, after spending a semester in secondary classrooms teaching a number of lessons, Zach began to value the importance of letting students explore information and build understandings on their own. The above comment suggests that Zach's primary strategy for teaching the public transcript of race involved student exploration rather than teacher-centered instruction.

Zach also transgressed against White racial knowledge by suggesting that he wanted his students to build conceptual understandings of race and racism as structural and as socially constructed forces:

> I can understand trying to teach them about the structure and how these things are built, right? I can see that idea. And then breaking down the idea that race is this made-up thing even though it is something that has been constantly taught to them and this and that. I think that you could do with upper, with that part of the conversation, you could do with older high school students but I think it would have to be a devoted, I don't think it could occur in like just kind of in the context of, you know, it could be brought up in a unit when you're talking about something but it would have to be multiple days, um, and like really hammering it down. It wouldn't be just like, oh, did you know that, you know, race is not real [laughs]? (Zach, interview, 2012)

Like Zach's previous comment in this section, this statement asserted the importance of teaching race as a structural rather than an individual phenomenon. Additionally, his statements about race as "this made-up thing" and as "not real" display his knowledge of race as a social construction that enacts material consequences on all raced individuals (Omi & Winant, 1994). Zach's commitment to debunking biological understandings of

race in an explicit fashion displays transgressive White racial knowledge. Furthermore, Zach's desire to help his students build conceptual understandings of race differs from a desire to teach about race through historical events. By providing his students with frameworks to understand race sociologically, he can allow them to see race as an ongoing rather than historical phenomenon (Schmidt, 2005).

Michael took this sociological approach several steps further, using it as a framework to think about racism as a social force supported by more than just a few "bad men doing bad things" (Brown & Brown, 2010). Michael's background in sociology from his undergraduate studies undoubtedly aided his development of this strategy for helping his students think about race and racism beyond the realm of the individual:

> I would want them to view their lives and my life and the school and the state and all of that as socially-produced realities. As like more than individual acts. So when they are understanding race historically, slavery wasn't a few white slave owners who were bad people and who were just individually corrupt. It was socially accepted and socially enabled by the United States as a whole until we finally had enough pushback that said, no, this isn't okay and we're going to do something about it. (Michael, interview, 2012)

By asking his students to consider individual beliefs and actions as "socially-produced realities," Michael laid the groundwork for a sophisticated understanding of how US institutions supported racist laws and practices throughout US history. Although the system of slavery might represent an example of a racialized topic that lends itself well to a structural analysis, framing slavery as "socially accepted and socially enabled" is far from common (Loewen, 2007, 2009; Wasburn, 1997). Michael also frames slave owners as more than just "individually corrupt," which places an emphasis on critiquing the system that enabled slavery rather than just the individual slave owners.

At a later point in the same interview, Michael elaborated on the benefits of buttressing historical discussions of race with a sociological understanding of race:

> I think the biggest thing, which I think can be less contentious is to just promote an idea in my students to look at any person or situation in a social context. So don't think of, you know, you see a news report of some guy who murdered people. Don't just think that guy is a delinquent. What is his social reality? Where does he come from? Why did he turn to criminality? What's going on? And maybe when it comes down to it that guy is maybe still a delinquent and whatever but there's other aspects. And don't think of a junkie as someone who just made a bad choice. Like why did they…how did their life end up there? There were a lot of people involved in their life, directly and indirectly, and that person ended up there as a result of all of that. Not just as, um, their own. I think that's the biggest thing because from there whether they take a more positive, egalitarian view of race or not, at least if they make that initial step of viewing everything as a social, as socially driven, then at least you can pursue those other conversations, I think. (Michael, interview, 2012)

Michael covered a lot of ground in this response. He returned to his previous contention that he wanted his students to think about events and individuals within a broader societal and historical context rather than in isolation. He provided examples of how one might use this framework by discussing how individuals could turn to deviance, criminality, or drug addiction as a result of more than their individual choices. By implicating the social environment in which the individual made these choices, Michael encouraged his students to move away from a naïve understanding of the primacy of the individual in social life (Mills, 1959). Most interestingly, Michael suggested that he would encourage this framework as a "less contentious" way to teach about race. Michael felt that if his students internalized this sociological approach, they could use it to develop a "more positive, egalitarian view of race." Michael hoped that his students would develop a way of thinking about social life that allowed them to move beyond an individual analysis and towards a broader social and historical critique.

Zach, Michael, and Grace felt that the public transcript of race should play an important role in their instruction. Grace hoped to position discussions of race and inclusion of racialized historical events as normal in her classroom. Zach and Michael took the public transcript of race even further, speaking about how they would craft learning opportunities for their students and help their students build conceptual frameworks for thinking about race and other forms of social difference. By explicitly addressing the topic of race within their formal curricula, these members of the Urban Cohort demonstrated a commitment to including the public transcript of race. These preservice teachers displayed transgressive White racial knowledge in their willingness to center the topic of race in the curriculum, a move away from the race-less pedagogies of many White teachers (Chandler, 2009).

Hidden transcript of race instruction

In addition to their desires to bring race into their formal curricula, many members of the Urban Cohort also stressed the importance of addressing racial issues when they occurred organically in their classrooms. Rather than glossing over (Haviland, 2008) racialized moments, the teacher candidates wanted to use those moments to interrogate the concept of race and to ask their students to think critically about their racial worlds. I designated these events as part of the hidden transcript of race precisely because they appear in extracurricular moments. The desire of the members of the cohort to use these moments as a platform to talk about race differs from their desire to integrate racial topics into the curriculum. It acknowledges the salience of race in the lives of their students and demonstrates a commitment to help students unpack these issues. Their

attention to this hidden transcript occurred in two ways. First, they expressed a desire to use student comments about race (e.g. use of racial stereotypes by students, student assertions of racial identity) as platforms to help students deconstruct the role of race in social life. Second, many commented that they hoped to serve as advocates for students of color by finding ways to acknowledge the structural obstacles that exist in schools and society.

Zach provided a common example of how the teachers considered the first hidden transcript category. During our first interview, I asked Zach what expectations he had for the race seminars I conducted with the cohort. He responded by saying that he thought the seminars might provide examples of "ways to talk about race to the kids in your class" (Zach, interview, 2012), which Zach felt would be largely ineffectual for dealing with the complexity of race as an issue and some of his personal discomfort with the topic. Zach anticipated the seminars might suggest methods or strategies (Bartolome, 1994) rather than focusing on developing critical understandings of race and racism. He appreciated that the Race Seminars focused on building conceptual understandings of race (see chapter 3). The following excerpt from our interview demonstrates Zach's thinking about how he would use his conceptual understandings to address the hidden transcript of race. Zach commented on how he would address the use of stereotypes by his students:

> Zach: I think now I feel like I know a better thing than just saying you know, not just the response of saying, you know, that's not true, not everyone is like that. Now you have an explanation of why, you know, people look that way.
>
> Ryan: So you feel the more foundational knowledge is helpful for when those situations come up in class?

> Zach: Yes.
>
> Ryan: How would it be helpful?
>
> Zach: Yeah, I think that kind of idea would be helpful for everyone, right, when we talk about understanding race and you know explaining to students, you know, something happens um you know you can talk about not just these [pause] mean things people say or do um but rather you can talk about um I guess how, I don't know, I guess I am trying to say the context of everything. Because it's like race is so shied away from so having this better foundation of exactly what it is and how it comes about, you can kind of just blow the door wide open on it rather than you know trying to patch things up constantly. So, I'm thinking something were to arise in class, if that were to happen then it's like, okay, instead of just throwing a bandaid on it, it's like let's really get into it and talk about kind of you know why these things are the way the are. (Zach, interview, 2012)

Zach expressed a desire to "get into it" rather than "throwing a bandaid" over a situation in which a student makes a racialized comment or deploys a stereotype in a simplistic fashion. Instead of brushing off a student's comment by saying, "not everyone is like that," Zach desired to use such a comment as a learning opportunity for his students. Zach's comment illustrates how a teacher can address the hidden transcript of race during instruction. He suggested that his appreciation for racism as being more than "just these mean things people say" allows him to engage his students in a meaningful discussion.

Patrick also expressed a desire to address the hidden transcript of race in his classroom. During Patrick's third written reflection, which asked members of the Urban Cohort to discuss their biggest takeaways from the seminars, he talked about feeling empowered to address racialized moments when they arose in his classroom:

> The biggest takeaway for me would be the ability to diligently think through racialized scenarios without feeling rushed through them (a racialized 'scenario' being one where racism was especially salient, such as a two students throwing around racist remarks). I think I've always had an appreciation for these types of encounters, but tended to feel pressure to either "diffuse" the situation or avoid it

> entirely. I probably had more of a mind to avoid these types of situations. I feel a bit differently now. It's almost like I possess a bit more fortitude and feel less inclined to shy away. (Patrick, written communication, 2012)

Patrick provided the most explicit example of desiring to address the hidden transcript of race in his teaching. During our first interview, Patrick mentioned the many ways in which he saw racial elements in his teaching placement, either through an awareness of his Whiteness in a place populated mostly with people of color or through noticing the sometimes tense racial dynamics between the African American and Latino students in his school setting (Patrick, interview, 2012). His experiences discussing race in the seminars emboldened him to tackle these racial moments when they arose in his classroom. Patrick's previous desire to "diffuse" or to "avoid" the situation is typical of many White teachers when the topic of race arises (Epstein, 2009; Lewis, 2008). Patrick desired to use these moments as learning opportunities for his students.

During our second interview, I asked Patrick to explain how he would go about addressing such a situation. While he did not articulate a particularly cogent strategy, his comments provided some insights into how he might address a hidden transcript moment. Patrick stated that when a student used a racist remark, he would simply ask the student to explain her or himself. Patrick felt that requiring the student to talk through the tacit, unspoken, and inferred elements of a racial comment would create a powerful learning opportunity. It would help to deconstruct the racial logic driving the statement, and it would open up the comment for discussion and critique by the class. He used an example of this strategy from a recent family situation in which he felt his parents were unjustifiably concerned about his younger sister's decision to room with an African

American woman for her first year of college. While the parents suggested that their concerns arose from not knowing the young woman, Patrick felt that racial elements played a role as well and he pushed his parents on this point. In Patrick's recounting of the event, his parents backed away from the critique at the moment Patrick asked if the woman's race played a role in their thinking and the conversation shifted topics. While it represents a small example, Patrick made a commitment that he would no longer let the unspoken meanings of such a comment go unchecked. He hoped to employ such a strategy in his classroom, seeking out racialized moments and using them as opportunities for engaging his students in discussion about the meaning and history behind the use of stereotypes or other racially coded language.

While Patrick and Zach provided examples of seizing upon unplanned classroom moments in order to address the hidden transcript of race in their instruction, several other members of the cohort felt a responsibility to find opportunities to highlight the operation of race and racism in society. Collectively, these responses expressed a desire to act as advocates for the students in their classrooms, finding opportunities to discuss social inequality along racial lines and to engage their students in conversations on the issue. Paige offered an example of how the preservice teachers imagined themselves addressing racial issues in order to act as advocates for their students. Paige viewed her role as a teacher in regards to the topic of race as

> Making them aware, making them aware of these powers that be that are stacked against them. Making them, yeah, making the hidden curriculum visible for them to go…to make them aware and to go forth from there and be like, but this isn't, these things are against you but that doesn't mean this has to continue you know like you, yeah, giving them the tools that they need. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Paige's comments related to the hidden transcript of race instruction through her desire to make racial obstacles explicit. This contrasts with the way that many White teachers disregard these forces in their approach with students of color (Bell, 2002; Haviland, 2008). Paige, like many other members of the cohort, walked a fine line on this topic. She desired to talk openly about racism and discrimination with the hopes of empowering her students, but she also wanted to imbue her students with a sense of agency, letting them know that, "these things are against you but that doesn't mean it has to continue." Although Paige remained vague on how she might "give them the tools they need," her desire to eschew colorblindness and to talk frankly about racism displayed transgressive White racial knowledge.

Thomas echoed Paige's sentiments, yet with a more robust vision of his role in addressing the hidden transcript of race in his instruction:

> I think I would want [my students], with the idea of race, to have a broader understanding of the racial structures in America, how they benefit and don't benefit certain people. But also I guess a level of fluency within the system, right? Like there has to be some sort of my responsibility that we can't all be 'kumbaya,' there has to be some sort of well, some sort of resistance but resistance through, it has to be through the system. That's what's kind of funny with all of our discussions is that we've all succeeded in it and so, I mean as a private school kid I was plucked out of it you know, I wasn't even really in it. So it's like there needs to be…[pause] that's kind of what I struggled a lot with especially with literacy and African American Vernacular English and stuff like that. I want to promote that and the culture of that but there is a level of access that you don't receive if you can't manipulate standard English. But understanding the purpose behind it, that's the big thing. Like, okay, now I'm in this environment so I'm going to present myself this way. It's really just enhancing the way you can communicate with people. (Thomas, interview, 2012)

Similar to Paige, Thomas' comment straddled the line between helping his students develop an appreciation for the "racial structures in America" and gaining a "level of

fluency within the system." Thomas hoped to be honest about the normalized nature of Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993) in a society like the US and how that power structure would devalue the cultural capital many students of color possess. However, Thomas also hoped to promote the use of African American Vernacular English (Rickford & Labov, 1999) in his classes. As a language arts teacher, Thomas felt this medium could provide a platform for his African American students to express themselves and engage with the course material and assignments. Thomas balanced these somewhat competing concerns through his desire to position these alternative modes of communication as additive—"enhancing the way you can communicate"—but also appropriate only for certain social situations. Thomas' statements express a desire for his students to learn the "codes of power" (Delpit, 2006) without creating an environment that devalued the modes of communication they brought with them to the classroom. Thomas also displayed an awareness of his personal relationship to these issues. Thomas appreciated that he is a product of a system that served him well but that he now views as inequitable. His success within the education system pushed him to teach his students the "level of access" he feels is necessary for their social welfare while also valuing their cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005)..

Litzy also touched upon a desire to address the hidden transcript of race in her instruction. In response to the interview question about what she hoped her students would learn about race in her classroom, Litzy expounded on her position as an advocate for the students of color in her classroom:

> So I think that making it explicit that you might be denied certain things because of certain aspects of your culture like race, gender, sexuality, class, all of those

> things, might have something to do with what…But because of this system that's in place you might not have access to certain things and I want them to come out of the class knowing that they can resist that and that they should have access to everything and that any point in their life they might experience something that is because of…they might experience something that is due to their race. (Litzy, interview, 2012)

Litzy jumps around a bit during her response, but she attempted to make it clear that, like Paige and Thomas, she hoped to be honest with her students about the obstacles they might face while also emboldening them to take action against those injustices. While Litzy's articulation of how she would help her students navigate this terrain is vague—"they should have access to everything"—her desire to speak frankly about social inequality positions her thoughts on this issue as transgressive. Litzy, along with Paige and Thomas, provided compelling examples of addressing the hidden transcript of race in their instruction through their stated desires to act as advocates for their students.

Discussion

Throughout their interviews and written reflections, the members of the Urban Cohort expressed a desire to teach about race and racism in their classrooms. As detailed above, the manner in which they addressed the issues of race and racism varied, falling into the categories of the public (curricular) and the hidden (extracurricular) transcripts of race. For the public transcript of race instruction, Zach and Michael discussed how they might help their students build frameworks for understanding racial inequality through the content of their courses while Patrick and Grace talked about the importance of centering racial topics so that their students could feel connected to the curriculum. For the hidden transcript, Patrick and Zach talked about how they would capitalize on unplanned racialized moments in their classroom to open up conversations about race and

its impact. Litzy, Thomas, and Paige talked about how they would look for opportunities to engage in honest conversations about social inequities and how their students might equip themselves to face these injustices. As a whole, their desire to talk explicitly about race and racism in their teaching represents transgressive White racial knowledge. Rather than accessing colorblind discourses (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) or evading discussions of race (Lewis, 2008), these preservice teachers hoped to make race a central part of their instruction.

The sociological imagination (Mills, 1959) played an important role in their desire to bring race talk into their classrooms. Most explicitly, Zach and Michael's comments about helping their students build frameworks to understand how racial inequality operates arise from a sociological perspective. In particular, Michael commented that he hoped for his students to "look at any person or any situation in a social context" (Michael, interview, 2012). This hope for his students eloquently captures the goal of the sociological imagination. The preservice teachers' comments about the hidden transcript of race also flow from the sociological imagination. Thomas, Litzy, and Paige discussed how they would talk with their students about inequality while also legitimizing the cultural attributes those students brought to the classroom. In doing so, the preservice teachers appreciated the impact of structure while also noting the potential for agency, considerations that speak to Mills' (1959) call for understanding the intersection of biography and history.

CONCLUSION

When speaking about the students of color they work with in their teaching placements, the Urban Cohort consistently displayed transgressive White racial knowledge, made possible by their deployment of the sociological imagination. They combatted deficit thinking (Valencia, 2010) by resisting individualizing discourses, critiquing the lack of curricular relevance the students experienced, and appreciating the disconnects the students experienced between their home and school environments. They also avoided viewing their positions in urban schools through the trope of the White savior (McIntyre, 1997; Titone, 1998), and instead demonstrated an appreciation for the problematic nature of their presence in these environments. In doing so, they navigated within what Ellsworth (1997) terms the White ally double bind. Finally, they transgressed against White racial knowledge through their assertions about the importance of centering the issues of race and racism in their teaching. They spoke extensively about interrogating race within their prescribed curriculum as well as how they would tackle racial topics when they arose outside of the formal curriculum. While conventional White racial knowledge prescribes deficit thinking, positions the White teacher as savior, and views race and racism as separate from the school experiences of students of color, this group of teachers pushed back against these ways of understanding. They consistently displayed transgressive White racial knowledge when thinking about students of color. In the proceeding chapter, I will discuss the Urban Cohort's transgressive White racial knowledge in relation to the workings of Whiteness, White privilege, and structural racism.

CHAPTER FIVE: TRANSGRESSIVE WHITE RACIAL KNOWLEDGE OF RACE PRIVILEGE AND WHITENESS

INTRODUCTION

The members of the Urban Cohort also displayed transgressive White racial knowledge through the way they talked about their personal experiences with Whiteness and racial privilege. This knowledge is transgressive for the way in which it runs counter to the typical narrative of the White preservice teacher as oblivious to many of the personal privileges that come with White racial identification (Bell, 2002; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Marx, 2006; Picower, 2009; Solomon et al., 2005). This chapter will detail transgressive White racial knowledge in two areas.

First, The Urban Cohort members displayed important racial knowledge related to themselves as racialized beings. This knowledge emerged through an awareness of the implications of their personal racial privileges. While most literature details the ways in which White privilege serves as a substantial barrier for White preservice teachers when engaging with antiracist pedagogies (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005), many of the teachers in this study used their privilege as an asset in understanding the workings of race and racism. The teachers drew upon a range of personal experiences in which they received access to opportunities or differential treatment that they felt people of color would not necessarily receive. In speaking back to the discourses of individualism, meritocracy, and egalitarianism that inhabit White racial knowledge (DiAngelo, 2010), these preservice teachers displayed transgressive White racial knowledge.

Second, the Urban Cohort displayed knowledge of the workings of race and racism in society both historically and contemporarily. This knowledge emerged in a variety of forms, including knowledge of the workings of Whiteness, the historical foundations of contemporary racism, the structural nature of racism, and the way racism operates in both passive and active forms. This knowledge speaks to their understandings of the broader mechanics of race and racism, not just the ways in which they personally benefit from or participate in the racialized social structure. These views depart from literature in which White preservice teachers proclaim ignorance toward the operation of race and racism (Levine-Rasky, 2000; Picower, 2009; Vaught & Castagno, 2008) or are only able to situate racism as relic of the nation's past (Trainor, 2005). By demonstrating a critical awareness of how racism functions, these teachers displayed transgressive White racial knowledge.

The inability of many White teachers to recognize the impact of racism and Whiteness on their individual lives flows from the "structured blindness" (Mills, 1997) of Whiteness as a racial system. Whiteness functions by obscuring much of its existence, making a holistic understanding of its processes difficult for those who benefit from the current racial order (Leonardo, 2009). Chubbuck (2004) suggests that the power of Whiteness arises through its normalization, a process

> Operating in conjunction with the persistent belief in the American Dream that anyone can succeed on the basis of merit, hard work, and adherence to the rules of society. [This process] produces inequitable material effects and racist attitudes. The underlying assumption of the American Dream – that American legal, economic, and educational institutions operate objectively and that they equitably reward individual merit – ignores the fact that these systems are based on White cultural norms, thus privileging and serving the self-interest of the dominant White race. (p. 304)

This entrenched belief in meritocracy and in the fairness of social systems in the United States typically blocks the ability of White individuals to recognize their personal privileges and societal advantages. In many accounts of how White teachers talk about race, racial privilege often served as a barrier to productive engagement on the topic of race (Marx, 2006; Solomon et al., 2005). The members of the Urban Cohort did not experience these same difficulties, nor did their privilege serve as an insurmountable barrier from engaging with the topic of race. They did not claim ignorance (Bell, 2002), retreat into silence (Mazzei, 2008), or re-center their experiences to disavow racism and assert meritocracy (DiAngelo, 2010a, 2010b). Instead, the Urban Cohort transgressed, willingly critiquing White privilege, Whiteness, and structural racism.

USING PERSONAL PRIVILEGE TO MAKE SENSE OF STRUCTURAL RACISM

The Urban Cohort drew upon a range of personal experiences in order to engage with the topics of race privilege and structural racism. Their ability to use their personal experiences in transgressive ways illustrated, once again, the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). Rather than viewing their accomplishments in isolation, they considered the way that broader social and historical forces played a role in their lives. They resisted the common trap of Whiteness in which White individuals become “falsely conscious of their social positions” (Mills, 1959, p. 5) through their obliviousness to the historical forces that made such positions possible. The members of the Urban Cohort did not rely upon the metanarratives of meritocracy and egalitarianism to explain their fortunes and

instead transgressed, highlighting ways that they benefitted as a result of belonging to the dominant group.

The sociological imagination and privilege

The members of the Urban Cohort did not rely on trite examples of their personal privilege as a means to access an understanding of structural racism. They did not simply say, "I was lucky in life and others were not." Instead, they connected personal stories and experiences to historical forces. They situated themselves as benefactors of a long history of material and discursive violence against people of color. Their appreciation for the structural nature of racism allowed them to move beyond a naïve, individualized analysis toward the development of the sociological imagination. Across our two interviews, Zach provided an interesting example of the difference between awareness of personal good fortune and awareness of how structural forces created that good fortune. During our first interview, Zach drew upon an experience from his time as an undergraduate when he reflected on the implications of his life outcomes:

> I remember writing for Teach for America. I applied for Teach for America. I was in the first stages. And I reflected on all these great things that have happened for me. And I have all these things aligned and my goal was to, um, to help, I guess, or be, or contribute. [pause] I wanted to be this contributing factor like I had all these other contributing factors in my life and I guess I realized how fortunate I was to have all those things and I guess that was why I wanted to be a teacher is because I think I have, because of my good fortune, I want to pass it along to other people. And I think that's probably why I was so accepting because I think I had already thought about it and just never put it in the perspective of like racism I suppose. It was more like, oh, I've been so blessed and all these things. I'm not religious so I wouldn't say I'm blessed but, you know, I have had all these good fortunes and I want to give back to other people so that they can have those same opportunities. (Zach, interview, 2012)

When asked to articulate why he wanted to become a teacher of disadvantaged students, Zach turned to an awareness and appreciation of his personal support network and "good fortune" that contributed to his successes. While this knowledge of his fortunate circumstances created a noble desire to "pass it along to other people," Zach realized that he possessed a limited understanding of the reasons behind his social status at the time of writing the letter. As he stated, he had "never put it in the perspective of racism," which he now did when he reflected on his experiences. Zach realized that he had viewed his accomplishments and their "contributing factors" in isolation rather than connecting them to broader social forces.

During our second interview, I again asked Zach about the ways in which he felt differently about his personal good fortune from the time he wrote his Teach for America letter. Zach expanded on the ways that his evolving knowledge of racism informed his understandings of his personal experiences and his engagement in conversations about race:

> My openness to engage in those conversations definitely comes from, at first, understanding how I was part of it and then seeing the rest of it, like okay, clearly if there are benefactors then there are people who are oppressed by the system. Now looking back it's like, well, why did I get all those things? Recognizing not just that I lived a good life and was very fortunate, but realizing what conditions set up all those other things for me. (Zach, interview, 2012)

By moving away from a more simplistic appreciation that "[he] lived a good life and was very fortunate," Zach recognized that certain conditions made that life possible and that his ability to benefit from a social system occurred at the expense of those oppressed by that system. Zach displayed the sociological imagination at work. While the charitable disposition Zach displayed in his Teach for America essay is laudable, I contend that

Zach's ability to connect his good fortune to structural and historical forces provides a more meaningful and malleable understanding of race and racism. Going forward, this knowledge allows Zach to attend to potential racial implications in a variety of social settings.

Michael also displayed an impressive awareness of how his personal achievements were connected to structural forces. Michael attended a racially diverse high school in the northeastern US, and he participated in sports throughout his schooling. Through his participation in high school sports, Michael spent a significant amount of time around the students of color at his school. Through this frequent contact, he came to learn about the family situations and some of the struggles these students faced. Michael used this knowledge to develop an appreciation for the systematic ways he benefitted from his racial identity. Michael noted that the behaviors of many of the White, middle class parents in his community put their children in situations where they were likely to succeed:

> So, as far as that, I was just going to college. Like never even thought there was another option. Just like, that's what you do. You know my parents were interested in academics and just encouraging reading when I was younger and getting me off TV and like when I was a kid I remember, just don't watch TV, how about we go read or let's like go out and do something. A lot of the…the proactive parenting uh was more common in the white racial group so that gave you a lot of advantage. I think even something like having two parents in the home. I know a lot of the minority students in our district had less traditional family structures. (Michael, interview, 2012)

Michael emphasized how the focus on academics in his household created an environment in which attending college became the norm rather than a choice. In his response, Michael somewhat followed a pattern of viewing the family structures of

people of color in a deficit fashion (Yosso, 2005) by suggesting that they did not engage in "proactive parenting," but he provides some justification for this viewpoint. Michael noted the greater prevalence of two-parent homes in the White community as an important factor that allowed the more proactive parenting to take place. While Michael did not cite any evidence of his assumption that the students of color in his community had less traditional family structures, he also did not attempt to disparage the intentions or effort of these families. Importantly, Michael located the reasons for the advantages he enjoyed as connected to larger social institutions such as parenting practices and family structures. That these practices and structures helped produce college-bound children connects to Chubbuck's (2004) comments on Whiteness and meritocracy: "American…systems are based on White cultural norms, thus privileging and serving the self-interest of the dominant White race" (p. 304). Michael did not attribute his pursuit of education after high school solely to his personal abilities. Instead, he recognized the ways that his environment influenced him in that direction.

Michael also elaborated on some of the challenges he witnessed his teammates of color face, particularly in terms of access to transportation and how that influenced their ability to succeed academically:

> Especially when I was in high school, my dad was a basketball coach and I played basketball and we used to drive everyone home [from practice]. Like our team that was predominantly Black and Hispanic and then my dad and I, we would drive separately to practice so that we could have two cars to drive all the kids home. And, so, just like the ability to get places like, you know, most of my teammates, not to say that was the case of all the minorities at the school, but most of them didn't have cars and like their parents might not even have cars and we don't have like great public transportation so to get to school was even difficult. So on an everyday practical level like it's just more difficult to do stuff. At the end of the day you have just less time to do homework, right? Your

> priorities are more survival based rather than, oh, how good do I want to do in my classes? (Michael, interview, 2012)

Although Michael referenced economic factors, rather than racial factors, that limited his teammates of color in their academic pursuits, the link between racism and wealth inequality is well documented (Lui, Robles, Leondar-Wright, Brewer, & Adamson, 2006; Oliver & Shapiro, 1997). Michael did not position the economic disparities between his family and the families of his teammates as accidental or coincidental. He appreciated the historical reasons for these differences. Michael used his sociological imagination to make the connection between the difficulties his teammates faced in terms of transportation and their academic outcomes: "At the end of the day, you have just less time to do homework, right?" Through this rhetorical question, Michael displayed his appreciation for the ways that economic struggles influenced academic achievement. Michael did not pass judgment or criticize the effort or intentions of his teammates. Instead, he understood their actions in a broader social context.

'Having someone to call': A critique of meritocracy

In our second interview, Michael expanded on how he viewed his accomplishments and social standing with an appreciation for the advantages he enjoyed from his status as a White, middle-class, able-bodied male. Michael is a talented athlete and participated in collegiate sports. He reflected on his acceptance to an Ivy League university and how his athletic ability played a role in his admission:

> Like there were academically more qualified kids but I was going to [the school] because I could run really fast. So I guess that sort of made me realize that even my academic outcomes aren't solely based on how smart I am or how hard I worked in school which carried over to just, you know, maybe my life outcomes aren't solely based on how hard I work. You know, athletically, it takes a certain

> amount of just natural ability to be good at a sport and so I'd see kids who worked just as hard as me in my sport but I was just better than them. And I felt fortunate to genetically be a pretty good athlete and I still worked hard, but…I was pretty aware that like your working hard is important but that everyone starts at a different spot. And I might have started at a head start. So anything I worked would move my spectrum a little bit but I was at a good spot to begin with so I was going to have good outcomes and good opportunities. (Michael, interview, 2012)

In this excerpt, Michael broke from the claims of meritocracy and "naïve egalitarianism" (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000) that inform many White preservice teachers' discussions about race and life outcomes (Solomon et al., 2005; Vaught & Castagno, 2008). Michael managed to account for his individual effort without relying upon it as the sole reason for his successes. He recognized that "everyone starts at a different spot," and that he "might have started at a head start." Michael used the connection between his natural athletic ability and his athletic success as a framework to understand how an individual's life outcomes result from a confluence of individual and structural factors. Michael did not view this fact as a condemnation of his efforts. Rather, he used the knowledge to understand the influences of social forces in a more profound way. Michael closed his comments on this topic by suggesting, "I think a lot of people don't want to admit they're advantaged. Like they'd rather credit themselves with hard work…I wasn't really trying to do that" (Michael, interview, 2012). Michael's comments provided a powerful critique of the notion of meritocracy in the US (McNamee & Miller, 2009).

Other members of the cohort shared Michael's ability to view their accomplishments within the context of their Whiteness and privileged economic status. In our initial interview, Patrick spoke about the ease with which he procured a part-time job when he began his graduate studies:

> I was telling you earlier about getting this job here. You know, I made up my mind when I was [teaching abroad] that I wanted to work in a bar. Um, I enjoy the social part of it, I could probably make some pretty good money to supplement that with schooling which I was getting ready to do, you know? Okay, I want to do this [snaps fingers]. Within a week, you know, I had something lined up. Yeah, I had to go in there and do some work. I made the phone calls and that kind of thing, but, come on [laughs], it's pretty easy. Just like that vein, that thread is something that I have always known and always [pause] you know I've never really felt apologetic for it, um, but I have felt aware of it, like how easy it was to do that. (Patrick, interview, 2012)

Patrick placed his phone calls to individuals whose names he received through a family contact. Patrick's access to these connections arose from his family's economic status and the variety of contacts his father and other relatives acquired through years in the business world. While many White individuals would view Patrick's bold critique of meritocracy as an affront to their individual achievements (DiAngelo, 2010), Patrick managed to note the work that he did (making the phone calls, in this situation) while also highlighting how his higher level of access made that work possible. He appreciated that his family contacts allowed him to find a part time job easily, which provided him with greater economic security during his graduate studies.

In our second interview, I again asked Patrick about how awareness of his personal privileges informed his appreciation for structural inequality. He returned to the example of his part time job, explaining that his hard work existed alongside his structural advantages:

> It clouds the whole meritocracy argument some because that hard work it gets lost in the mix if you don't have somebody to call and you know get that opportunity with which to apply the hard work…I think people attribute so much hard work to the things that they do along the way. And I think in one sense there's nothing wrong with that. You know, I hate to demonize that because it's good to feel proud of the things that you do and I did work hard and it does not somehow take away but I think you can live in a world where both are possible. You know, you

> can work hard and do all those things but still realize that there is a lot of advantage going on. I had that advantage. I was still doing some things that were allowing me a leg up on my next jump on the ladder. (Patrick, interview, 2012)

Much like Michael, Patrick noted that many of his personal successes occurred because of the differential social access he enjoyed. Patrick did not discount the role his individual talents and work ethic played. Instead, he allowed both his hard work and his structural advantage to "[be] possible." In doing so, Patrick answered in the affirmative to Jensen's (2005) question: "Can we accept that many white people have worked hard to accomplish things, and that those people's accomplishments were made possible in part because they were white in a white- supremacist society?" (p. 24). Patrick recognized that having "somebody to call," along with "apply[ing] the hard work," played crucial roles in his life path.

Although the connections Patrick mentioned above arose, in part, from his class status, he also spoke candidly about the role of race as well. In our interviews, Patrick referred to himself as, "a white male who grew up in an upper middle class area," and frequently discussed the many privileges those identities bestowed upon him. Patrick did not experience the struggles that many White individuals have in identifying the invisible ways their Whiteness privileges them in social situations (Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2009). Patrick developed an awareness of structural inequality through a critical and honest analysis of his personal experiences. Although personal experience can often serve as a tool for Whites to re-center White perspectives and disavow racism (DiAngelo & Allen, 2006, Vaught & Castagno, 2008), Patrick used his experiences to inform his

understanding of racism. He also felt that his critique of meritocracy would benefit his students:

> I really think that you can also see the system and see the ways that privilege works and that that has profound implications for your classroom. Especially if you're going to go into a classroom that is working with students who aren't gonna identify with the mainstream curriculum. I think that helps. (Patrick, interview, 2012)

Patrick desired to use his awareness of how he benefitted from social systems such as classism, sexism, and racism to inform his classroom practice. He felt that an appreciation for structural inequality would serve as an important tool for doing effective work with students of color and students from lower income backgrounds.

The differential consequences of 'bad choices'

Two final examples also provide insight into how the Urban Cohort used their personal privileges as a framework for talking about race in transgressive ways. Both Thomas and Samuel referred to situations in which they clearly saw differential outcomes as a result of race and class factors. Thomas, a native of a large Mid-Atlantic urban area, drew from experiences volunteering in a men's shelter and rehab facility populated primarily by African Americans. He spoke extensively about the stark differences between the affluent, White neighborhood where he grew up and the adjacent neighborhoods populated with people of color and marred with poverty and drug abuse. Thomas did not note these differences to disparage or to place blame upon these communities of color. He recognized the element of chance that separated his life of economic security and private school education from the lives of those in the shelter: "The biggest shock of being there, [pause] I mean they were born in the same city as me,

they were born in the same zip code as me, and really, yeah, they got into drugs but, it was like, I would have, too, probably (Thomas, interview, 2012)." Thomas referenced a particular encounter in the shelter during his undergraduate studies. During a GED tutoring session with a young man about his age, Thomas realized that he and this man had played football against one another in middle school. Their lives crossed paths in the not so distant past and yet their outcomes by age twenty could hardly be more different. In a somber tone, Thomas noted that this young man, "barely had the chance to make any choices yet, and look at where he ended up" (Thomas, interview, 2012). Although it may seem like a small thing, Thomas' comment that this young man's situation did not occur simply because of choices he made displayed an appreciation for the way structural forces can sometimes outweigh individual agency. In the spirit of the sociological imagination, Thomas understood his personal outcomes and those of his less advantaged peers with an appreciation for broader sociohistorical forces.

Samuel also used a particularly poignant experience to make a structural argument similar to the one made by Thomas. During our second interview, I spoke extensively with Samuel about the ways he noticed race and race-related situations more and more as a result of his time in the Urban Teaching program. He relayed the following story after attending his 10-year high school reunion and being reminded of the affluence of many of his classmates:

> One of the guys I went to high school with, he got caught by the cops for smoking crack our junior year in high school. And he wound up leaving [the school] over it. But his mom is like a federal judge so nothing happened to him and now he's working as an attorney in [a large city] and is doing very well for himself. And I just thought of that story because if that had happened to a different kid at a different school, maybe of a different race, like where does that kid end up versus

> my friend who is a well-to-do attorney, working for a law firm in downtown? Probably in jail or with a big mark on his record that bans him from scholarship opportunities or entrance to college and kind of just screws with his life path. (Samuel, interview, 2012)

While Thomas suggested that one's environment could influence them to adopt a life of drug abuse, Samuel's story suggests that drug abuse has different implications for a wealthy, White, socially-connected teenager than it does for the individual Thomas encountered in the men's shelter. The family connections and financial resources of Samuel's classmate allowed him to overcome his early encounter with the police and to earn an advanced degree and to secure a well-paying job. Samuel noted that "a different kid at a different school, maybe of a different race" would not enjoy a similar result. Through this story, Samuel used the world of access and opportunity in which he lived to understand that the life chances of individuals are shaped by far more than hard work. He understood that his classmate's outcomes did not result simply from hard work. This allowed Samuel, like other members of the Urban Cohort, to offer a powerful critique of meritocracy.

Discussion

Thomas, Samuel, Michael, Patrick, and Zach all displayed an impressive ability to use their experiences with privilege and access to understand structural inequality along racial and other lines. Typical White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009) strongly adheres to a belief in the US as a meritocratic society (DiAngelo, 2010; Solomon et al., 2005; Vaught & Castagno, 2008). These members of the Urban Cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge by offering critiques of meritocracy and by appreciating how their personal privileges provided them with undeserved access to elements of society.

Importantly, these individuals did not offer simplistic explanations for their life outcomes in relation to people of color such as, “I was lucky and they were not.” Instead, they talked about forces such as racism and poverty. They talked about how their cultural frames of reference granted them access to privileged places. They found ways to recognize that their individual efforts and talents were buttressed by the head start they acquired through possessing a dominant social identity. They recognized that the access and the opportunities they received did not arise from chance, and they discussed how their systemic advantage existed alongside systemic disadvantage for other groups.

Their ability to engage in this discourse resulted from the use of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). They viewed their individual stories with an appreciation for how the particularities of their biography intersected with historical forces such as racism. They adhered to Mill’s suggestion that, “The individual can understand his own experience and gauge his own fate only by locating himself within his period, that he can know his own chances in life only by becoming aware of those of all individuals in his circumstances” (p. 5). Thomas, Samuel, Michael, Patrick, and Zach did not view themselves only as individuals when they reflected on their life outcomes. They considered how their social and cultural capital influenced their interactions with individuals and institutions, providing them with considerable advantages. By viewing their lives with a sociological imagination, these members of the cohort transgressed against White racial knowledge. When making sense of their lives, they foregrounded structural advantage rather than individual effort.

The views of these members of the Urban Cohort are significant for how starkly they contrast with the common narratives one hears of White preservice teachers. Typically, the invisibility of White privilege (Allen, 2004) blocks individuals from recognizing the role of broader social and historical forces in determining their life outcomes (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Moreover, when educational literature does tell stories about White individuals who possess transgressive understandings of race, these individuals tend to come from less privileged class backgrounds (Jupp & Slattery, 2010; Laughter, 2011), have extensive intercultural experiences (Garmon, 2005), or have understandings of inequality due to personal experiences with discrimination (Cabrera, 2012; Johnson, 2002). Ullucci's (2011) study of three White educators who work effectively with communities of color fits this mold. Her three participants cite life experiences with diversity and marginalization as influencing their work with children of color. Ullucci uses these stories to remind us that

> Many Whites live ethnically identified lives…Whites can be immigrants, can live in poverty, can experience abuse, grow up with grandparents, speak with an accent or be non-native English speakers. It is also necessary to remember that racial groups form hierarchies within their own race (based on class, language ability, national origin, skin tone, etc.) and in many ways, some of these teachers found themselves at the bottom of that order. (p. 576)

These stories offer powerful examples of how Whites come to understand racism through personal experiences with marginalization. Interestingly, the stories told by the members of the Urban Cohort do not arise out of such experiences. Instead, these individuals used experiences with privilege and access to help them understand the machinations of racism. Their deployment of the sociological imagination provides yet another example of how White preservice teachers can learn to recognize and to grapple with race.

KNOWLEDGE OF WHITENESS AND STRUCTURAL RACISM

The members of the Urban Cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge through their ability to speak on issues of Whiteness, White privilege, and structural racism. In contrast to the above finding, which highlighted the ability of the preservice teachers to use their personal experiences to understand racism and critique meritocracy, this finding speaks to their ability to talk about Whiteness as a set of racial power relations (Mills, 1997) and how those relations play out in society. This knowledge is transgressive because White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009) discourages White individuals from talking about their Whiteness. As Thompson (1999) suggests, "whiteness is a normalized condition of racelessness, every other 'race' being treated as a departure from that condition" (p. 149). Along similar lines, Thandeka (1999) refers to the racial identification of European-Americans as "the great unsaid" (p. 3). Mills (1997) argues that the epistemology of ignorance that informs White racial thinking discourages Whites from developing an awareness of their personal racial identities and the implications of those identities. Studies with White preservice teachers show they also struggle with viewing themselves as raced and as beneficiaries of racial hierarchies (Applebaum, 2005; Mazzei, 2008; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009; Schick, 2000). The members of the Urban Cohort often spoke eloquently about the implications of their racial identities.

Transgressive knowledge about Whiteness and the operation of race and racism appeared in two primary areas. First, many individuals talked about the normalized nature of Whiteness (Thompson, 1999) and how that normalization impacted their material

realities. They discussed the privileges that accrued to White individuals and how they operated within the privileged spaces afforded to them. Second, the members of the cohort demonstrated nuanced knowledge about the operation of racism. They acknowledged the passive and active elements of racism (Tatum, 2003), noting how status quo attitudes about race perpetuated racism. They talked about racial structures and referenced the historical underpinnings of contemporary racism (Marable, 2002). They also critiqued individualized racial discourses (Young, 2011) such as stereotypes. Overall, they transgressed against conventional White racial knowledge by constructing a critical take on Whiteness and the mechanics of racism.

The normal-ness of being White

As noted above, one of the most pernicious aspects of Whiteness as a racial worldview (Leonardo, 2009) is the elevation of White to a default racial identity that exists without recognition. Whiteness becomes, "the unmarked marker of others" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 198) or "the unnamed, universal moral referent" (Giroux, 1997, p. 286). This normalization is productive of difference (McCarthy, 1988), Other-ing the cultural practices of people of color while also allowing Whites ease of navigation within most social institutions and public spaces. Not noticing or discussing the existence of White norms is an important part of White racial knowledge. Instead, White racial knowledge encourages colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), both for its ostensible commitment to equality and its ability to silence discussions about inequality. However, colorblindness, as a racial discourse, often serves as a way for the racial privileges of Whites to go unmarked while also removing race as a factor in the life outcomes of

people of color. This preserves White dominance and obscures its existence. Thandeka (1999) offers a telling example of the difficulties many Whites have in talking about their racial identities. As an activity to promote racial awareness, Thandeka encourages White individuals to play what she calls, “the race game.” This game requires that the individual always refer to other individuals with their appropriate racial descriptors during conversations. For example, if an individual speaks of her friend, Tina, then she must refer to Tina as “my White friend, Tina.” Not surprisingly, many of the individuals Thandeka challenges to play the race game say they lack the courage to do so. Those who play typically do not last more than a few hours. By overtly talking about Whiteness, Whites lift the veil and expose their privileges. Most White individuals resist doing so, but many members of the Urban Cohort transgressed against this unwritten rule of Whiteness.

During the initial interviews (Appendix D) with the Urban Cohort, I spent a considerable amount of time asking the preservice teachers about their racial biographies, drawing several question ideas from Thandeka’s (1999) conversations with White individuals in her book. These questions asked about the diversity of their childhood neighborhoods and the schools they attended. The questions also probed at their awareness of race at early ages. With the individuals who I know identified as White, I asked them about what it meant to be White in their schools. Although I expected this to be a difficult question for them to answer, very few hesitated in their responses. Thomas’ response was typical of many of the White cohort members:

Ryan: So what did it mean to be White at [your high school]?

> Thomas: It meant to be normal. It meant to be, like real [city name]. If you know what I mean, like old [city name], legitimate [city name] in a sense (Thomas, interview, 2012).

In telling fashion, Thomas used the words "normal," "real," and "legitimate" to describe what it meant to be White in his high school. He also did so without hesitation. In Thomas' school, African Americans were the largest group of color, and Thomas spoke extensively about many of the challenges those students faced as a result of their deviation from the norm. Thomas understood the demarcations that existed between those marked by their race and those with the privilege to have their race normalized.

Kevin offered a similar response to Thomas and extended it with an analysis of some of the benefits that the normalization of Whiteness offered to him. While Whites made up the majority, Kevin's school also had a substantial Asian American population. Kevin's awareness of the issues that the Asian students in his school faced attuned him to the benefits of his Whiteness:

> Ryan: So what did it mean to be white in your high school?
>
> Kevin: [pause] I don't know…it was the norm. But then again it was pretty normal to have a lot of Asians in your class, too, so um but on the whole you know being white you don't have that—I don't know what to call it—whatever is directed at you, that stereotypes you so much. Um cause you know there's kind of a split in the Asian community, I feel, in that there were those that kind of stuck traditionally to their culture and language and family, which were generally the new immigrants but also others, too. And there were those who were more American you know kind of hung out with the white kids and did all that kind of stuff you know got into [pause] went to the sports games, school spirit and all that kind of stuff. (Kevin, interview, 2012)

Kevin noted that White equated with normal at his school. He also suggested that a primary benefit of Whiteness involved insulation from stereotypes, a protection that Kevin realized the Asian students in his school did not enjoy. In order for the Asian

students to begin to transcend their racial Otherness at the school, they had to become "more American." To do so, they had to abandon the language and cultural practices of their ancestral countries and conform to the White norm in Kevin's school, which involved attending sports games and having "school spirit." Scholars often suggest that Asian Americans occupy the racial middle (Matsuda, 1993; O'Brien, 2008) in the US as a result of their model minority status (Lee, 1996). However, Whites also tend to perceive Asian Americans as "perpetual foreigners" (Ng, Lee, & Pak, 2007), a form of marginalization that makes assimilation into Whiteness difficult, if not impossible. Even when the Asian students in Kevin's school conformed to White norms, they could still not escape their racial classification. By observing this process, Kevin came to understand the implications of his Whiteness.

Paige offered the most powerful response about what her Whiteness meant in her high school environment. Paige attended high school in a small southern community. Whites made up the majority population with African Americans as the next largest racial group. In her response, Paige quickly stated that White equated with normal at her school and then elaborated on the benefits of this normality:

> Ryan: So what would you say it meant to be White at your school?
>
> Paige: It meant that you were normal.
>
> Ryan: Okay, tell me more about that or give me an example.
>
> Paige: Yeah, I mean most if not all the teachers were White and I guess the majority population was white and it just and…and even the culture of the community as far as like it being, you know, stressing kind of good ole southern values, that it meant that being white was normal but also beingWhite was worth more, I think. Because I think that you could be treated a lot better in school and in the community. You just had more privileges, I guess. Even thinking about I

> guess going to the drug store downtown and getting a fountain drink. You would do that if you were White but I couldn't see, honestly, I couldn't see a black person or a person of any other color going in there being able to do that. (Paige, interview, 2012)

While Paige noted that the normal state of being White somewhat owed to the predominance of White people in her school and community, she also stated that the normalization created benefits. She suggested that "being White was worth more" and that it "had more privileges." Those in power in the school community valued White students more and White students enjoyed the freedom of movement in the town. They could inhabit public spaces where African American students did not feel welcome. Paige's response is transgressive because she talked about the implications of Whiteness in her high school. Being a White student was not only normal because more classmates and teachers would share your racial classification. Being White meant being more valuable to the school and receiving unearned privileges.

Members of the cohort also spoke of the normalization of Whiteness and its benefits at other points in our conversations. Litzy did so when I asked her for examples of the daily benefits she received from her Whiteness. She referenced a recent encounter in which she and her boyfriend came upon a woman walking alone late at night in downtown. The woman had been through some sort of ordeal and was clearly distraught. Litzy and her boyfriend brought her to their apartment and helped her to find a ride home. This story illuminated some of the benefits of Whiteness for Litzy:

> I mean I'm sure [being White] does a lot. I'm presumed to be pretty harmless. Like, last night the girl we found, like, it was my boyfriend and I and we're both White and we like walked up to her and she wasn't afraid of us and she didn't think we were gonna hurt her and she came up to our apartment like…so I mean I feel like I exude an atmosphere of trust. You know, I feel like that's easier

> because I'm White and I look relatively middle class and I feel like it would be harder to…especially, like, I can't imagine trying to be a teacher in a school and have to build up to this like neutral level of trustworthiness. I don't, not to say that other races are not trustworthy or otherwise not comfortable, but it comes back to what I was saying about White being like the normal. So you have to build towards that normal and prove that you're capable before…before you're trusted in that area. (Litzy, interview, 2012)

Litzy explored some problematic ground in this response but also affirmed what many scholars suggest about the unearned benefits of Whiteness (McIntosh, 1989). Litzy's "presumed harmlessness" and her "atmosphere of trust" is owed to her Whiteness and, as she noted, her "middle class" appearance. Interestingly, Litzy used this incident of presumed trustworthiness to consider the difficulties experienced by people of color in majority White spaces. That these individuals have to "build towards that normal" of Whiteness, which equated with trustworthiness in this example, means that mistrust is the default condition placed upon them by White people. It is unclear as to why Litzy chose the example of a teacher to illustrate this point. Litzy did her student teaching in a school populated primarily with students of color and many discussions in the Multicultural Course centered on the importance of White teachers earning—rather than presuming—trust from their students. Despite the odd example, Litzy's analysis of Whiteness and White privilege is very sound. Litzy recognized the ways in which she walks through life with the presumption of innocence and trustworthiness, owing in large part to her racial identity.

Grace also spoke about some of the benefits of the normalization of Whiteness and how the benefits accrued to her often operated in a more subtle way that she began to

notice more and more. Grace talked about this issue when I asked her about the daily treatment she received as a result of her racial identity:

> Hmmm, I know there's probably benefits to it but I think that it's hard when you're on the side of being white and there are these benefits to realize those benefits because there's nothing that's like [pause] you know, it's not like I'm being discriminated against where it's this very obvious kind of action by someone that is based off of my race. But I think that is something I am learning to be more aware of is maybe a situation happens and realizing that maybe that situation was easy for me because I'm white. Like how helped are you at a nice restaurant, or if you walk into a nice restaurant I think probably for me, being a white woman, like it's easy for me to walk into a restaurant and get the treatment that is expected whereas other people might not. (Grace, interview, 2012)

Grace initially noted the difficulties of recognizing unearned benefits rather than overt acts of discrimination. In order to appreciate the operation of White privilege, Grace had to look for situations in which she enjoyed ease of navigation and then consider how a person of color might not have the same experience. Grace's example of receiving prompt attention at a nice restaurant demonstrated this phenomenon. Although she—or anyone, for that matter—should not expect anything other than respectful treatment in such a situation, Grace realized that her Whiteness insulated her from ill treatment and led her to "get the treatment that is expected" in such situations. Like Litzy's recognition of her presumed trustworthiness, Grace's realizations come from the deployment of the sociological imagination. Rather than engaging in a surface, individualized analysis, Grace considered her experiences alongside a history of racial discrimination. Although Grace and Litzy's examples of how the normalization of Whiteness benefits them may seem small, their willingness to vocalize these moments and explore the implications of Whiteness positions their discourse as transgressive.

A final example of the ways the cohort members talked about the normalization of Whiteness comes from one of Kevin's written responses. More so than any other member of the Urban Cohort, Kevin displayed an impressive desire to explore what his Whiteness meant and how his background experiences with race shaped him. Kevin did so in a very straightforward manner. He did not attempt to craft his words into acceptable liberal or critical discourses on race. Instead, he offered insightful, critical takes on race while also pushing back on the ways that race essentializes individuals:

> As for being racialized myself, being "white" doesn't feel like being racialized. Whiteness is almost, in my view, an absence of race. Whites are not "colored," whites don't have a culture that's easy to pin down (no cultures are, but in my opinion it's easier to talk about aspects of "Korean culture" than "white culture"), we're not "ethnic." Have you ever thought about that? When we say something like "let's get some ethnic food," we mean something non-white. That, at least in my perception, means Chinese, Ethiopian, Cuban, Mexican, Thai, etc. We don't even consider French or Italian to be "ethnic." So what that shows to me is the strangeness of whiteness. It's somehow different from the other races in that we think of whiteness as the norm. Whiteness is the standard, and the other races are kind of like an aberration. In a way I think whiteness almost robs us of culture and identity. But I don't want to sit around and complain about being white—just pointing out that maybe the conception of whiteness actually impoverishes whites in some way. (Kevin, written communication, 2012)

In this response, Kevin described Whiteness as "an absence of race," "the norm," and "the standard." Kevin did so without any exposure to CWS literature from folks like Frankenberg (1993), who similarly termed Whiteness as an "unmarked marker of difference." Kevin also explored the notion that Whiteness lacks a definitive culture, as compared with his example of "Korean culture." While Kevin noted that any group's culture is difficult to "pin down," he felt White culture possessed "strangeness" that made its content even more difficult to articulate. In this aspect of his analysis, Kevin hinted at how CWS scholars explain White identity as formed out of negation of the Other

(Ignatiev, 1994; Leonardo, 2009; Roediger, 2005). In this way, Whiteness takes shape through its contradistinctions to Blackness, Brownness, Yellowness, and Redness (Mills, 1997). Those kept outside of Whiteness possess race and culture while Whiteness elevates to a normative status beyond racialization. Kevin's example of what counts as "ethnic food" illustrated this critique of Whiteness. The racial Other is "ethnic," while Whites are normalized. Kevin ended his comments by noting that he did not intend to "complain about being white"—suggesting that he recognized the benefits of Whiteness—but that Whiteness has a way of "impoverishing" Whites in some way. In this analysis, Kevin drew from discourses in CWS that frame Whiteness as an oppressive racial formation (Roediger, 1991) that damages the White oppressor as well as the oppressed person of color.

In his above statement, Kevin displayed a rather remarkable awareness of the peculiarities of Whiteness as a normalized racial identity without losing sight of its role in the functioning of White supremacy. This statement contrasts starkly with the statements many White preservice teachers make about race in the extant literature (Picower, 2009; Solomon et al., 2005). Through their critical awareness of the normative nature of Whiteness and the benefits that flowed from its normalization, Kevin, Grace, Litzy, Thomas, and Paige displayed transgressive White racial knowledge. Rather than adopting stances of colorblindness or claiming ignorance about the functioning of race and Whiteness, these members of the Urban Cohort spoke eloquently about how Whiteness produced the Other and granted Whites preferential treatment. Even when in spaces with large White majorities, these individuals learned how Whiteness operated by granting

invisible privileges to Whites and by closing off certain spaces to people of color. To develop these critical understandings, the members of the cohort deployed their sociological imaginations. They evaluated the intersection of the history of race relations in the US with their personal biographies. They accessed the idea of their own race privilege by understanding the implications of being members of the "normal" race. Through their "normal" status, they enjoyed ease of navigation in many social situations and insulation from negative stereotypes. To reference Litzy's experiences, they understood that they were "presumed innocent" while people of color, even when they attempted to conform to White norms, were permanently racialized. Their sociological imaginations allowed them to name Whiteness and to identify its effects.

Knowledge of the operation of race and racism

Leonardo (2002) notes that two key aspects of Whiteness and, therefore, White racial knowledge, involve an "unwillingness to name the contours of racism" and "the minimization of a racist legacy" (p. 32). Most White individuals refrain from discussing racism as a structural force or engaging in explorations of the differences between active and passive racism (Tatum, 2003). Instead, most of these individuals talk about racism in individualistic terms (Ringrose, 2007; Scheurich, 1993; Sleeter, 2008). They tend to view racism as engaging in egregious acts against people of color and perceive status quo, colorblind behavior as antiracist or as not perpetuating racism. White racial knowledge also understands racism as a historical artifact (Picower, 2009; Trainor, 2005) most readily apparent in extreme circumstances such as slavery or Jim Crow segregation. In this mindset, racism is "bad men doing bad things" (Brown & Brown, 2010) and, in

particular, “bad things” that happened in the past. The Urban Cohort transgressed against such practices of Whiteness. They spoke about racism as structural, rather than individualized, and as operating in both passive and active ways. They also used knowledge of historical racism to understand the persistence of racial inequality.

Paige provided an example of how members of the cohort talked about racism in institutional and structural forms. During our interview, she referenced a short video segment I showed to the cohort during the second race seminar. The clip, taken from the film *Race: The Power of an Illusion* (Adelman, 2003), discussed the discriminatory lending practices of the US Federal Housing Authority (FHA) in the wake of World War II. In effect, the FHA subsidized home ownership for Whites in suburban areas and barred people of color from these neighborhoods. These practices isolated communities of color in urban centers with declining real estate values and a lack of industry, trapping people of color in a cycle of poverty and unemployment. These practices had far-reaching implications, as White families accumulated wealth through home ownership and passed that wealth on to future generations while communities of color did not have such opportunities. This video clip resonated with many cohort members and Paige’s comments capture those sentiments:

> I already felt that way anyway so it was more of a process for me to…to be able to, like I said, understand the “why” behind it. And, for me it really highlighted a lot of things that I hadn’t ever thought about or heard about before like these reasons I mean like the whole talk about the housing market and things like that it was really enlightening to me because I just never, I’ve never seen it presented in that kind of way. Why like there’s these pockets of poverty and certain races here. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Paige used the historical accounts of the FHA to understand current racial segregation and economic disparities along racial lines. She also stated at the beginning of her comments that she "felt that way anyway," meaning that she sensed that such disparities were not natural. Despite these feelings, Paige did not have the type of information she needed to make the connection between past discrimination and current inequality. This film clip allowed Paige to see a stark example of institutional racism and its legacy.

I pushed Paige a bit more about her thoughts on the film by asking her to identify why the film was so "enlightening" for her. Paige's response further illuminated her appreciation for racism as structural rather than individual:

> I think [the video] helped me understand that…I don't know, because otherwise I think you can come to it with this perspective of like [pause] these people are responsible for where they are. Which is the argument I hear a lot from white people. But with that it actually helps me to be able to explain to somebody else like, no, actually there are all these institutional reasons for how things came to be the way they are and its, sure people are stuck in a cycle, but that's not how it has to be and you can do something tangible to let these people be free of this cycle. Like you're implicit [sic] in this, too. It's not just something that happened on its own magically. It's not this Darwinian notion of like, this is what's going to happen to these people because they're this certain way it's [pause] we're all involved in it. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Paige covered quite a bit of ground in this response. She noted that institutional backing of racial discrimination in housing created a legacy of economic inequality and racial segregation. This knowledge armed her with counterarguments to the White racial knowledge that "these people are responsible for where they are." She also used this understanding to note the ongoing complicity of White people in segregation and racial inequities. Paige engaged in antiracist rhetoric (Tatum, 2003), claiming that something must be done to disrupt this "cycle." Paige transgressed against White racial knowledge

by highlighting how past discrimination contributed to current inequalities and by suggesting the ongoing participation of White people in these racial injustices.

Thomas also spoke of racism as a structural force with historic roots. During our interview, I asked for his thoughts on Tatum's (2003) definition of racism as a system of advantage that was used in the seminars. When I gave this definition in the first seminar and asked students to think of examples of structural racism, Thomas contributed thoughtfully. I asked him to expand on those thoughts he offered in class:

> [The definition] kind of framed the whole thing for me. Um, cause that, it's very inclusive. It's like everyone's involved, which I think is the first thing you have to recognize which is that there is a level of born responsibility you know that I have that's you know, that doesn't change when Obama becomes president [laughs] you know, like everyone says. Like I said earlier, I was born with a college degree in my hand, essentially. So I think the more people recognize that the more you can bear the responsibility and somehow [pause] you don't have to be a teacher to change that, you can be anything. And I think that just starts in our societal, collective societal brains. Yeah, so that was hands down the biggest takeaway I took because I never really heard it said like that. (Thomas, interview, 2012)

Much as Tatum (2003), who borrowed this definition from Wellman (1993), intended, Thomas used this definition to construct an understanding of racism that held Whites accountable for racism. Rather than focusing on the ill effects of racism on people of color, Thomas discussed his "level of born responsibility" as a result of benefitting from the system of advantage based on race. Thomas also critiqued simplistic, individualized understandings of racism. He laughed at the contention that President Obama's election signaled an end to racism, and he stressed that solutions to racism start "in our collective societal brains" rather than in the actions of one individual.

I pressed Thomas to explain how this definition of racism differed from his previous thoughts on the topic. He explained that understanding racism as structural

allowed him to appreciate the significance of the issue and to problematize his earlier conceptions of what constituted racism:

> Um, the level of generational calculation that has taken place to establish where we are. I think that's why it's not something you can just lift...Yeah, the idea of the structure, changing it from being like my original idea of racism would be a person that acts through racial hate, things like that. Racism is what drives hate crimes. It was much more specific. Um, the idea that I would think now as more like bigotry. I've never been a bigot but I've been rewarded because of the structure of advantage. (Thomas, interview, 2012)

Here Thomas hits on a crucial element of a critical understanding of the operation of race and racism. Thomas transgressed against the White racial knowledge that views racism as "bad men doing bad things" (Brown & Brown, 2010). Rather than viewing racism as present only in hate crimes or other egregious acts, Thomas hinted at how White individuals benefit from racism even without committing overtly racist acts. As Tatum (2003) suggests, status quo racial behavior—passive racism—on the part of Whites perpetuates rather than pushes back against structural racism. Thomas made this connection, realizing that he participated in and benefitted from racism even when he did not engage in acts of bigotry.

Grace also spoke extensively on how the notion of passive racism led to a consideration of her role as a participant in race relations. In her final written reflection, Grace highlighted this concept as crucial to her evolving understanding of race and racism:

> Discussing the term passive racism was really powerful as it made me think about my role in racism. When you realize that by simply living day-to-day you are contributing to the maintenance of racism, you feel obligated to change and to take on a position that actively opposes racism. (Grace, written communication, 2012)

Grace grappled with this aspect of her personal learning process more so than any other member of the cohort. In our initial interview, Grace and I discussed the implications of thinking about racism as structural and as operating in both active and passive forms. I asked Grace if, based on these understandings, she considered herself to be racist. She responded,

> No, but then going back to the term…but if you look at the fact that maybe I haven't taken actions that work against it then, technically, I could fall along the lines of passively racist. Um, but I don't [pause] yeah, I'm sure that now knowing the spectrum of things that like I've never thought of myself as someone being racist and I have always valued hanging out with people who are like, or being in the company with people who are different from me and have different perspectives and really wanting to engage in those and respect those and learn about them. But I guess technically I probably have been a passive racist because I haven't actively done anything to counter. (Grace, interview, 2012)

Under White racial knowledge, Grace's statements about valuing difference and respecting the views of others would typically be used to distance oneself from racism. However, Grace took the notion of passive racism to heart and conceded that her personal failings to counteract the structural aspects of racism served to perpetuate status quo race relations. Grace understood that building personal relationships and having an interest in diverse perspectives did not make one antiracist. This statement transgressed against mainstream White racial knowledge that views racism as present only in egregious acts. Grace also transgressed against the discourse of the "good White," in which Whites disavow personal participation in racism by pointing to other, less enlightened Whites as the true perpetrators (Schick, 2000; Young, 2011).

Grace's understanding of racism as structural and as manifesting in active and passive forms caused her to rethink her past views and actions on the topic of race. Grace

was not alone in this willingness to rethink what antiracism really looked like in action. Kevin also broke from the “good White” identification in his written reflection after the third Race Seminar. Kevin discussed his experiences growing up in progressive communities in the Pacific Northwest. He noted that the liberal White view on race and racism in these areas fell short of an antiracist orientation:

> Race and racism is always a difficult subject to confront, especially when you're from a relatively liberal-minded area...That's because the problem seems to be invisible. I think that our tendency ("our" meaning the people I grew up with, the community I learned from) is to gloss over the problem, acting as if we are not part of it—that if we simply treat everyone the same, then racism goes away. This is an unfortunate, even tragic tendency of progressives. We are not like some conservatives who say things like "racism is over"—we recognize it exists. But by treating everyone the same, holding all to the same standards, and ignoring difference, we in fact create a distinct kind of racism—one that fails to take into account multiple stories and perspectives…There is a sort of racist undercurrent that fails to truly respect difference. We repress our racism and it becomes hidden. (Kevin, written communication, 2012)

Although Kevin did not use the term passive racism in his response, his critique of simplistic gestures like “treating everyone the same” aligned with an appreciation of the role of passive racism in perpetuating racial inequality. Kevin claimed the liberal White community in which he lived “gloss[ed] over the problem, acting as if [they were] not part of it,” rather than engaging in honest conversations about race. Kevin clearly distanced himself from the discourse of the “good White” with these sentiments. Despite growing up in an area in which racist remarks were frowned upon and discourses of acceptance were prevalent, Kevin recognized that racism was still pervasive. Although these communities positioned themselves as being on the right side of many social justice issues, the race question remained unexamined. In Kevin’s words, “multiple stories and perspectives” were not considered, causing White norms to go unchecked.

Kevin and Grace's willingness to engage with the notion of passive racism displays transgressive White racial knowledge. As self-professed open-minded individuals with positive orientations towards difference, they could easily view racism as someone else's problem. Instead, their sociological imaginations allowed them to view racism as bigger than the thoughts or actions of any one individual. By understanding that racism was normal rather than aberrational (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), they were able to view their individual life choices within the system of racism. In that system, their openness towards others did not translate to an antiracist commitment. They appreciated that their backgrounds socialized them to equate abstract commitments to equality with an oppositional stance towards racism. As they learned of the structural, embedded nature of racism and the operation of racism through the status quo behavior of Whites, Kevin and Grace recognized that their individual thoughts were not enough. Their views deviated strongly from many White preservice teachers who conceptualize racism as an individual malady and as something possessed by other, more bigoted people (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Sleeter, 2008; Young, 2011).

As a final example of how the Urban Cohort spoke knowledgeably about the operation of race and racism, Zach provided an interesting critique of stereotypes. Individualized understandings of racism typically equate racism with stereotypes. These views imply that prejudice and discrimination occur because individuals do not have the proper information about individuals with different backgrounds than their own. This psychological model of racism (Sleeter, 1995) suggests that progress in race relations would occur if Whites learned more about people of color so as to debunk negative

stereotypes. While this agenda is laudable, it fails to account for the structural elements of racism and it pays little attention to the production of stereotypes and the ways stereotypes reinforce White supremacy (Lensmire, 2010, Thompson, 1999). Proving stereotypes inaccurate by introducing more information can create a powerful affective learning opportunity, but it keeps the functional purpose of stereotypes veiled. As Guinier (2004) would suggest, this strategy treats the symptoms of racism rather than the disease. Zach appreciated this distinction:

> I feel like in a classroom setting, race and racism are often examined through specific restrictions or stereotypes of people rather than in a larger context. While I have been in the classroom, I hear students say, "that's racist" about passing judgment on some someone or something and I feel that they do not see the greater landscape of a systematic approach to understanding certain ideas or restrictions throughout history. (Zach, written communication, 2012)

Zach suggested the importance of understanding stereotypes in a "larger context" and as part of the "greater landscape" of racial ideology. Zach felt this knowledge required awareness of the historical foundations of racist thought rather than a surface analysis of whether or not an individual statement might be considered racist. Zach pushed back against an individualized model of racism, and he hinted at the importance of appreciating structure as well.

During his interview, Zach spoke extensively about the evolution of his views regarding racial stereotypes and racism. I asked Zach what information presented during the Race Seminars resonated with him. His response provided greater insight into his critique of individualizing racism:

> And then like getting into ideas like race as a socially constructed system and everything like that. I guess it was something that I, I mean I didn't know, but as soon as, it was like a veil, you know, as soon as those words and that idea popped

> in then everything was clear right after that. It was like, oh, I was able to see this broader picture other than just being like you know, you know, if you're Black you're going to steal and stuff like that. It allowed me to see the context behind a lot of these stereotypes, I guess, which made the line kind of a little more defined between what are stereotypes and what is racism…And now I guess with all these other readings in all these other classes I see that stereotypes are sort of like kind of the manifestations of this longer context of social constructions and forms of constraint. So it was a conversation that I never had, um, and it was pretty eye-opening and enlightening. It was just a new perspective on everything. (Zach, interview, 2012)

Based on my other conversations with Zach, I knew that he did not have a biological determinism view of race. However, he had not heard race referred to as a social construction. Zach immediately began to grasp the implications of such a system and used the framework to understand the functioning of stereotypes. Prior to this, Zach might have suggested that the stereotype of a Black person as a possible thief was incomplete and racist in intent. Zach went beyond that simplistic critique here, however, suggesting that, "stereotypes are…the manifestations of this longer context of social constructions and forms of constraint." This statement demonstrates transgressive White racial knowledge in at least two ways. By noting that stereotypes are manifestations of racism rather than racism itself, Zach critiqued an individualized understanding of racism. Additionally, by understanding stereotypes as a product of a longer context of constraint for people of color, Zach hinted at the historical underpinnings of racism. Zach offered a critical take on how stereotypes functioned in the system of racism, and he pushed back against the prevalent psychological model of racism (Sleeter, 1995).

Through their nuanced awareness of the operation of race and racism in society, the members of the Urban Cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge. They talked about racism as a structural force with historic roots that Whites participate in

through both active and passive forms. Paige and Thomas spoke about how current racial inequities were grounded in historical processes, perpetuated through institutional policies, and sanctioned by governmental bodies. These claims transgressed against the view that racism is a thing of the past (Trainor, 2005) and only the product of “bad men doing bad things” (Brown & Brown, 2010). Thomas, Grace, and Kevin discussed the operation of passive racism in their lives. They critiqued the notion that commitments to openness and equality equated with a commitment to antiracism. They recognized the ways that racism was normalized in everyday interactions and how their inaction perpetuated systemic racism. In doing so, they disassociated themselves with the trope of the “good White” (Case & Hemmings,, 2005; Fellows & Razack, 1998) that many White preservice teachers use to disavow participation in racism. Zach critiqued an individualized understanding of racism through his discussion of stereotypes. Rather than equating stereotypes with racism, Zach talked about how stereotypes function as one component of a larger racial system. Collectively these views contrast with White racial knowledge that individualizes racism, locates racism in the past, and views racism as only present in egregious acts.

Discussion

The members of the Urban Cohort displayed transgressive White racial knowledge through their ability to speak about Whiteness and the machinations of structural racism. In doing so, they rose above the structured blindness (Mills, 1997) that informs White racial thinking. Structured blindness discourages Whites from developing an awareness of their personal racial identities and the implications of those identities.

White preservice teachers typically struggle to view themselves as raced and as beneficiaries of racial hierarchies (Applebaum, 2005; Mazzei, 2008; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009; Schick, 2000). Additionally, White racial knowledge views racism as a relic of the past and as only present in overt acts of bigotry (Tatum, 2003; Picower, 2009). However, the members of the Urban Cohort often spoke eloquently about the workings of Whiteness and the functioning of race and racism. They discussed the normalization of Whiteness and the benefits that flowed from membership in the dominant racial group. They discussed racism as a structural force with historic roots. They provided examples to link racist practices of the past to current racial inequality. Finally, they talked about how status quo attempts to ignore race can perpetuate, rather than mitigate, the impact of racism on the lives of people of color. These members of the cohort transgressed against White racial knowledge through their critical understandings of Whiteness and the operation of racism.

Once again, the ability to engage in these transgressive understandings about race flowed from the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). The cohort members resisted the epistemology of ignorance (Mills, 1997) that characterizes Whiteness and often causes Whites "to become falsely conscious of their social positions" (Mills, 1959, p. 5). The participants constantly drew connections between their personal experiences and broader social and historical forces, attending to Mills' call to appreciate the intersection of biography and history. They resisted an individualized analysis and understood the connection between their experiences and the position of their racial group in society. Comments made by Grace and Kevin from above illustrated the use of the sociological

imagination. In discussing the benefits of Whiteness, Grace suggested that noticing White privilege requires a deeper level of social awareness:

> It's not like I'm being discriminated against where it's this very obvious kind of action by someone that is based off of my race. But I think something I am learning to be more aware of is maybe a situation happens and realizing that maybe that situation was easy for me because I'm White. (Grace, interview, 2012)

While noticing overt discrimination or overt advantage can be relatively easy, Grace had to use her sociological imagination to appreciate the more subtle ways in which she enjoyed ease of navigation in most social encounters. Kevin's use of the sociological imagination allowed him to recognize the operation of passive racism: "I think that our tendency…is to gloss over the problem, acting as if we are not part of it—that if we simply treat everyone the same, then racism goes away" (Kevin, interview, 2012). By viewing racism as a contemporary, rather than historical, force, and by appreciating that White norms prevail when White people decide to "treat everyone the same," Kevin was able to understand his personal behavior in the context of racism. He recognized that he participated in racism by not taking more direct antiracist action. In both of these examples, as with the comments of many other cohort members in the above section, Grace and Kevin demonstrated transgressive White racial knowledge through the deployment of their sociological imaginations.

CONCLUSION

The members of the Urban Cohort displayed an impressive ability to consider the implications of how race and racism operate in their lives. They drew from their personal racial privileges as a means to understand structural racism. They detailed the workings

of Whiteness and the operation of race and racism both historically and contemporarily. Their dispositions towards engaging with the topic of race provide a powerful contrast to the resistant White teacher that appears in much educational literature (Haviland, 2008; Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009; Solomon et al., 2005). The members of the Urban Cohort transgressed against the typical White racial knowledge that is learned from and reinforced by the White community (Hurtado, 1996; Thandeka, 1999).

As a result of their transgressions, this group of White preservice teachers troubles the narrative of the resistant White teacher (Sleeter, 2008). The intent of detailing this transgressive White racial knowledge is not to proclaim these teachers as finished antiracist products. Rather, this analysis broadens the conceptualization of White racial knowledge by de-essentializing how White preservice teachers talk about race. At a fundamental level, the data presented here push back on the notion that Whiteness and White privilege serve as insurmountable obstacles in antiracist pedagogy (Lowenstein, 2009). Through the use of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959), the participants developed an awareness of Whiteness and the functioning of racism. They used that knowledge to develop critical understandings of how race operates in the context of education. They used their personal experiences to critique the notion of meritocracy and to appreciate how racism impacted the life outcomes of people of color. They talked openly about the normalization of Whiteness and how it provided them with ease of navigation in many social situations. They conceptualized racism as structural rather than individual, as passive as well as active, and as part of the present as well as the past.

These transgressive interpretations of how race functions in US society paint a more complicated picture of how White teachers engage with the topic of race.

However, the members of the Urban Cohort did not only display transgressive White racial knowledge during the Multicultural Course, the Race Seminars, their interviews, and their written reflections. As the next chapter will detail, these individuals also delved into more problematic talk about race and its impact on schools and society. Despite many of the impressive statements and burgeoning critical understandings of race on display in this chapter, the teachers also engaged in more conventional White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009). While one might read this upcoming chapter as a sign of discouragement, I feel it more completely captures the fits and starts that characterize the discomforting learning process (Kumashiro, 2004) for the Urban Cohort. While they arrived at the Urban Teaching program with commitments to social justice and a desire to grapple with issues of race, class, and gender, they also arrived with more than two decades of socialization in the ways of Whiteness. They transgressed against this background in many ways, but their engagement with the topic also displayed moments of inconsistency, anxiety, and inauthenticity. These views will provide a more complete portrait of how the Urban Cohort talked about race.

CHAPTER SIX: CONVENTIONAL WHITE RACIAL KNOWLEDGE

INTRODUCTION

To end the story of the Urban Cohort at this point would not provide a complete picture of their racial attitudes. While the transgressive White racial knowledge they displayed throughout their time in the Multicultural Course is laudable, they also engaged in some problematic talk about race. This problematic talk should not diminish the burgeoning critical understandings on display in the previous two chapters. Instead, it should be seen as a product of the complicated nature of discussing race and Whiteness in the teacher education space. Moreover, it should serve as a reminder of the conflicted, ambivalent nature of White identity (Lensmire, 2010) and how that identity produces mixed responses to antiracist pedagogy. I selected the Urban Cohort for study because of their stated commitments to social justice. I hoped that their productive, positive engagement with the topic of race might speak back to the ongoing trope of the resistant White preservice teacher (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Gordon, 2005; Haviland, 2008; Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). I also hoped that their stories would contribute to the de-homogenization of the White preservice teacher (Lowenstein, 2009) and serve as inspiration in the project of cultivating White allies (Tatum, 1994). However, as raced individuals sitting atop a racial hierarchy, they also have holes in their racial knowledge. Their nascent understandings of critical racial discourses sometimes lead them in problematic directions. By exploring these shortcomings and theorizing their connections to the racial worldview of Whiteness

(Leonardo, 2009), this chapter will provide portraits of White identity serviceable for teacher education.

As detailed previously, Leonardo (2009) uses the term White racial knowledge to describe the discourses accessed by Whites when discussing the topic of race. This perspective runs contrary to the view of Whites as lacking knowledge about race and holds them accountable when engaging in racial dialogue. When Whites remain silent (Mazzei, 2008), shift the conversation to class or gender (Gay & Kirkland, 2003), promote colorblind discourses (Ullucci & Battey, 2011), or otherwise disavow the significance of racism, they are conveying their understandings of race. This "White talk" (McIntyre, 1997) demonstrates the uneasiness that Whites have with the topic of race. As an example, Winans (2005) suggested that her students engaged in colorblindness as a way to avoid being perceived as racist. The students felt that seeing race or talking about race equated with racism. This response to racial dialogue reveals an aspect of their White racial knowledge. For these students, race is a taboo subject and something only possessed by people of color. For fear of saying the wrong thing, they attempt to avoid it entirely. In similar fashion, one can unpack many of the White tropes of resistance that emerge in the literature and trace them back to a fundamental discomfort with the topic of race for many White individuals.

These same issues emerged for the Urban Cohort as well. They experienced uneasiness with certain aspects of the conversations about race. I refer to these aspects of their understanding of race and racism as conventional White racial knowledge. This knowledge appeared in three ways. First, many members of the cohort shared stories of

early experiences with race in which they learned problematic lessons about Whiteness and the operation of racism. While these stories do not necessarily constitute the racial knowledge participants espouse today, the stories demonstrate early lessons on the meaning of Whiteness that impacted their racial identity development. Second, several members participated in moments of more typical White preservice teacher resistance to antiracist pedagogy. Many of these comments align with the White tropes of resistance detailed in chapter 2. In some cases, individuals demonstrated both transgressive and conventional White racial knowledge on the same subject. Third, on several occasions, members of the Urban Cohort misappropriated critical discourses about race and racism. This aspect of their conventional White racial knowledge is the most intriguing. Rather than pushing back on the notion of structural racism or passive racism, some participants used these concepts as a way to disavow their personal responsibility for the continuation of racism. These three categories of conventional White racial knowledge, particularly when juxtaposed with transgressive White racial knowledge, provide an interesting portrait of White racial identity. Rather than pushing back against antiracist pedagogy, these teachers engaged with the ideas in impressive fashion. However, limits to their engagement emerged. Teacher education can learn from both the progressive and problematic racial knowledge displayed by the Urban Cohort.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

Before sharing data related to the conventional White racial knowledge of the Urban Cohort, it is necessary to return to the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). While the sociological imagination acted as an essential habit of mind in crafting the

transgressive White racial knowledge of the Urban Cohort, it also impacted their conventional knowledge. The sociological imagination requires an appreciation for the intersection of biography and history when engaging in any social analysis. One who deploys it conceives of individual lives and actions bounded by broader sociohistorical forces. As Mills (1959) suggests,

> The first fruit of this imagination…is the idea that the individual can understand his own experience and gauge his own fate only by locating himself within his period, that he can know his own chances in life only by becoming aware of those of all individuals in his circumstances. (p. 5)

As the Urban Cohort demonstrated, the sociological imagination allowed for an array of critical understandings of the role of race and racism in schools and society. The participants used this framework to consider deficit thinking, the trope of the White savior, White normativity, the limits of meritocracy, passive racism, structural racism, and individualized understandings of racism. The Urban Cohort did so by considering the implications of their racial identities in a racially hierarchical society. In short, they viewed their biographies as nested within a longer history of racialization and White supremacy.

When the participants engaged in the conventional White racial knowledge detailed in this chapter, they fell short of utilizing the sociological imagination. As suggested above, their failings in this regard are linked to the mechanics of Whiteness and the conflicted, ambivalent aspects of their racial identities (Lensmire, 2010). In order to theorize their failings within the context of the sociological imagination, I return to Mills' original critique of the dominant social science paradigms of his time. In his classic work, Mills attacked the "abstract empiricists" and the "grand theorists" for

methodological failings in how they approached issues of social importance. While the empiricists myopically gathered data without connecting their findings to broader social forces, the grand theorists spoke from "useless heights" (Mills, 1959, p. 33), fetishizing concepts rather than identifying issues that mattered in people's lives. I draw a parallel with Mills' critique of these two camps and ongoing social science debates over the prominence of agency (capacity for individual, autonomous action) versus structure (social arrangements that limit choices and opportunity) in influencing social outcomes. An over reliance on agency is akin with the unmoored (Grant & Wieczorek, 2000) nature of the abstract empiricists while too much dependency on structure aligns with the disembodied thinking of the grand theorists. When members of the Urban Cohort engaged in conventional White racial knowledge, they either over-emphasized the autonomy of the individual in their racial analysis or their awareness of racial structures led them to undermine the potential of individual action. In this way, they fell short of Mills' contention that "neither the life of an individual nor the history of a society can be understood without understanding both" (p. 3).

LEARNING TO BE WHITE

Thandeka's (1999) work, *Learning to be White,* offers a unique take on the roots of the conflicted nature of White racial identity. While CWS scholars in the field of history (Ignatiev, 1994; Roediger, 2005) often discuss Whiteness as a racial identity born out of negation, Thandeka extends this notion to how Whiteness is learned within the White community. Thandeka suggests that White people, even at very young ages, experience a series of micro and macro aggressions from their White caretakers aimed at

policing the borders of Whiteness. In short, White adults teach White children what it means to be White. Hurtado (1996) concurs, suggesting that "the unspoken, nonconscious power dynamics" of Whiteness are "socialized in the intimacy of [White] families" (p. 149). This racial curriculum can manifest as negative actions or attitudes toward people of color but also occurs through disapproval of White attempts at cross-racial relationships or interactions. Often at young ages, Whites meet resistance from the White community as a result of displaying interest in racial difference or attempting to interact with people of color. As a result, many White people's early memories of race evoke feelings of *shame*, an emotional and psychological response produced by the policing of the boundaries of Whiteness. Thandeka chronicles these experiences of racial shame by asking her interview participants about the first time they realized they were White. As an example, one respondent shared a story of bringing two African American friends over during his fifth birthday party. As he walked through the house and felt disapproving stares from the White adults in attendance, he knew he had done something gravely wrong. He felt shame for bringing his two friends to the party.

Thandeka's theorization of White shame differs from the notion of White guilt (Picower, 2009). While guilt is a feeling that stems from a wrongful deed, shame represents not something that one did, "but rather from something wrong with oneself" (Thandeka, 1999, p. 13). White guilt about the issue of race flows from an awareness of White privilege and the history of White supremacy. White shame emerges from a feeling of letting down the White community by "not being White enough.". After

feeling rebuffed by one's community for crossing an unspoken boundary, the individual experiences internal trauma that shapes one's view toward racially proscribed Others:

> Shame is an emotional display of a hidden civil war. It is a pitched battle by a self against itself in order to stop feeling what it is not supposed to feel: forbidden desires and prohibited feelings that render one different. Such desires and felt differences must be suppressed or blocked off in some way because one's community deems them to be bad. (p. 12)

Thandeka suggests that the price of admission into the White collective is a denial of feelings and desires that "render one different." Ultimately, one becomes White not from a choice, but from a desire "to remain within the community that is quite literally its life" (p. 24). In this way, Whiteness is learned at young ages through the fear of a loss of community. To avoid this loss, the White individual abides by the borders of Whiteness. Ultimately, these practices reinforce a sense of White solidarity (Hurtado, 1996), but because the construction of this community rests upon tacit understandings of racial dynamics, its existence becomes natural or unremarkable to its members.

The members of the Urban Cohort shared similar stories to those of Thandeka's participants. These stories emerged at two points in the data collection. First, the written reflection after the second Race Seminar asked them to share an incident in which their racial identities became particularly salient. Second, I asked the preservice teachers in the first interview if they could recall the first time they thought about or felt their Whiteness. The stories they shared with me in these two forms did not always constitute a first memory of thinking about race or Whiteness, but they were all significant incidents in which race or racial difference rose to the surface in an interaction. These stories emerged in two primary ways. In some of the stories, the cohort members detailed explicit

experiences in which their interactions with people of color or their interest in cultural aspects of minority racial groups met resistance by members of the White community. These stories expressly captured the feeling of White shame Thandeka discussed. The second type of story also related to White shame but involved an incident in which the participant drew scorn for how she or he talked about or noticed race. In these stories, the individual did not receive an explanation for why the race talk was problematic and left the situation with confused feelings about the topic of race. These incidents represent missed opportunities for learning about racial difference. The cohort members left these incidents with conflicted feelings, ultimately assuming that they should avoid any discussion of race.

The policing of Whiteness

Thomas' early memory of thinking about his racial identity provided a classic example of the policing of Whiteness and the shame such practices induce for those reprimanded. In one of his written reflections, Thomas wrote of an interaction involving two older cousins who were of a mixed racial background:

> I distinctly remember, however, an encounter [with my cousins] in our neighborhood that still has an impact on me today. It was nothing overtly racist or blatantly disrespectful, but I remember that my neighbor saw us all interacting together and was noticeably puzzled. [My cousins'] father is black, you see, and their skin complexion is much darker than anyone else in our family. In retrospect, I am sure that I recognized this difference in appearance even from a young age, but I immediately realized it had no divisive implications in our relationship and that was the end of it. When my neighbor questioned the very nature of our relationship and required my cousins to truly "explain" how we were related, I remember the emotion very well. It wasn't anger, hate, or disappointment-it was a feeling closer to awkwardness. I hated the fact that my neighbor felt the need (whether consciously or unconsciously) to make us aware that our roots just didn't line up, and that we were somehow off. It just never seemed necessary. (Thomas, written communication, 2012)

In Thomas' story, his neighbor "felt the need" to remind Thomas and his cousins "that [their] roots just didn't line up." Thomas' neighbor attempted to police Thomas' transgressions against the White community. The emotion that Thomas described as "awkwardness" fits well with Thandeka's descriptions of White shame. Thomas realized that the price for interacting with his cousins in public spaces would be a loss of respectability in the eyes of some in his community. The shame and confusion Thomas experienced was compounded by the adoration he felt for his two older cousins. This incident taught Thomas that such interactions could be subject to public scorn.

Paige shared two stories that illustrated the practice of White policing. During our first interview, Paige spoke about how her transition from a predominantly White elementary school into a more diverse middle school heightened her racial awareness. Although she claimed that different racial groups interacted positively in the school, her story reveals the operation of White policing:

> Um, but I do remember one time in eighth grade, this guy, he was Mexican, he sent me a note asking me out and my friend was like you can not date him. But not saying really explicitly that it was because of race but, I mean, that was why. Because that would be really bad. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Paige did not offer many details in this story and did not state whether or not she had interest in accepting this young man's offer. The actions of her friend are a clear example of policing the borders of Whiteness. Paige spoke elsewhere about the greater value that being White had in her school. For Paige's friend, dating a Latino boy would diminish that value and place her outside the good graces of her White friends. Although Paige did not express whether or not she felt shame or embarrassment from this incident, her ability

to recall the situation conveys the impact it had on her awareness of the boundaries Whites should not cross.

A second story from Paige demonstrated policing but related to a White friend rather than herself. This incident also related to the more diverse nature of the middle school Paige and her friend attended. Paige's friend experienced severe taunting from other White students due to his interest in hip hop culture:

> Um in middle school also, my friend, […], he, it was a big deal because he got called a wigger a few times. Um because, I think because he was kind of in to hip hop culture at the time. And I remember like figuring out what the word meant and then really being confused as to like why that would even make a difference, as to why that would be a big deal if you were white but you were into this other kind of music and other kind of thing. Um but he was really upset about it. It became a really big deal that he got constantly teased because of that. And he kind of changed like who he was hanging out with and what he was doing. I remember even from middle school to high school there was kind of a big change as far as the groups he was hanging out with. I think he was friends with a lot more black students [in middle school] and not when he got to high school. I remember that is more about his whiteness than mine but it was, it made me think about the fact, I mean that what I consume dictates like how into my own race I am. (Paige, interview, 2012)

In this overt act of policing, Paige's friend experienced ridicule and virtual excommunication from the White community as a result of his interest in hip hop culture and his relationship with Black students. This policing ultimately caused Paige's friend to submit to the norms of the White community, as he "changed…who he was hanging out with and what he was doing." Although Paige was a spectator rather than the subject of these taunts, she clearly learned an important lesson of Whiteness: "that what I consume dictates like how into my own race I am." Paige learned that experimenting with cultural practices of other racial groups does not come without its costs. Through taunting and

marginalization, the White community in Paige's school pressured her friend to renounce his cross-racial interests.

Kevin also recounted an incident in which he experienced policing by the White community. As mentioned previously, Kevin attended schools with a large Asian American population. When speaking about the operation of Whiteness in his school, Kevin noted that White norms created a hierarchical distinction between Asian students with closer ties to their country of origin's language and culture and those who embraced American culture and mainstream values. Kevin shared a story of a budding friendship with an Asian American student from the former group. This student spoke accented English and did not interact with the popular, White crowd in Kevin's school. After recognizing this about his new acquaintance, Kevin began to distance himself from the relationship in order to retain a superior status position:

> I don't think that I, I don't know if it was even purposeful like a conscious move, but you kind of have this, almost like this, survival instinct and, um, I remember working really hard to try and you know get in with the kids who I saw were cool or that people liked. Although I was never [pause] maybe I was, but I tried never to be antagonistic or mean to those students. Or to students that were you know not cool or disadvantaged or had an accent but yeah you definitely end up [pause] I ended up distancing myself from that group and trying to almost in an attempt to gain some sort of social power or influence. (Kevin, interview, 2012)

Kevin's story is one of suppressed desire. Although Kevin used terminology related to "coolness" rather than Whiteness, the racial connections are quite easy to see in this story. Kevin squelched his connection with this student as a type of "survival instinct." Using Thandeka's notion of White shame, Kevin's rejection of this friendship resulted from a desire to remain within the fold of Whiteness. He witnessed Asian students with accents and obvious cultural differences endure ridicule and ostracism. Kevin realized

that if he wanted the "social power or influence" Whiteness granted to its members, he could only have relationships with individuals who abided by White standards of behavior.

Kevin, Paige, and Thomas recounted stories of White policing from their youth. These stories varied but all represented examples of the process of "learning to be White" (Thandeka, 1999). The White community in which they lived governed their actions with racially proscribed Others. This policing process reveals much about the nature of Whiteness. Gross (2009) suggests that paying attention to these interactions on the borders of Whiteness reveals key elements: "The margins of a category create the core…People revealed what race meant to them only when they needed to adjudicate its boundaries" (p. 11). When Kevin, Paige, and Thomas experimented with the margins of Whiteness, they faced scorn, ridicule, and rebuke. These "ajudications" taught them "what race meant" to White people. More than just a racial identity, Whiteness acted as a valuable form of property (Harris, 1993) that one should not tarnish through cross-racial interaction. Paige conceded as much when she elaborated on how White policing encouraged her to associate primarily with the White community:

> Yeah, yeah that's what you do. That's what you're into. And you, it, again, because white people are worth more, you should hold yourself to a higher standard and not lower yourself to these other people by engaging in their culture. (Paige, interview, 2012)

Regardless of the transgressive ways these individuals might talk about race in other contexts, they all had early experiences in which they learned the value of Whiteness and how to maintain, even invest (Lipsitz, 1995), in that value. They experienced White shame for their attempts to reach across racial lines.

Racial silences and missed opportunities

Other cohort members also shared powerful stories of early racial memories. Although these stories did not involve attempts at cross-racial interactions that met with refusal, they involved lessons that taught much about the nature of Whiteness. Whites also learn lessons about the meaning of Whiteness through racial silences or through unchecked or unexplained antagonisms toward people of color. Thandeka (1999) suggests that "in the face of adult silence to racial abuse, the child learns to silence and then deny its own resonant feelings" (p. 24). In these examples, the cohort members made racial comments that invoked memorable reactions from other members of the White community. However, no explanation or learning opportunity occurred. The participant who made the racial comment left the incident without learning the reasons behind the reaction she or he received. Instead, the only lesson to emerge was that talking about or noticing race was not acceptable. This gave the topic of race a strong negative connotation, something one should feel shame for discussing. These lessons promote a confused White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009) that views race as a taboo topic but also a very important distinction between people. Samuel, Paige, and Litzy's stories revealed how their attempts at making sense of race evoked anger in members of the White community and brought shame upon them for their actions.

During Samuel's initial interview, we discussed his early experiences with race. In particular, we talked about the Whiteness of his school and community and the racial attitudes he witnessed in those areas. When I asked Samuel if he could recall an incident that made him think about his racial identity, he spoke about his experiences spending

time with his grandparents at a young age. He prefaced the story with some background on his grandparents:

> And both my grandparents had, you know, they are the white hegemony stuff that we talk about in class. They had very racist attitudes and just, um, made that pretty explicit that there was a difference between how they felt we were and how African Americans were. And, I mean, you can say they came from a different generation and they did and all the rest of it, but they had a very clear way of how they viewed the races and um brought it up constantly. Not constantly, but they didn't shy away from it. It's not like how we treat racism and stuff today where we don't talk about it or we use very overly correct language. It was very blunt. (Samuel, interview, 2012)

Samuel conceded that growing up in predominantly White, affluent environments made his Whiteness rather invisible to him. His immediate family engaged in "overly correct language" about race and so Samuel did not experience explicit discussion about racial difference. The trips to his grandparents' house brought these issues to the forefront in an aggressive fashion and shaped his understanding of the value of Whiteness.

When I asked Samuel if he recalled a specific incident from the time he spent with his grandparents, he shared the following story: "I can think of one thing that my grandma said. I said, 'Granny, there is a black lady over there.' And, I forget what I was referring to but I remember her response: 'That's a black woman, not a lady'" (Samuel, interview, 2012). This incident displayed the convoluted way in which Samuel learned about racial difference from his grandmother. Samuel attempted to draw attention to the presence of an African American woman as a result of his grandparents' frequent discussion of racial issues, as detailed in the previous quote. His grandmother's response—that the woman in question was not a "lady"—delivered racial lessons to Samuel in an indirect fashion. At his young age, Samuel did now know the difference

between a "woman" and a "lady," but he learned that one was more valued and that a Black woman could not be a lady. Samuel's story is typical of the tacit, incomplete manner in which many Whites learn about racial difference and the meaning of their own Whiteness.

Litzy's story also involved learning about race as a taboo subject, albeit in a different fashion. The experience occurred at a very young age so her memory of the incident is shaped both by her mother's retelling of the event and Litzy's personal recollections. The story comes from an interview Litzy participated in as part of the admission process into a kindergarten class. The interviewer asked the students questions on a variety of topics and the students either circled a smiley face to represent an affirmative response or a sad face to signify a negative response. One question asked the students whether or not they would play with a student who had different colored skin than their own. Litzy, misunderstanding the intent of the question, circled the sad face. This resulted in a meeting with her mother and the school principal in which they discussed Litzy's stated refusal to interact with students of color. Litzy explained that she thought the question referred to a child with purple or green skin and that she answered with the sad face because she thought the question asked about an alien. When her mother explained that the intent of the question was to find out if Litzy would play with a Black child, Litzy explained that she thought about those skin colors as all the same but with different shades. Litzy's mother continues to tell this story as a humorous anecdote but Litzy took away a much different lesson from the incident:

> As far as lessons that I took away from the memory, I remember feeling like race was something that I did not understand, but was quite crucial, and most

> importantly, that it was not to be talked about because that meant you were in trouble. Who knows what conclusions I would have drawn if I had not been taught in kindergarten that talking about race is only something that will get you in trouble? Rather than turning race into a taboo subject only associated with skin color, perhaps a foundation for understanding and appreciation of cultural differences could have been established. (Litzy, written communication, 2012)

Litzy's associates this incident, and the topic of race in general, with a scary and confusing visit to the principal's office. In her mind, the reaction her response on the admissions interview generated signified the "crucial" nature of race, but she received no explanation for its importance. Race clearly mattered to the adults in her life and only certain race dialogue was acceptable, but, to Litzy, race remained a confusing topic that "meant you were in trouble." Rather than serving as a learning opportunity, Litzy's experience reinforced the taboo nature of race.

As a final example, Paige recounted her memories of learning about the "N-word" at a young age. Growing up in the South, Paige recalled hearing the word before but only began to understand its implications through hearing her stepfather use it on a frequent basis. During a car ride with her mother, Paige saw a Black man walking on the sidewalk and decided to show off the new term she learned. Her mother's reaction created a lasting impression on Paige:

> [My mother] knew where I had picked up the word, and she forcefully told me to never say it again. When I complained that other people were allowed to say it, she only repeated that I could never say it. I didn't really understand why it was so bad, but I equated it with saying a curse word. I am a rule follower by nature, so I didn't say the word again. (Paige, written communication, 2012)

Similar to Samuel and Litzy, Paige's experience with noticing race and utilizing racial terminology resulted in a harsh rebuke but with no explanation. Paige's contention that "other people were allowed to say it" did not dissuade her mother or merit additional

explanation. From this encounter, Paige learned only that she should not say this word. She did not learn anything related to the history of the word or why some people, such as her stepfather, chose to use the word. Paige's emotional response to this incident aligns with Thandeka's theorization of White shame: "I felt shame about using that word, not because I understood what it meant, but because I was reprimanded for using it" (Paige, written communication, 2012). Paige's White shame did not come from a rebuffed attempt at interracial interaction. Instead, it came from unknowingly violating standards of polite racial talk. In many ways, Paige's shame actually arises from the shame her mother felt in hearing Paige casually use a racial epithet. Her mother's shame drove the sharp reprimand and, in turn, created a feeling of shame for Paige as well.

Discussion

These stories resonate when thinking about the racial knowledge of the Urban Cohort because of their impact on foundational understandings of Whiteness and racial identity. These stories represent small examples of the White policing and White racial silences that the White community commits against its younger members throughout their development. In an attempt to remain in the good graces of the White community, the cohort members backed away from their desires for racial difference. They also came to view race as an explosive topic that they should refrain from discussing. Their early attempts to notice race or use the racial terminology that swirled around them created negative interactions with members of their families or others in the White community. These stories allow one to understand the process of learning to be White as a series of "small, seemingly inconsequential, defeats" (Thandeka, 1999, p. 1). These defeats help

bring about the conflicted, ambivalent nature of White identity (Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Lensmire, 2010). When the cohort members discuss these racial memories, “It produces the disconcerting feeling that something about one’s own white identity is not quite right. This sense of misalignment with one’s own identity could serve as a definition of shame” (Thandeka, 1999, p. 1). Understanding this feeling of misalignment or conflict within White identity provides an insight into how transgressive and conventional White racial knowledge can exist alongside one another in an individual. Rather than viewing these individual preservice teachers as either transgressive or conventional, one should understand that White identity is fundamentally conflicted over issues of race. Ralph Ellison (1986) suggested that Whites resolve their conflicted identity by labeling people of color, Blacks, in particular, as outsiders. However, this “tricky magic,” as Ellison calls it, comes at a cost. The stories presented above demonstrate how the “tricky magic” of White identity can also induce feelings of shame, loss, and misalignment.

THE WHITE TROPES OF RESISTANCE

As documented previously, the scholarship in teacher education abounds with depictions of White preservice teacher resistance to antiracist or multicultural pedagogy. This resistance manifests as silence during racial discussions (Mazzei, 2008), a reliance on colorblind discourses (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Ullucci & Battey, 2011), an individualized understanding of racism (Applebaum, 2005; Sleeter, 1993), a re-centering of White experiences (DiAngelo & Allen, 2006), an attempt to claim White victimization (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2012), an assertion of positive White identity (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Schick, 2000), or a move to shift the conversation to other identity elements such

as class or gender (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). Collectively, these tropes of resistance constitute what McIntyre (1997) calls "White talk," referring to White utilization of particular discourses to deflect or to avoid a critical racial analysis. However, one should not understand the deployment of these discourses as an attempt to avoid discussions of race. Instead, the discourses operate as strategies that allow White preservice teachers to navigate race discussions in ways that do not damage their positive self images (Segall & Garrett, 2013). The content of these strategies also constitutes the body of White racial knowledge (Leonardo, 2009) possessed by the individual. White participation in these resistance discourses should not be seen as the smooth representation of racism. Rather than viewing Whites as autonomous individuals choosing to engage in problematic race talk, Whites should be viewed in the context of Whiteness as a system of racial reasoning (Ringrose, 2007). White preservice teachers speak from a particular racial positionality and a body of racial knowledge that buttresses their position in the racial hierarchy.

Although the members of the Urban Cohort often eschewed many of the resistance discourse mentioned above, such as colorblindness and individualized understandings of racism, their willingness to engage in the antiracist project had limits as well. Many members found ways to talk about race in transgressive ways while also leaving openings for conventional White racial knowledge. While the cohort members never offered up egregious denial discourses or made strong claims about meritocracy or fairness, they nevertheless pushed back against their implication in structural racism. Their decidedly more subtle resistance discourses took the form of positioning themselves as "good Whites" in race relations (Case & Hemmings, 2005), suggesting that

productive dialogue about race required a safe space to protect White participants (Leonardo & Porter, 2010), and minimizing the salience of race through the use of qualifying statements about its importance. Through these resistance discourses, the Urban Cohort members demonstrated the limits of their transgressive White racial knowledge.

The 'good White' and the housekeeper of color

Throughout the interviews and written reflections, several White members of the Urban Cohort found ways to acknowledge the existence and operation of racism while finding subtle ways to distance themselves from those structural processes. Such tactics are not uncommon to progressive-minded White teachers. As Schick (2000) found with many of her participants, their self concepts as saviors and protectors of society's underdogs formed a crucial element of their teacher identities. In order to maintain these identities, the teachers disavowed their personal participation in racism. Instead, they talked about the racism of others, highlighting how they differed from these individuals. Maria's discussion about growing up in the South provided an excellent example of this tactic:

> I think there are a lot of racist people and there were people that said derogatory things about Black people, but I didn't grow up in that kind of environment so like I would always be really offended by that and stand up for people. Yeah, there was a lot of stereotypical stuff said by teenagers and stuff, you wouldn't really hear a lot of adults say that, but younger people around you would and you'd be like, where did they get that from? (Maria, interview 2012)

Here, Maria positioned herself as a defender of Black people from the racist attacks of her peers. Maria "didn't grow up in that kind of environment" so racist language offended her and she took action in response. Although she did not elaborate on what she

did to “stand up for people,” she clearly imagined herself as more enlightened on the topic of race than many of her peers. Maria also shared stories about how she often corrected her brother’s thinking about race, as he frequently made outrageous claims such as stating that people of color “have more kids because they want to make more money on welfare and stuff like that” (Maria, interview, 2012). Maria did not engage in discourses of outright resistance toward the existence of racism. Instead, her discussions of race positioned her as a “white, middle class helper” (Schick, 2000, p. 87).

Another way that members of the Urban Cohort positioned themselves as “good Whites” was by emphasizing the positive relationship that they had with their housekeepers. Interestingly, this topic emerged from both Grace and Maria. They grew up in the Southwest and South, respectively, and Grace’s family employed a Latina housekeeper while Maria’s family employed an African American housekeeper. In both situations, a housekeeper seemed to be a “normal” part of their household and those of their friends. They both positioned their relationship with their housekeeper as very positive and noted that their families felt very close to the women in their employ. They also used these relationships to highlight their personal openness toward people of color and to suggest that race relations in their communities had positive aspects as well as negative aspects. Maria spoke extensively about this relationship:

> I’ve thought about the relationship I’ve had with my housekeeper, like my mom worked growing up and we had somebody clean our house and watch us and stuff and we had a really good relationship…I think I told someone in our group or in our program that like I had a black housekeeper growing up and they take it the wrong way, but it’s not like that. We actually had a really good relationship. She still comes and cleans and I bring her home and take her to the bank and to the grocery and drop her off at home you know. I think there’s a stigma of having, like, help people come to your house like that and especially in [city name], that

> Southern you know, but it wasn't like that and still isn't and I feel like I have to defend it, you know. We have a really good relationship. (Maria, interview, 2012)

Maria offered the commentary on her relationship with her housekeeper after I asked about her thoughts on the quality of race relations in her community. She chose to emphasize her family's relationship with their housekeeper to push back against the traditional understanding of racial tension in Southern communities. In this comment, Maria mentioned that they had a "really good relationship" three times. She also positioned herself as a helper, driving her housekeeper to run errands and then giving her a ride home as well. Maria's numerous declarations about the quality of the relationship suggest that she recognized the stigma of having a person of color as "help" in a Southern household. However, she maintained that her family's situation with their housekeeper "wasn't like that." It existed outside of this history and its implications.

Grace also referred to her relationship with their family housekeeper, a Mexican American woman, to emphasize her openness toward racial Others and her rejection of negative stereotypes towards people of color. During our first interview, I asked Grace how she developed her positive dispositions towards racial difference, particularly since she grew up in a rather racially isolated community. Grace traced her attitudes to the values instilled in her by her family and specifically mentioned the housekeeper relationship as an important influence on her thinking about race:

> I think a lot of this has to do with my home environment again. Like our housekeeper, her name is […], and she is Mexican, but we consider her part of our family. And she has been with us for years. My mom goes over to her house and her mom has been to our house and, you know, so there's that relational aspect. So, part of me thinks that in [city name] there are moments when it's not as, you know, kind of divided, that there really is a community or relationships between Whites and Latinos. (Grace, interview, 2012)

Much like Maria's comment above, Grace emphasized that her housekeeper is "part of [their] family" and implied that the housekeeper also considers them part of her family. Grace noted that her mother has visited the home of their housekeeper, suggesting that their relationship is deeper than more traditional relationships with household help. Grace also used this story to suggest that race relations in her city were not as divided as many people perceive them to be. Like Maria, Grace seemed aware of the implications of the relationship between a White family and a housekeeper of color, but she suggested that their relationship signified a positive example of racial interaction and understanding.

In some ways, Maria and Grace's mentioning of their positive relationships with their family housekeepers is reminiscent of how some White people might reject the notion that they participate in racism because they have Black friends (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) or, as one of Picower's (2009) White participants stated, "I would date a Black guy." Such stories individualize racism rather than considering racism as a broader, structural force. By emphasizing the relationship between a family and its housekeeper, Grace and Maria might be seeking to provide an "exception to the rule" (Leonardo, 2009) in regards to racism. However, Maria and Grace do not use these stories as casual rejections of the existence of racism. They use the stories to highlight some of the positive elements of their racial backgrounds. They positioned themselves as "good Whites" and as open to interacting with racial Others. One might interpret this self portrayal similar to how Trainor (2005) responded when, in response to discussions about race, one of her students stated: "My ancestors didn't own slaves." Rather than viewing this comment as situating racism as a thing of the past, Trainor suggested that this

comment could also be “a way of expressing, ironically, racial solidarity, by suggesting that they are on the ‘right’ side” (p. 146). The statement could express an appeal for racial solidarity across a confusing and seemingly insurmountable sociohistorical divide. When Maria and Grace centered their families’ relationships with their housekeepers, they also attempted to express racial solidarity. Their analysis was ahistorical and avoided the structural implications of race, but that does not make their sentiments false or their intentions impure. They positioned themselves as progressive White actors in race relations not to reject racism outright but to push back against the essentialization of White racial identity as negative and oppressive.

A ‘safe space’ for talking about race

Another interesting technique of resistance employed by some members of the Urban Cohort involved an emphasis on the need for safety during discussions of race. The preservice teachers expressed this concern both in regards to racial conversations they participated in with peers and with the conversations they imagined having with students when they entered classrooms. Even Michael, perhaps the cohort’s most stalwart proponent of acknowledging and dismantling racism, expressed concerns about safety in racial dialogue:

> I think it’s scary. I mean even somebody like me who’s as [pause] versed and, more than just versed, like passionate about this, it’s still scary to put it into your teaching, to put it into your classroom. Because as you said, you’re then taking on a very political role as a teacher, which just has much greater risk, I think. Risk of upsetting, ruffling feathers of your own administration or like the students in your class and their parents or whatever. Because I think a lot of our, our discussions this semester are that teachers are political agents. But I think society has an expectation that teachers aren’t political agents. That you are supposed to be unbiased and academically informative on a neutral basis. So, um, I think it’s scary, but at the same time, I think that if I get fired someday because of

> something like that then I'm not gonna care very much, but you still don't want to disrespect anyone. (Michael, interview, 2012)

Michael expressed concern for safety on numerous levels in this response. He noted that explicitly talking about race risked upsetting school administrators, students, and parents. He also expressed the potential loss of job security through acting as a "political agent" by bringing discussions of race to the classroom. Although Michael ended this comment by suggesting he was "not gonna care very much" if he lost his job over his commitments, he even finished that statement by noting that he did not "want to disrespect anyone." Michael clearly desires to bring racial conversations into his classroom, but he fears that the lack of safety for those involved in the discussion make his pedagogical goals risky and perhaps impractical.

Litzy also explored the issue of safety when talking about race in classrooms. However, whereas Michael expressed concerns over the backlash he might experience, Litzy's primary concern related to the possibility of tension between White students and students of color in her classroom:

> I mean, I'm not really sure how to communicate that to children and that's what we're learning and that's what we're talking about and, that's what I'm writing this big paper about, but I mean it's really difficult to try to [pause] I just don't want the girls[8] to think that like [pause] I don't want them to be antagonistic toward their white friends because they think white people are out to get them or think they are better than them. (Litzy, interview, 2012)

Throughout our discussions, Litzy struggled with how she might address issues of race in her classroom. She pushed back strongly against the essentialization of Whiteness she perceived through our class discussions about structural racism. She also mentioned that

---

[8] Litzy's student teaching field placement was in an all-girls school.

spending too much time talking about racism throughout history would be unproductive since the students in the classroom did not participate in such actions. Ultimately, Litzy feared that her discussions would endanger the White students in her classroom, making the students of color "antagonistic" out of fears that "White people are out to get them."

Maria conveyed a similar sentiment to Litzy's about the issue of safety in race dialogue. During our first interview, I asked Maria what she would want a student of color to learn about the topic of race after having her as a teacher for a school year. Maria hoped that the racial knowledge those students gained would be channeled toward taking action rather than evoking anger:

> I guess I would want them to understand that there's something they can do about racism. You know, like there's actions that they can take that doesn't involve just getting angry at the system, that there's ways to work around it. And, like improve other people's understanding about it without being incendiary, I guess. And, the only reason I'm saying that, I guess, is with the election and the whole year and stuff is just so [pause] people have gotten so sensitive, and race is a very sensitive subject as it is, but especially like in a political year, in an election year, I guess that's been on my mind a lot. I guess just like not all white people are bad, a lot of us care about them, too. (Maria, interview, 2012)

Maria's comment provided interesting insight into the lack of safety she felt in conversations about race. Although her hope that her students will learn to take action against racism seems laudable, the remainder of her comment makes clear that she feels that the students should tread lightly with the actions they take. Maria implied that "getting angry" or "being incendiary" would only make the situation worse, particularly due to the "sensitive" nature of the topic of race. She also feared for the safety of White people, expressing a desire that the students of color do not view all White people in a

negative light. This final part of her comment aligned with Litzy's critique that racial discussions tend to over-essentialize Whiteness.

Michael, Litzy, and Maria tempered their commitments to talking about race and racism by questioning the issue of safety in the classroom space. However, they did not use this critique to assert the notion that racial discussions have no place in schools. Instead, they suggested that such conversations could be unproductive without proper safeguards in place. They share these concerns with other White teachers who fear the implications of talking about race in schools (Bolgatz, 2005; Epstein, 2009; Lewis, 2008; Pollock, 2009). However, what they fail to appreciate about their concerns for safety in racial discussions is that their primary interest is in White safety. Litzy and Maria feared for the White students in their classrooms. Michael feared backlash from administrators and parents, both of whom are presumably White in Michael's scenario. One could imagine that their view of "White safety" in cross-racial dialogue would involve creating a space where individuals can speak their minds and share their experiences while feeling respected and affirmed in their viewpoints. While such guidelines seem admirable, DiAngelo and Sensoy (2012) suggest that

> In the context of cross-racial dialogues that are explicitly about race and racism, what feels safe for Whites is presumed to feel safe for people of Color. Yet for many students and instructors of Color the classroom is a hostile space virtually all of the time, and especially so when the topic addressed is race. (p. 3)

The dominant racial position of Whites, which reproduces the normativity of Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993), typically insulates White individuals from considerations about their racial identities. Overt discussions about racism that center White supremacy create an uncomfortable situation for White people. They often view this racial discourse as an

attack on them as individuals rather than as a critique of an inequitable system. The pleas for "White safety" in such discussions actually serve as a cover to protect Whites from frank discussions about their implication in White supremacy. In many ways, Litzy, Michael, and Maria's calls for safety align with protecting themselves and White students from the uncomfortable realities of racism.

Leonardo and Porter (2010) thoughtfully expand on this critique of "White safety" in cross-racial discussions:

> This is tantamount to premising racial pedagogy on assumptions about comfort, which quickly degrade anti-racist teaching into image and personal management. In other words, the higher goal of understanding and fighting racism is exchanged for creating a safe space where whites can avoid publicly 'looking racist,' which then overwhelms their reasons for participating in racial dialogue. (p. 139)

Leonardo and Porter suggest that a focus on comfort and safety in racial dialogue compromises the pedagogical project of identifying and dismantling racism. In order for productive dialogue on race to occur, people of color need to share their experiences and White people need to listen. Too often, Whites feel that their experiences with race, which often contradict claims of racism (Applebaum, 2008; DiAngelo & Allen, 2006), are just as valid as those of people of color. When their attempts to center their experiences and perspectives meet resistance, Whites often retreat to silence (Mazzei, 2008) or protest that they are "getting slammed" (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2012) by the people of color in the conversation. In this way, calls for safety typically mean that Whites can avoid the discussion or use their unmediated personal experiences as shields from considering the contours of racism. Michael, Litzy, and Maria prioritized protecting the White individuals involved in the conversation. However, it is worth stating again

that their desire for safety is not the same thing as suggesting that conversations about race have no place in schools. On the contrary, these preservice teachers—Michael, in particular—perceive a conflict of interest between their desire to tackle racial issues and their goals for harmonious classroom environments. Their resistance to the antiracist project emerged in a more subtle form, but it emerged here nonetheless.

Downplaying the salience of race

Gay and Kirkland (2003) highlighted a typical White trope of resistance to antiracist or multicultural pedagogy by identifying how many of their preservice teachers tended to shift conversations about race toward talking about class or gender. While the student teachers' desire to engage in a class or gender analysis of inequities in education may have been sincere, such an approach ultimately disengages from a conversation about race. For White folks, a shift away from an explicit focus on race shines the critical gaze elsewhere. It allows these individuals an opportunity to assert their own societal disadvantages through what Fellows and Razack (1998) call "the race to innocence." They can appeal to subordinated elements of their identities in order to disavow complicity in hierarchical power structures. At times, the members of the Urban Cohort attempted to center an analysis of class or gender rather than race. However, their moves to diminish the salience of race operated in a more subtle fashion as well. Rather than rejecting the racial elements at play in a situation, they engaged with the racial component but also noted its incompleteness. It is difficult to say why they felt the need to make these qualifying statements about the salience of race. Perhaps they sincerely desired to engage in an intersectional analysis (Crenshaw, 1991) or perhaps they

perceived an essentialization of race and Whiteness that made them uncomfortable (Trainor, 2002). Regardless, this technique of resistance followed the pattern of the cohort's other tactics. Rather than outright rejection or pushback, the members of the cohort massaged their understandings of antiracism in ways that diminished the overall salience of race.

Kevin provided an excellent example of this resistance tactic during our first interview. I asked Kevin how the definition of racism used in the race seminars (racism as a system of advantage) differed from how he previously thought about racism. Kevin suggested that this definition made him think a bit differently about racism:

> I don't know, because usually I think of racism as inscribing these inherent qualities to people, um, and I think that's probably part of your definition, too, but to actually say how that creates this system of advantage is interesting. Although [pause] although I do think just to talk about racism as a system of advantage is limited. Because I think education and I think money are two really big equalizers and I think may be more powerful possibly than race in the grand scheme of things. So I think all of those things are together. But the sense that I have is that education and money are more available on the whole to people who are white, clearly. (Kevin, interview, 2012)

Kevin's comment captured the nuanced and interesting way that many of the cohort members minimized the salience of race and racism. He suggested that thinking about racism as a system of advantage was "interesting," but then quickly moved to suggest it was a "limited" angle as well. Kevin instead shifted to a class analysis, adding that "education and money" can serve as "equalizers" for people of color. However, his comment ended with the recognition that, "clearly," class privileges are often intertwined with race privileges.

Litzy offered a similar critique during her final written reflection after the completion of the three race seminars:

> Although I still think that there are many, many factors that influence an individual's success or failure in "the system," our focus on racism as a piece of the larger system of advantage is certainly a constructive step toward understanding how various "isms" can work to the advantage of some people more than others. (Litzy, written communication, 2012)

Although Litzy celebrated the focus on racism as a “constructive step,” she also emphasized the importance of “many, many factors” outside of race that influence the outcomes of individuals. This comment aligned well with other comments made by Litzy during the seminars and in her interviews. More so than any other member of the cohort, Litzy stressed the importance of considering other factors besides race. She claimed to do so out of a dislike for the negative essentialization of White people she perceived from race critiques. She frequently cited the importance of considering the role of gender when talking about power and inequality. Litzy also shared a detailed story in one of our interviews about how an African American woman in her high school class received admission to a prestigious university over Litzy and another, “crazy smart” White friend. Litzy’s primary complaint about this woman’s acceptance to the university related to the woman’s affluent family background. Litzy did not feel this young woman deserved any special consideration for her racial background due to her privileged class status. As another example of Litzy’s focus on identity elements outside of race, she wrote her final paper for the Multicultural Course using a feminist perspective to examine the state’s language arts standards. I do not share these examples to disparage Litzy’s interest in issues of class and gender inequality. Instead, I feel that, within the context of our

cohort's explicit analysis of race, Litzy's frequent moves to talk about gender and class represent a technique of resistance. Specifically, her discussion of gender allowed her to partake in the aforementioned "race to innocence" (Fellows & Razack, 1998).

Both Kevin and Litzy resisted considering race as a concept that explained the totality of social inequality, but the discussions about race with the Urban Cohort never ascribed race that type of significance. Throughout the Race Seminars, I put forth the notion that a focus on race did not intend to ignore other factors such as gender or class. I also suggested this to the participants during our interviews at moments when they evaded a racial analysis. I intended the focus on race as an attempt at understanding the functioning of racism and the production of social inequality along racial lines. Despite these caveats, Kevin and Litzy's comments showed their level of discomfort with a sociological analysis of race. One could argue that their attempts to shift the conversation displayed their personal investment in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995). Using race to critique the societal advantages of Whites placed Kevin and Litzy, and their Whiteness, in a precarious situation. Leonardo (2009) offers a response to White preservice teachers who resist a racial analysis of inequality:

> I argue that *all whites benefit equally from race and racism, but they do not benefit equally from other social relations*…Thus, we are warranted to suggest that white women, for example, are not less advantaged than white men with respect to race, but with respect to gender, which affects their overall relation to the totality of forces. That is, it is not the white woman's place in race relations that causes their oppression but rather their place in gender relations. (p. 121, italics in original)

By failing to separate the racial privilege of Whiteness from other instantiations of societal privilege such as gender, class, sexuality, or ability status, Kevin and Litzy minimized the salience of race in structuring social outcomes.

The cohort members also found ways to downplay the role of racism through the use of qualifying statements about racialized events in their past or when discussing how they would implement discussion of race in their classrooms. Maria shared such a story during our discussion about the racial dynamics of her Southern high school. She attended an all-girls, parochial school with minimal diversity overall and with African Americans representing the largest minority group. I asked Maria if she noticed differential treatment of students based upon their racial identities. Maria suggested that such treatment existed, but then quickly downplayed it as well:

> Um, I don't know, maybe [the Black students] would have felt like they had more trouble. It was so strict, you could get a detention if you talked in assembly or if your shoes were dirty. So, I don't know, a lot of times some of the Black girls might have been in detention more. But there were a lot of my friends that were White and they were considered, they were always in trouble. I could have done that, too, but I was in student council and stuff. I don't know if it was that much of a race thing, but some people might disagree with me. I had a lot of White friends that were in detention every week. (Maria, interview, 2012)

Maria temporarily engaged with the racial elements of the situation under discussion and then quickly problematized the racial analysis by pointing out its incompleteness. Maria noted that Black students in her school probably received harsher discipline but then suggested that treatment was also a product of the school's strict discipline policies overall. She also noted that many of her White friends spent time in detention in an attempt to mitigate her initial claim of racial inequality in her school's discipline.

Maria also used qualifying statements when talking about the role racial considerations would play in her classroom:

> I think that race plays a pretty big role in your daily activities as a teacher. It doesn't have to dominate your classroom and your way of thinking but you need to take race into account when you think about your interactions with your students and their history and motivations. You can balance having insightful discussions about race with your students with other aspects of your class. It doesn't have to be the majority of your class time but it can't be ignored either. (Maria, written communication, 2012)

Similar to the way that Litzy and Kevin's comments resisted using race to explain the totality of social inequality, Maria suggested that race has a place in the classroom but "doesn't have to be the majority of your class time." As noted above, the idea that explicit racial pedagogies should occupy the majority of a social studies or language arts course was never suggested. Furthermore, Maria seemed to make contradictory statements about where race entered into her teaching. She initially suggested race should play a factor in how one approached student interactions and backgrounds, which would seem to make race a constant consideration. However, her statement that race should not occupy a majority of class time suggests that race is only present when it arises in the curriculum.

Thomas shared a similar, albeit more contextualized, statement about the role that race should play in a classroom:

> Race should not be hidden, avoided, discounted, or ignored in a classroom setting; but it should not be divisive either. Race is just another reality that influences the individualized self of every human, and since students should be viewed as complete individuals, race should serve no greater dividing purposes than say, learning styles or prior knowledge. All of these things mesh together to create individual human beings with individual identities, and no two children are "more the same" than any others because they are all individuals so they must all be approached with the same respect and emotions of possibility. It is naïve to think

> that all classroom dynamics avoid the pitfalls of larger society in regards to racial prejudice, but creating an open and safe environment for all students is the first key to creating a successful classroom. (Thomas, written communication, 2012)

Thomas' data sample could have easily been included in the previous section related to concerns for safety in racial dialogue as he noted that race "should not be divisive" and that an "open and safe environment" played a key role in a successful classroom. However, Thomas also made an interesting discursive move that minimized the salience of race in his classroom. Although he forcefully suggested one should not ignore race, he then hedged that assertion by adding that race should be considered alongside other classroom differences such as learning styles. Thomas' language of treating students as individuals is appealing, but equating the difference produced by the social and historical force of racism with the other types of student difference he mentions seems, to borrow his word, "naïve." On another level, this equivalency is interesting because many scholars would suggest that racial and cultural factors inform student learning styles and prior knowledge (Epstein, 2009; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzales, 1992). In the end, Thomas' comments followed a similar pattern to those of Maria, Litzy, and Kevin. By injecting qualifying statements about the importance that race would play in his classroom considerations, Thomas subtly diminished the salience of race.

Discussion

The members of the Urban Cohort engaged in resistance in interesting ways throughout the race seminars and our individual interviews. Rather than outright rejection of the significance of race and racism, the cohort members simultaneously engaged and

disengaged with the topic of race. Their disengagements involved positioning themselves as the "good Whites," focusing on the need for safety in cross-racial conversations, and minimizing the salience of race. At no point did a cohort member proclaim that race did not matter, that it no longer existed, or that their personal racial identities would not play a role in their teaching. Nevertheless, they still found ways to push back against an antiracist approach to education. White resistance can be interpreted in a variety of ways. In my examination of the White racial knowledge of the Urban Cohort, I attempted to keep Ringrose's (2007) question in mind: "By focusing exclusively on students' discursive repertoires to prove them endlessly resistant, does white resistance become an individualized pathology that we can set about to cure?" (pp. 326-327). Rather than searching the statements of the participants for signs of White resistance, I have attempted to identify the moments when they negotiated with the ideas of antiracist pedagogy from their social positionality as Whites in a racially hierarchical society. This perspective avoids the circular logic in which any type of White resistance is perceived as reproductive of White supremacy, which positions the White preservice teacher as an autonomous racist agent. Instead, this analysis understands the members of the Urban Cohort as complex racial actors balancing their desires to enact antiracism with their personal investments in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995) and their self concepts as progressive, caring individuals (Schick, 2000). In the final section of this chapter, the "tricky magic" (Ellison, 1986) of Whiteness will emerge once again as the members of the Urban Cohort appropriate critical discourses of race in problematic ways.

THE MISAPPROPRIATION OF CRITICAL RACIAL DISCOURSES

The final way that the members of the Urban Cohort engaged in more conventional White racial knowledge involved their interesting misuse of the critical racial discourses discussed during the Race Seminars. Specifically, the members of the cohort struggled to understand the role of stereotypes in the maintenance of racism and to grasp the implications of passive racism (Tatum, 2003) with regards to how Whites participate in structural racism. These topics arose from specific activities I designed for the cohort in the Race Seminars. The discussion of stereotypes emerged in response to a TED Talk by novelist Chimamanda Adichie (2009) titled, "The danger of a single story," that we watched during the first race seminar. The students elaborated on the negative impacts of stereotypes but failed to discuss the production of stereotypes and the purpose they serve for maintaining White supremacy. Second, many students gravitated toward Tatum's (2003) distinction between passive and active racism, terms introduced through the racial metaphors activity during the second race seminar. Rather than reflecting on the status quo ways in which they participate in racism, some members used their understanding of passive racism to disavow their personal responsibility for taking antiracist action. In both instances, the cohort members engaged positively with the topics at hand. They did not reject the critical interpretations offered during these activities. They used their interpretations of these discourses to minimize their personal role in reproducing racism.

The single story, stereotypes, and power

During the first race seminar, I showed the Urban Cohort Chimamanda Adichie's (2009) TED Talk about the negative impact that "single stories" about people or cultures

have on how they are understood by dominant groups. The video has been circulated widely, with over six million views on the TED website, and its message aligns well with the goals of multicultural or antiracist education. Adichie's description of single stories provides a powerful starting point for conversations about deficit thinking (Valencia, 2010) and the damaging effects of stereotypes in educational settings. I hoped to make the cohort members more reflective about how they viewed the students of color they worked with in their classrooms. More importantly, however, I selected the video because of the wonderful job Adichie does in talking about the production of stereotypes by groups in power:

> So that is how to create a single story, show a people as one thing, as only one thing, over and over again, and that is what they become. It is impossible to talk about the single story without talking about power. There is a word, an Igbo word, that I think about whenever I think about the power structures of the world, and it is "nkali." It's a noun that loosely translates to "to be greater than another." Like our economic and political worlds, stories, too, are defined by the principle of nkali. How they are told, who tells them, when they're told, how many stories are told, are really dependent on power. Power is the ability not just to tell the story of another person, but to make it the definitive story of that person. (Adichie, 2009)

I felt confident that the cohort members would have a general aversion to the use of stereotypes, but that they would likely view them as incomplete ways of thinking about individuals or groups. Their view of stereotypes as incomplete judgments could potentially feed into a psychological, individualized understanding of racism in which avoiding the use of stereotypes would make them antiracist actors. I hoped to build upon their skepticism about stereotypes in order to help them think more critically about the operation of racism. Adichie's description of nkali provided this entry point. She

eloquently linked stereotypes to the workings of power. I hoped to use her analysis to get the Urban Cohort to think about the production and purpose of stereotypes.

The decision to center a discussion of stereotypes also related to an understanding of their connection to the conflicted nature of White identity and the maintenance of White claims of superiority. Lensmire's (2011) theorization of White identity as fundamentally ambivalent on matters of race informed much of my thinking on the subject. Lensmire, who borrows heavily from Ralph Ellison in his discussion of the role of stereotypes, illustrates how the construction and deployment of stereotypes informs the conflicted nature of White identity:

> In other words, as white people, we need stereotypes of people of color to give us relief from the strain of participating in and benefiting from a society that at every moment disregards a founding principle—that all people are created equal. Stated differently, racial stereotypes enable white people to continue believing in democracy even as they betray it. Thus, for Ellison, at the core of white racial identities is a dilemma, a conflict, ambivalence—a belief in, a desire for, equality in America, poised against the evidence, all around us, of massive inequality. (Lensmire, 2011, p. 102)

White people produce and deploy stereotypes against people of color as a way to resolve the dissonance they experience as a result of the conflict between their egalitarian ideals and the reality of racial inequities. Thompson (1999) adds to Lensmire's analysis of stereotypes by suggesting that stereotypes help Whites position their unequal social status as justified:

> Because whites in the U. S. needed to be able to "explain" their advantages as natural or earned—as legitimate under the terms of a democracy—they vilified blackness and brownness as emblematic of inferiority. Whiteness, in short, was invented to justify racial inequity by linking color with undesirable character traits (lazy, unmotivated, sexually voracious, slow-witted), whites were able to shift the burden of explanation regarding inequitable social conditions from themselves to people of color. (p. 147)

In this way, stereotypes also allow Whites to "blame the victim" (Ryan, 1976) rather than interrogating their role in racial inequality. Taken together, Lensmire and Thompson's commentary positions stereotypes as a crucial element of the ongoing maintenance of White racial identity.

The members of the cohort responded enthusiastically to the Adichie TED Talk. Many of them mentioned it in their initial written reflection after the first race seminar. Invariably, their primary lesson from the talk involved avoiding the use of a "single story" toward the students in their classrooms. Thomas addressed such a concern in his written response:

> Chimamanda Adichie explains it well in her lecture, "The Danger of a Single Story," when she talks about the risks of approaching human beings under prejudged pretenses (even if your intentions are supposedly "caring"). In terms of people having false prejudices against Africans and assuming they are all "suffering," she argues this leaves "no possibility of feelings more complex than pity." Pity is far from a productive emotion, and as a classroom teacher if you feel pity towards students for their race or circumstance it can create major barriers that prevent true progress from being achieved. Students are not and should not be viewed as victims, or worthy of pity, because this denies them the right to be *active* participants in their own lives and education. (Thomas, interview, 2012)

Thomas suggested that the danger of succumbing to a "single story" for a teacher involved only having feelings of pity for disadvantaged students. His analysis seemed to suggest that stereotypes can feed into an array of deficit discourses. While Thomas is justified in his concerns about avoiding stereotypes, he does not provide an author for the stereotype and he does not locate the purpose of stereotypes in the constellation of practices that constitute Whiteness (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998). Thomas failed to

consider the ideological elements of racism. Instead, he viewed deficit thinking and stereotypes as a form of misinformation rather than a mechanism of White supremacy.

Patrick also wrote of the impact of Adichie's "single story" concept. He shared an anecdote from a recent class session in his student teaching placement. In this class session, he led a review session from a recent unit in a World History class in which he encouraged students to make personal connections with the terminology to help them recall it for an exam. When he came to the term immigration, many of the students in the class yelled out, "Illegal!" and "Mexican!" This caught Patrick off guard and he quickly offered up the definition for the term. In his written reflection to the first race seminar, Patrick lamented that he did not follow the advice he gleaned from Adichie's lecture:

> After listening to Chimamanda Adichie's TED video about "The Danger of a Single Story," I became even more aware of the need to hear these different stories about race, experiences, and preconceived notions. Adichie argues that it is important to, "engage in all stories, lest we rob people of their dignity." In the future, I could try to share my story about what Immigration (in the previous instance) means to me. Maybe we could form small groups where students ask each other about the various places they have heard "Illegal Immigration" and perhaps show videos or pictures of legal and illegal immigration to illustrate the idea. (Patrick, written communication, 2012)

Although Patrick's idea for how he could have capitalized on this moment in his teaching and drawn out his students' understanding on the topic is exciting, he, too, failed to make the connection between single stories and power. Patrick seemed to suggest one could remedy the damage inflicted by a single story by encouraging more stories about the topic. While I do not disagree with that notion, Patrick did not center the role of power in creating these single stories. Interrogating student stories and understandings about illegal

immigration would have gravitas only if students also considered how single stories get constructed and whose interests single stories serve.

As a few additional examples, Paige, Maria, and Litzy also referenced the "single story" and its impact on how they think about race and working with students of color. Paige provided a particularly interesting comment as she positioned the "single story" as a possible reason for the racial tension she observed between the Black and Latino students in her field placement:

> Perhaps the students have only heard one story about other races, and the single story emphasizes their differences rather than their similarities. I think this is a great strength of the English classroom, in that we can purposefully guide our students to experience these other stories. (Paige, written communication, 2012)

While Paige's assessment of the racial tension in her classroom may involve these groups having single stories about one another, this analysis discounts Adichie's notion of nkali. Rather than analyzing how dominant groups use stereotypes for instrumental purposes, Paige reduces the single story to any act of intergroup prejudice. Maria and Litzy offered simplistic critiques of the single story as well. Maria suggested that Whites should "not fall into stereotypes and, you know, say racist things and think racist things for that matter" (Maria, interview, 2012). Litzy commented that, "I just keep trying to remind myself how important it is to understand other cultures without patronizing them, without giving them a 'single story'" (Litzy, written communication, 2012). In both instances, the preservice teachers suggest that single stories or stereotypes should be avoided due to their incomplete nature, but they offer no connection between these practices and the operation of power.

Racial smog and the passiveness of active racism

Another interesting misuse of critical racial discourses occurred from concepts discussed during the second Race Seminar. I drew from Tatum's (2003), use of metaphor to explain the operation of racism. Tatum used the metaphors of a moving walkway and smog as emblematic of racism. I used her examples to help the Urban Cohort parse the differences between passive racism, active racism, and antiracism. Both metaphors demonstrate the normal and pervasive nature of racism while also suggesting that Whites benefit from racism even when behaving in status quo ways. Without providing definitions for Tatum's three terms, I asked the students to explain them in relation to the racial metaphors. I displayed a picture of a smoggy Los Angeles skyline and had students use their understandings of smog to define the three terms. After a discussion, I repeated the exercise with an image of the moving walkway. I found from pilot studies of the race seminars that students typically responded very favorably to this activity. It seemed to have a significant impact on their ability to grasp Tatum's concepts. By helping them make distinctions between passive racism, active racism and antiracism, I hoped to impart the idea that White-identified individuals can benefit from racism as a system even without taking egregious, purposeful actions against people of color. Additionally, the metaphors position antiracism as pushing back against racism and employing purposeful action rather than just avoiding engagement in overt racist practices. Overall, the members of the Urban Cohort spoke more positively about the racial metaphors activity than any other component of the Race Seminars. Many suggested that they would consider doing such an activity with their students and some commented that it helped them build a better conceptual understanding of the structural nature of racism.

I hoped the activity would help them appreciate that even the passive, status quo elements of racism had ideological and material effects for White people and for people of color. Such an understanding would then illuminate the necessity of purposeful, antiracist action rather than merely avoiding overtly racist acts. Once someone accepts this conceptual understanding of how racism works in the US context, anything short of antiracist initiatives should be understood as fundamentally, even if not intentionally, racist. However, some of the participants latched on to the notion of passive racism as an excuse or an escape for taking the overt action I hoped it would inspire. This tacit acceptance of the racial status quo provided a way to obviate the need for further interrogation of ways to mitigate or redistribute racial benefits. In other words, the idea that one could benefit from racism in a passive way removed some of the psychological barriers that often block Whites' acknowledgement of racial privilege, but it also produced a somewhat *laissez faire* attitude toward the possibility of change. These participants were able to imagine themselves as unwilling, if not unwitting, participants in race relations.

The misappropriation of Tatum's (2003) three types of racism occurred in a variety of contexts. Several members of the cohort mentioned it during their written reflections. I also asked students about the terms during our initial interviews. Several of them elaborated on how the racial metaphors and the use of the three types of racism helped them conceptualize racism in a broader sense. The topic also arose during class discussions within the second Race Seminar. As the data will show, several of the students discussed the role of passive racism in the reproduction of racist structures.

Maria's commentary on the implications of passive racism during our interview demonstrated a common way that the cohort members used the terminology to diminish their personal role in racism. After Maria commented that she enjoyed the racial metaphors activity, I asked her what lessons she took away from the experience:

> Maria: I'm sure there are ways in my life that I've had racism around me and I haven't noticed it or maybe I've been racist and not meant to, you know, what I mean? Just from my experience and growing up and not realizing it because I can't see it. I can definitely attest to that.
>
> Ryan: What do you take away from the smog metaphor?
>
> Maria: Just trying to be more conscious and aware of what you're doing and kinda trying to take it to heart when you talk to other people of different races or even people of your own race, they might have said something they don't even realize is offensive, you know. (Maria, interview, 2012)

Maria's response started off in an encouraging fashion, as she noted that she considered how the "racial smog" in which she lived made it difficult for her to recognize the presence of racism. She suggested that she might have acted in way that others might perceive as racist but that seemed normal based on her surroundings. This insight aligns well with a CWS analysis of the normative nature of Whiteness. The concept of passive racism is meant to highlight, at least in part, the very phenomenon that Maria suggested. However, instead of using this understanding to reconsider what constituted antiracism, Maria reduced the impact of her awareness of the insidious nature of racism as a reminder to not say certain things to certain people. Maria also suggested that one should consider that a person "might have said something they don't even realize is offensive." Maria used her understanding to excuse individuals for saying racist remarks because their environment did not teach them otherwise.

Litzy provided the most interesting engagement with Tatum's (2003) three racial terms. She displayed a particular interest in this topic because she had read Tatum's book, *Why are all the black kids sitting together at the cafeteria?,* prior to the Multicultural Course. Litzy remembered the significance of Tatum's argument about understanding the differences between passive racism, active racism, and antiracism. When this topic arose in the second race seminar, she participated enthusiastically. During our interview, I asked Litzy how her understanding of these racial terms informed her thinking about the topic of race. She discussed the implications of appreciating race as a structural force:

> I was like, yeah, okay, race is a system. I understand that I benefit from the system and I think what was an uncomfortable moment for me was when we were talking about confronting that system and what do you do if you get pulled over and a cop lets you off. Like, I still don't like these examples [pause] well, they're good examples but I don't like kind of, because, I mean, I feel like it's still [pause] well it's a racist thing to say, why are you letting me off, is it because I'm white? [laughs] Why are you giving me this apartment? Is it because I'm white? [laughs] Do I have a white-sounding name to you? Like, I mean I feel like that's not helping the problem. (Litzy, interview, 2012)

Litzy's engagement with this topic aligned with how she spoke about racism in other contexts during the study. She did not deny the existence of racism and, based on her statement, she claimed to understand racism as a structural rather than individual force. However, Litzy used her structural understanding of race to disregard any possibility of antiracist action. She felt that one could not refuse the privileges that accrued to White individuals because they often occurred without the person's awareness or consent. If a White person tried to refuse these privileges by naming them and rejecting them, as in the examples she offered, that White person would be acting in a racist way. Essentially, Litzy argued that White attempts to push back against the elements of passive racism

would only constitute them as racist. While Litzy's analysis of the difficulty Whites have in refusing privilege is sound (Allen, 2004), she also suggested that White antiracist efforts embodied racism.

Litzy also commented on this topic during the second Race Seminar. Prior to the racial metaphors activity, the students were tasked with building definitions of terms such as race, racism, White privilege, racialization, and a few others. When Litzy's group shared their definition of racism, she commented that their group distinguished racism from prejudice. Litzy noted that Tatum's (2003) book influenced this decision:

> Uh, so basically it argues that racism is not the same as prejudice and prejudice is more of an active discrimination based on race but racism is a structure in a society that benefits certain members based on their race and not others. Um, so you could be benefitting from racism and not be a racist. So racism is more of a structure and not something you actively participate in. (Litzy, verbal communication, 2012)

Although Litzy does not get Tatum's definitions completely correct in her comment, the important aspects lie in how she framed structural racism. Her contention that one could benefit from racism without "being a racist" aligned with the idea that even status quo racial behaviors perpetuate racism and that Whites often receive privilege based on race without realizing they do so (McIntosh, 1989). However, Litzy then made the conceptual leap that one could not "actively participate in" racism. Litzy used her appreciation for the passive elements of racism and the structural nature of racism to suggest that the individual could not take action against racism and that accepting the passive benefits of racism did not constitute "participating" in racism.

Litzy demonstrated an interesting misappropriation of a critical understanding of passive racism, active racism, antiracism, and structural racism. Typically, one of the

challenges of talking about race with White preservice teachers involves pushing them to consider racism outside of individual thoughts and actions (Sleeter, 1993, 1995). Teacher educators attempt to move beyond these individualized understandings of race to discourage myopic approaches to antiracism (Pollock, Deckman, Mira, & Shalaby, 2010). Litzy did not engage in an individualized analysis of race. Instead, she centered the structural nature of race and suggested that the benefits of racism flow to Whites even without their consent. While this understanding might seem like a victory for the antiracist teacher education project, Litzy used her knowledge of structural racism to suggest that individual actions did not influence the reproduction of racism. Litzy found an interesting way to both engage with, and disengage from, a discussion about how Whites participate in racism. Her response, along with others illustrated above, creates an interesting dilemma for teacher education.

As a final example of the difficulties the cohort experienced with Tatum's three racial terms, I will share an excerpt from a class discussion during the second race seminar. The discussion concerned a quote I shared with the class from Gillborn (2010):

> While all White people are not uniformly racist or privileged by a racist social structure, all White-identified people are implicated in relations of racial domination. In other words, White people do not all behave in identical ways and they do not all draw similar benefits – but they do all benefit to some degree, whether they like it or not. (p. 3)

I shared Gillborn's quote with the Urban Cohort because I hoped it would address the issue of White essentialization many of them raised in previous discussions. The quote explicitly addresses the lack of homogeneity in the way Whites function within and benefit from racism, but still identifies Whites as participants in a racialized social

structure. The cohort used the quote as a platform for discussing whether or not White reproduction of racism occurred in ways outside of their control or if they should take ownership for their role in structural racism:

> Ryan: So, I want to draw your attention to one thing here in this quote, to one of the more complicated parts of the quote. Right here it says that White-identified people are "implicated in relations of racial domination." As you look at that phrase, what does that mean to you?
>
> Thomas: That's the toughest one to swallow I think. Because like by implication it means that you share guilt, you share active guilt. Meaning like even in the most passive sense you have an active contribution to the system. Just by merely accepting the way you are born.
>
> [Redacted]: Guilty by association.
>
> Grace: Not just even guilt but that you have an active role.
>
> Litzy: And not even an active role, the important part is that it's often a passive role.
>
> Ryan: And that it could be either one.
>
> Litzy: But I mean that in a lot of cases, especially the ones that we were just talking about, it's nothing that you do on a day-to-day basis that implicates you in this racist structure, you could just exist and just sit around all day and still be taking part of it passively.

This exchange began with Thomas providing an insightful analysis into how the passive elements of racism constituted active reproduction of racist structures. He noted that all Whites played a role in this process regardless of whether or not they chose to do so. Grace also noted the importance of recognizing the active component of White racism. However, Litzy's comment aligned with her previous statements about the passive aspects of structural racism. She contended that the important aspect one should consider about White participation in racism is its passive element, that "nothing you do on a day-

to-day basis implicates you in this racist structure." Again, Litzy makes a problematic leap from an appreciation for the structural aspects of racism to the suggestion that Whites do not actively participate in the reproduction of racism.

Discussion

Through their struggles with analyzing the purpose and production of stereotypes, as well as their difficulties conceptualizing the implications of passive racism, the members of the Urban Cohort demonstrated an interesting response to antiracist ideas. In both instances, the participants used their understandings of these racial concepts to minimize their personal roles in taking action against racism. Rather than reflecting on the link between stereotypes and power and considering how stereotypes perpetuate White supremacy, the preservice teachers simply eschewed the use of stereotypes. They suggested that stereotypes were a form of misinformation about groups and could be remedied either by avoiding the use of the stereotype or by telling additional stories about the group to diminish the power of the "single story" (Adichie, 2009). In doing so, they focused on how stereotypes impacted people of color rather than reflecting on how they, as White individuals, used stereotypes to maintain a positive self image and justify the unearned advantages of Whiteness (Lensmire, 2011; Thompson, 1999). In a similar fashion, the cohort members failed to use the concept of passive racism to critique the status quo ways in which Whites participate in the reproduction of racism. Instead, they used passive racism to excuse individuals for not having awareness of racist acts or to suggest that the benefits of racism operated in a way that individuals could not influence. In both instances, the members of the cohort did not engage in an outright rejection of the

critical racial discourses. Instead, they applied them in ways that diminished their importance and protected the cohort members' investments in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995).

CONCLUSION

As a means of complicating the portrayals of transgressive White racial knowledge on display in the previous two chapters, this chapter has detailed how the members of the Urban Cohort engaged in conventional White racial knowledge. I shared these aspects of the cohort's engagement with the topic of race as a means of demonstrating the complicated nature of White preservice teachers learning about race. Despite the commitments to diversity and social justice that brought them to the urban teaching program, the participants maintained problematic racial understandings. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, I interpret their problematic engagement with race as a product of the fundamentally conflicted and ambivalent nature of White racial identity (Lensmire, 2010). I also consider any resistance or difficulty they have with the topic of race within the context of Whiteness as a racial worldview (Ringrose, 2007). With these considerations in mind, the conventional White racial knowledge on display in this chapter is not the product of autonomous individuals engaging with the topic of race. Instead, the comments the cohort members make about race represent their negotiations, as White-identified individuals, with the implications of White supremacy. They negotiated at the structural level through their attempts to maintain their investments in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995) and they negotiated at the interpersonal level through their desire to retain their positive self concepts as "good Whites" (Case & Hemmings, 2005).

The chapter laid out three specific ways in which the members of the Urban Cohort engaged in conventional White racial knowledge. The first involved their early experiences with learning about race or attempting to interact with people of color. Through the policing efforts of members of the White community, these individuals learned indelible lessons on what it means for one to "be White" (Thandeka, 1999). They learned that they should avoid cross-racial interactions and that talking about or noticing race in a public fashion could have negative consequences. These lessons undoubtedly influenced their racial identity development, as they learned about their Whiteness in tacit ways, often through a series of negative experiences. The second aspect of conventional White racial knowledge involved the White tropes of resistance the cohort displayed during discussions about race. Rather than engaging in outright denial of the salience of race, they found ways to shift the conversation to other topics in subtle ways and to diminish the importance of race as a social force. These engagements represent complex negotiations of Whiteness and engaging in racial dialogue. The third display of conventional White racial knowledge involved the misappropriation of critical racial discourses. Once again, the participants engaged with, rather than withdrew from, these critical ideas about race. However, they found ways to use the discourses to minimize their personal responsibility for the ongoing reproduction of racism. Collectively, these negotiations with antiracism demonstrate a complicated desire to cling to a positive White identity while also recognizing the problematic past (and present) of Whiteness.

When their transgressive and conventional White racial knowledges are assessed holistically, the complex nature of White identity and the difficult task of helping White

preservice teachers think differently about race comes to light. While the members of the Urban Cohort do not represent the typical White preservice teachers that appear in much of the literature (Lowenstein, 2009), their story still has significant implications for teacher education. Even as teacher candidates with purported commitments to social justice along race, class, and gender lines, these teachers oscillated between progressive and problematic views about race. Within the teacher education space created in the Urban Teaching program, they found ways to display antiracist commitments while still clinging to the possibilities of their White racial identities. In doing so, they engaged in discourses that ran counter to the transformative goals they had for their careers as teachers. In the concluding chapter, I will discuss what lessons the Urban Cohort offers for CWS, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This study investigated the experiences of a cohort of ten White social studies and language arts teachers as they engaged with critical racial knowledge in an urban teacher preparation program. Two research questions guided this qualitative and critical inquiry: In what ways do White preservice social studies and language arts teachers with commitments to work in diverse, urban environments make sense of critical understandings of race and racism during their teacher preparation? In what ways do these White preservice social studies and language arts teachers' understandings of race and racism fall short of critical perspectives? In chapters 4, 5, and 6, I discussed two broad themes that characterized the Urban Cohort's engagement with the topic of race: transgressive White racial knowledge and conventional White racial knowledge. Within chapters 4 and 5, I elaborated on several findings that comprised the transgressive White racial knowledge of the Urban Cohort. In chapter 6, I discussed the findings related to the conventional White racial knowledge of the participants. In this chapter, I will review these findings and then move to a discussion of the implications these findings hold for critical Whiteness studies (CWS), antiracist teacher education, and social studies education.

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

The Urban Cohort displayed both transgressive and conventional White racial knowledge throughout the Multicultural Course, the Race Seminars, their interviews, and their written reflections. I used the phrase "White racial knowledge" (Leonardo, 2009) to

frame the cohort's engagement with race because I wanted to position their racial discourse—whether progressive or problematic—as a way of communicating what they knew about race. Leonardo suggests the use of this term because it removes the possibility of White innocence in racial dialogue. Even if Whites claim ignorance about the operation of racism or retreat into silence when the topic of race arises, those modes of non-engagement can still be seen as White racial knowledge. Leonardo's term also aligns well with the notion that "White talk" (McIntyre, 1997) often contains multiple meanings (Trainor, 2005). The example of White silence on the topic of race provides an example of why it is useful to think of any White engagement with race as representative of White racial knowledge. One might typically read silence by a White person in a conversation about race as suggestive of a lack of knowledge about racial issues. However, from a White racial knowledge perspective, the decision to remain silent is, at least in some way, a communication of that White individual's ideas about race. Mazzei (2008) used the term "racially inhabited silences" to describe the lack of engagement by the White teachers in her study on the topic of race. Mazzei suggested that these silences were produced by the teachers' view that talking about race was not polite and could perpetuate racism. DiAngelo (2012) suggested that White teachers often view silence as a tactic to shut down conversations about racial difference. These teachers know that by choosing not to engage they could keep their participation in race relations free from scrutiny. In both instances, the preservice teachers displayed White racial knowledge through their silence.

Drawing from Leonardo's (2009) suggestion, I interpreted any engagement with the topic of race—even resistance—as part of the Urban Cohort's body of White racial knowledge. I classified the progressive, critical discourses about race used by the members of the cohort as transgressive White racial knowledge. To "transgress" means to cross boundaries or to go beyond the bounds of a moral principle. When the Urban Cohort espoused critical understandings of race, they transgressed against the typical White racial knowledge displayed in the antiracist teacher education literature (Haviland, 2008; Marx, 2006; McIntyre, 1997; Picower, 2009). I used the term conventional White racial knowledge to describe the more problematic ways the Urban Cohort members talked about race. This theme included examples of resistance to antiracist pedagogy as well as misappropriations of critical racial discourses. By conveying both the transgressive and conventional aspects of the Urban Cohort's White racial knowledge, I provide a complex portrait of how White teachers with commitments to social justice engage with the topic of race.

Transgressive White racial knowledge and the sociological imagination

In chapter 4, I detailed the Urban Cohort's transgressive White racial knowledge towards working with students of color in urban schools. This knowledge manifested in three prominent ways. First, the cohort members combatted deficit discourses (Valencia, 2010) towards students of color by talking about the conflict between the culture of the school and the home culture of the students. They discussed how official school curricula often did not include the stories and experiences of urban students. Additionally, they talked about alternative ways to interpret the lack of student engagement they perceived

in their field placements. The cohort members considered that their students might view them with mistrust or suspicion because of previous encounters with White teachers and as a result of the legacy of paternalism embedded in White efforts to work with communities of color (Ellsworth, 1997). The second example of transgressive knowledge about urban students related to how the preservice teachers resisted viewing themselves as White saviors, a common trope enacted by White teachers who work in urban schools (Titone, 1998). They suggested that they could not work in an urban school without participating in the long history of colonization that informs White interest in subaltern communities. They managed to speak about the fears and hesitations they felt toward working in urban schools without enacting deficit thinking. Through awareness of the implications of their presence in settings populated by people of color, they displayed transgressive White racial knowledge. As a third example, they suggested that discussions of race and racism should occupy a prominent place in social studies and language arts classrooms. They discussed how they would address issues of race and racism in formal ways through their curricular content and in informal ways when the topic of race arose organically through student comments or interactions.

The Urban Cohort's ability to talk about students of color in transgressive ways arose from their deployment of the sociological imagination (Mills, 1959). They viewed the actions and attitudes of their students as mediated by their social location in relation to the larger cultural project of schooling. The cohort members understood that schools often operated from a White cultural frame (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986) that devalued the cultural capital of students of color. The participants also considered that their students

might view a White teacher with skepticism due to a history of experiences with White adults that involved hostility or suspicion. Rather than viewing the students' perceptions of schooling through an individualizing lens, they considered how structural forces influenced how these students acted during the school day. Instead of viewing students as disinterested in school, the cohort members considered how they were pushed towards disinterest through a non-inclusive system dominated by White norms. The Urban Cohort members' ability to critique the notion of the White Savior also involved the sociological imagination. They understood that their presence in urban schools always occurred as part of a history of White paternalism and would always be bounded by systems of oppression such as racism and classism. Finally, their willingness to talk about race and racism considered the intersection of individual and structural forces as well. They knew that historical processes of racialization in the US caused people of color to view themselves in racialized terms while Whites remained un-raced (Omi & Winant, 1994). The cohort members knew that, regardless of their previous awareness of race, they could not ignore such a salient aspect of their students' identities. Once again, the preservice teachers used an understanding of broader, sociocultural forces to guide their views on urban teaching.

While chapter 4 detailed findings related to how the Urban Cohort talked about the students they worked with in urban schools, chapter 5 shared their thoughts about their personal White privilege as well as the mechanics of Whiteness and structural racism. Several of the cohort members drew from personal experiences of race privilege to critique the notions of meritocracy (Bonilla-Silva, 2010) and naïve egalitarianism

(Causey, Thomas & Armento, 2000) that constitute White racial knowledge. They spoke about their life outcomes as resulting from a confluence of personal effort and structural advantages. While the race privilege of Whites often serves as a barrier to accessing critical understandings of race and racism (Picower, 2009), these individuals viewed their accomplishments as nested within broader sociohistorical forces. The cohort members also spoke eloquently about the working of Whiteness in US society. They discussed the normalization of Whiteness and how it provided them with easy navigation in many social settings. They noted that they were not required to think about their racial identity in most of the environments they inhabited growing up, causing them to view race as something only possessed by people of color. Several preservice teachers in the Urban Cohort also spoke about their burgeoning understandings of the connections between current racial inequities and historical practices of governments, banks, and other institutions. This knowledge allowed them to view segregation and income inequality along racial lines as produced by conscious, systematic actions. These teachers also displayed an impressive grasp of several critical racial discourses. They spoke of racism as a system of advantage (Tatum, 2003) that implicated them even when they engaged in passive, status quo racial behaviors. By understanding race as a structural rather than individual force, the Urban Cohort members also critiqued simplistic understandings of racism. They did not equate racism with stereotypes nor did they only view racism as operating through egregious acts of racial prejudice. Collectively, they transgressed against White racial knowledge through their engagement with critical interpretations of race and racism.

In similar fashion to their comments about urban students, the Urban Cohort's discussion of the functioning of race and Whiteness was informed by the sociological imagination. They used this habit of mind to connect personal experiences of access and opportunity to larger social forces. As Mills (1959) notes, "The individual can understand his own experience and gauge his own fate only by locating himself within his period…he can know his own chances in life only by becoming aware of those of all individuals in his circumstances" (p. 5). The Urban Cohort members consistently attended to Mills' suggestion when reflecting on their life outcomes. The participants also employed the sociological imagination in order to understand the structural aspects of racism. Instead of naively thinking that contemporary racial segregation and income inequality were products of individual choice or lack of effort, the cohort members connected these inequities to past and present institutional constraints. The Urban Cohort applied the same line of thinking in order to understand that Whites perpetuated racism through seemingly benign, daily practices and not just through acts of bigotry or prejudice. Through the use of the sociological imagination, they came to view themselves as constant participants in the reproduction or reconfiguration of race relations.

Conventional White racial knowledge and the sociological imagination

In chapter 6, I detailed the theme of conventional White racial knowledge. These racial discourses represented the more problematic engagement by the Urban Cohort on the topic of race. I placed their conventional White racial knowledge in three categories. First, I discussed some of the cohort members' early experiences with "learning to be White" (Thandeka, 1999). Through theses stories, the participants provided insights into

the development of their racial identities. From young ages, they learned complicated lessons about when it was acceptable to notice race and what the consequences were for interacting with people of color. For the second aspect of conventional White racial knowledge, I detailed the cohort's use of various "White tropes of resistance" during their engagement with antiracist pedagogy. These discourses did not involve outright rejection of the significance of race and racism. Instead, they represented subtle negotiations between their racial identities and antiracist ideas. The cohort members simultaneously engaged and disengaged with the topic of race by positioning themselves as the "good Whites," focusing on the need for safety in cross-racial conversations, and minimizing the salience of race. The third aspect of conventional White racial knowledge involved the misappropriation of critical racial discourses by the cohort. These examples emerged during the activities I conducted with the Urban Cohort in the Race Seminars. In response to the Adichie (2009) TED talk about the use of single stories, the cohort members strongly eschewed the use of stereotypes but failed to consider how stereotypes were produced or what role they played in the maintenance of White supremacy. They viewed stereotypes as problematic due to their incomplete nature rather than for how they helped to stabilize the conflicted nature of White identity (Lensmire, 2010). Some of the cohort members also used Tatum's (2003) concept of passive racism to suggest that Whites could not actively participate in the perpetuation of structural racism.

Whereas the transgressive attitudes of the Urban Cohort were informed by the sociological imagination, the group's conventional White racial knowledge arose through failures to consider the "intersection of biography and history" (Mills, 1959, p. 5) in their

analysis. The members of the cohort either relied too much on an individual or on a structural analysis. In particular, these analytical shortcomings were displayed through their use of White resistance tropes and in the misappropriation of critical racial knowledge. By positioning themselves as "good Whites" in race relations and by calling for safety in racial dialogue, they leaned too heavily on their personal desires for agency and comfort when talking about race. In doing so, they failed to connect their individual actions or desires to the larger racial milieu of Whiteness. They did not consider how racism is sustained both by "good" and "bad" Whites (Scheurich, 1993). They also disregarded the notion that people of color often experience a lack of safety in discussions about race (Leonardo & Porter, 2010). The Urban Cohort members wanted to engage in race dialogue but they wanted to maintain their identities as "good Whites" and they wanted a comfortable environment where their ideas could be heard. Their misappropriation of critical racial discourses also resulted from failing to use the sociological imagination. The suggestion, from Litzy, that individual Whites do not "actively participate" in the system of racism relied too heavily on a structural analysis. Litzy discounted the way that the daily practices of White people worked to sustain racism as a structural force (Leonardo, 2009). In sum, their conventional White racial knowledge either resulted from clinging to a myopic, individualized analysis of race or an overly deterministic structural analysis of race. The former perspective is akin to Mill's (1959) critique of the "unmoored empiricists" who did not contextualize their analysis in light of broader sociohistorical forces. The latter perspective relates to Mills' critique of

the grand theorists whose analyses did not speak to the lived realities of individuals. Both fall short of the sociological imagination.

Collectively, these findings paint a complex picture of how White teachers engage with the topic of race in their teacher preparation. I selected the Urban Cohort for study because I hoped their decision to join the Urban Teaching program was informed by social justice commitments. I presumed that they would be open to considering how sociocultural factors influence the project of education. As a whole, I feel that the Urban Cohort met these expectations and, as a result, they served as an intriguing group to study. The Urban Cohort's openness toward talking about race placed them in conflict with the "typical" White preservice teacher in the teacher education literature (Lowenstein, 2009). However, the findings also show that the cohort members experienced their fair share of difficulties discussing race. Investigating a group like the Urban Cohort is important because, as De Lissovoy and Brown (2013) note, "the obstacles to engaging even this interested group in effective praxis have not been fully considered" (p. 541). The dispositions of the Urban Cohort created an antiracist teacher education space *beyond resistance*. While such an occurrence seems like a victory for antiracist pedagogy, the data show that the journeys of these White preservice teachers are nowhere near completion. They are complex racial actors trying to balance their desires to enact antiracism with their personal investments in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995) and their self concepts as progressive, caring individuals (Schick, 2000). I will share the implications of this study and then close with some final thoughts on the Urban Cohort.

IMPLICATIONS

The experiences of the Urban Cohort have implications for three areas of study: critical Whiteness studies (CWS) in education, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education. For CWS, these teachers' engagement with race provides additional empirical insights on the conception of White racial identity as fundamentally conflicted and ambivalent (Lensmire, 2010). For antiracist teacher education, the stories of the Urban Cohort speak to the possibilities of White teachers engaging with critical racial knowledge. Their engagement with these ideas also provides important lessons about antiracist pedagogy, which I will explain in greater detail. For social studies education, the experiences of the Urban Cohort open a conversation about Whiteness and social studies that the field has yet to consider. By helping teacher candidates critically examine how Whiteness impacts them as teachers and learners of social studies content, social studies educators can foster greater racial literacy.

Implications for Critical Whiteness studies in education

Contrary to Rudyard Kipling's claim that the "White man's burden" was civilizing the non-White world, philosopher George Yancy (2004) suggested that the true burden of the "White man" is sustaining the fiction of his Whiteness. Whiteness is a "tricky magic" (Ellison, 1970), for it derives its meaning out of negation and it obscures its existence by claiming to be nothing at all. To frame this study, I drew from CWS scholarship that aims to name the practices of Whiteness with the goal of reconfiguring these practices in an antiracist way (Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2009; Wiegman, 1999). I believe that White preservice teachers can transgress against their Whiteness and adopt antiracist postures. This does not mean that I feel that these teachers can stop being

White or that they can renounce White privilege. Regardless of their personal desires for racial equity, they will continue to draw benefits from their racial identities (Applebaum & Stoik, 2000). Working against Whiteness is akin to playing a Whac-A-Mole carnival game. Just when one thinks an aspect of Whiteness or White privilege has been addressed, it pops up somewhere else. If these preservice teachers hope to engage in the ongoing process of antiracism, it will require supreme vigilance (Mayo, 2000).

If White preservice teachers begin to think deeply about what adopting an antiracist posture in their lives will entail, the prospect of doing so can seem daunting. However, to return to Yancy (2004), they must remember that sustaining the oppressiveness of Whiteness is also a heavy burden. This is why a theorization of White racial identity as fundamentally conflicted is a crucial consideration for CWS scholarship in education. The work of Lensmire (2010, 2011) is informative for this task as he draws from extensive interview data with White participants to display the ambivalence they feel on the topic of race. White ambivalence arises from a tacit recognition that the White ethos of equality and egalitarianism is really a mythos that serves to obscure unequal power relations. The "burden" that Yancy suggested comes from the maintenance of this conflicted White identity. Particularly in an era when overt claims to White superiority have given way to colorblind racial ideologies (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Winant, 1997), Whites are stuck in a cycle in which they notice that race structures society in a fundamental way, but they are given no avenue to investigate how or why this structuring occurs. Thandeka (1999) suggests that attempts to display interest in race and racial difference at young ages are often met with refusals and rebukes from the White

community. In effect, this closing off of space for racial inquiry is passed on to the next generation. Whiteness begets Whiteness.

The views of the Urban Cohort on race are representative of White ambivalence. Their desires to explore the implications of their racial identities and to develop positive dispositions towards urban education are signs of their willingness for racial outreach. However, their subtle tactics of avoidance and identity management reveal the encumbrances they experience when engaging in critical racial discourses. For the field of CWS in education, they provide empirical examples of conflicted White racial identity in action. This extends Lensmire (2010) and Thandeka's (1999) work because this research with the Urban Cohort specifically targeted individuals with stated commitments to social justice and antiracism. The challenges the Urban Cohort faced have profound implications for CWS because they further assert the necessity of theorizing White identity as operating from a position of *conflict* and *ambivalence*. From this theoretical starting point, CWS can consider alternative ontological, epistemological, and methodological aspects of Whiteness. I will speak about each of these items in light of my previously stated goal of using CWS to disrupt Whiteness and reorient it in antiracist ways.

Traitorous White ontology: 'Taking the red pill'

CWS engages in an interrogation of White ontology by asking what it means, in a material sense, to walk around as a White person. From a historical realist ontological perspective (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), a White racial identity is the product of a confluence of social, historical, cultural, and political factors. White identity is not real

because it is objective and immutable, but only because it has been made real by societal structures. Yancy (2004) suggests that

> Whiteness is a form of inheritance and like any inheritance one need not accept it. Poor whites benefit from walking in clothing stores without the encumbrance of being followed and subjected to surveillance. Is it fair to say that they are white supremacists because of this? To the extent that they leave this aspect of whiteness's social ontology unmarked and uninterrupted, they do occupy a space of being supreme, for they move and have their being in ways that do not challenge the very white social order that comes to mark the black body as suspicious, as criminal. Indeed, they do not challenge the white power system that continues to mark the white body as preferable, privileged, and supreme. (p. 8)

CWS in education should help Whites gain insights into the implications of their ontological status, but with the understanding that White identity is riddled with conflicts rather than surety. Rather than serving as a hindrance, however, I argue that White ambivalence should be viewed as an opening for White ontological shifts.

An example from popular culture will help illuminate the possibilities created by viewing White racial identity as fundamentally conflicted. In the science fiction film, *The Matrix* (Wachowski & Wachowski, 1999), the protagonist, Neo, is recruited to join the rebellion against the machines that have enslaved the human race for use as an energy source. The rebels pursue Neo because Morpheus, their leader, feels that Neo is "The One," a prophesized figure who will end the war between humans and machines. In a famous scene, Morpheus offers Neo a choice between unplugging from the Matrix and joining the rebellion or returning to his previous life: "If you take the blue pill, the story ends. You wake up in your bed and believe whatever you want to believe. You take the red pill, you stay in Wonderland and I will show you how deep the rabbit hole goes." Neo

chooses the red pill and fundamentally alters his ontological state. In doing so, he exposed himself to knowledge that he could not unlearn.

Part of the reason Neo chose the red pill was because he had lived for many years with a sense that something was amiss in his life. He was no longer content to participate in his trite daily existence. Neo's intuition parallels the conflict at the heart of Whiteness. When a White preservice teacher chooses the "red pill," they expose themselves to a seismic ontological shift or, in the words of Mills (1997), an "ontological shudder" (p. 85). Jones and Enriquez (2009), drawing from Bourdieu's notion of a change in habitus, also provide an adequate description of what the "red pill" does to the White preservice teacher's ontological state:

> To experience something so different from one's expectation of the social world that a person must reconsider how to use his or her mind, language, and body. This crisis does not have to be one of shame or anger or fear....The crisis is often more psychological and cognitive--more of a dissonance and disequilibrium rather than a necessary jolt of electrified emotion. (p. 147)

I contend that the impetus for the White preservice teachers who begin this journey is a sense, much like Neo had, that something is amiss. They feel that their racial existence is misaligned (Thandeka, 1999) in some fundamental way. The psychological crisis occurs when critical racial knowledge interacts with this misalignment. While these individuals cannot completely renounce the privileges they receive, they can alter their conceptions of racial realities. They deconstruct the tacit feeling of superiority that Whiteness provided in favor of what Frankenberg (1993) refers to as a "privilege-cognizant" state of being. The inner conflicts of their identities provide openings for developing awareness of how and when they perpetuate White dominance through the animation of oppressive

White racial scripts (Bailey, 1998). This allows them to cultivate a traitorous White ontology that seeks out ways to resist the re-inscription of White norms.

'Off-centered' White epistemologies

CWS can also benefit from an interrogation into White epistemology with awareness of the conflicted nature of White identity. Mills (1997) suggests that Whites have an inverted epistemology or an epistemology of ignorance. The oppressive racial relations that created White dominance had the reproductive effect of putting Whites in the flawed epistemological perspective of the center. From this dominant vantage point, a holistic understanding of race relations is difficult. This epistemological perspective may even cause Whites to claim that race has little to do with how they experience the world (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Although the structural position of Whites can create difficulties in understanding race, it does not preclude Whites from developing a critical racial awareness. Leonardo (2009) suggests that Whites can make choices about how they know the world. Although they can never fully lose their insider status, Whites can de-center their worldviews by paying attention to marginal and "outsider-within" (Collins, 1986) perspectives. Again, the ambivalence of White racial identity can inform this shift away from the center. The abilities of the Urban Cohort to critique White racial knowledge and to avoid engaging in discourses of meritocracy came from a de-centered epistemological standpoint. Zach, Patrick, Michael, Samuel, and Thomas all used this perspective to create transgressive White racial knowledge when they spoke about how their race impacted their life outcomes. As they gained more knowledge about race and racism, they applied it to their experiences and generated critical racial knowledge.

Rather than constructing the structural position of Whites as a barrier to learning about race, CWS should use the conflicted nature of White identity to draw out "off-centered" White racial knowledge.

Methodologies of 'learning to be White'

This inquiry with the Urban Cohort also highlights the pedagogical potential of helping preservice teachers view Whiteness as a cultural practice rather than a benign, normalized worldview. Positioning Whiteness as learned behavior evokes an interrogation into the methodologies that sustain Whiteness. The cohort's stories about "learning to be White" in chapter 6 demonstrate a component of these methodological approaches in action. Through practices of White policing and through racial silences, the Urban Cohort learned problematic lessons about race. Samuel learned that a Black woman could not be a "lady." Thomas learned that public interactions with his racially mixed cousins required explanation because "their roots didn't line up." Paige learned that "what I consume dictates how into my race I am." Litzy learned that race "was quite crucial [but] it was not to be talked about because that meant you were in trouble."

Unpacking stories such as these can help Whites realize the ways that the White community re-inscribes White norms through a litany of racial rebukes and refusals. From a young age, Whites begin to learn what it means to be White. They learn, as Paige so eloquently stated, "Because white people are worth more, you should hold yourself to a higher standard and not lower yourself to these other people by engaging in their culture" (Paige, interview, 2012). In this way, the methodology of Whiteness is predicated on exclusion with the end goal of preserving the value of White racial identity.

This exclusion is a crucial mechanism in the long history of investment in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995), but it often appears to be the natural way of things due to the *de facto* nature of racial hierarchies (Winant, 1997). CWS should help Whites interrogate the extent to which they squelch desires for cross-racial interaction, or even solidarity, in favor of White racial bonding (Sleeter, 1994). When Whites begin to deconstruct how they "learned to be White," they can recognize the ways that they participate in White policing. By exposing these White methodologies, CWS opens yet another avenue for Whites to engage in antiracist work.

Implications for antiracist teacher education

The experiences of the Urban Cohort speak to antiracist teacher education in two important ways. First, they suggest the importance of enacting good practice in antiracist pedagogy (Brown & Kraehe, 2010). Second, they serve as a reminder that White teacher candidates deserve compassion and space for growth during their teacher preparation (Conklin, 2008). Both of these propositions can be illuminated by re-conceptualizing White resistance in antiracist pedagogy. When one begins to open to the possibility that the "White tropes of resistance" in conversations about race are not *only* forms of resistance, an important epistemological shift occurs in the teacher educator. This new epistemological ground is less firm than what one previously stood upon, but it provides a more nuanced, generative space for enacting antiracist pedagogy. When a White student suggests, as Litzy did in this study, that a conversation about race obscures the functioning of gender oppression, what does this type of engagement mean? Is Litzy truly interested in pursuing a more gendered analysis of societal oppression? If she is, then one

can hardly blame her. She is a woman and can likely recount experiences with gender oppression in schools. Her female identity shapes her worldview and mediates how the world sees her. However, what if this discursive move by Litzy is really a tactic aimed to preserve her Whiteness by leaving it unexamined? She may be participating in the "race to innocence" (Fellows & Razack, 1998), thrusting the marginalized nature of her gender identity forward so as to eclipse her racial identity and the advantages it affords her. Yet another possibility is that Litzy is tacitly making an argument about race by trying to shift the conversation to gender. Litzy may feel that Whiteness is being over-essentialized in its portrayals in antiracist pedagogy. She may see no way to engage with this type of Whiteness so she articulates that critique through her desire to talk about gender.

The potential of multiple meanings (Trainor, 2005) in Litzy's engagement with race complicates the antiracist teacher education project. However, I would argue that these considerations improve antiracist pedagogy. If the antiracist teacher educator views Litzy's desire to talk about gender as only representative of resistance (Gay & Kirkland, 2003), then Litzy's views are reduced to a sort of false consciousness (Ringrose, 2007) that is a product of the structured blindness of Whiteness (Mills, 1997). This interpretation positions the teacher educator as the knower and the preservice teacher as the unreflective, resistant subject. It does not offer Litzy compassion (Conklin, 2008) and it does not consider the discomforting (Kumashiro, 2004) nature of learning difficult knowledge. If the teacher educator opens to the possibility that Litzy's desire to talk about gender is sincere, or that perhaps Whiteness has been portrayed in a static, monolithic, and essentialized fashion, then a different set of considerations arise. The

teacher educator might ask: Has this course given enough attention to the dynamics of gender in education? Did I over-simplify how race, racism, and Whiteness operate in schools? Is it possible that the way I have introduced and discussed these topics actually produced some of the resistance I am seeing in the classroom? Did I presume a level of fluency in racial discourse that my student teachers did not have? Again, the example of Litzy helps to make two broader points about antiracist teacher education. The first is that pedagogy matters. How teacher educators approach these topics with White teachers impacts how the ideas of antiracism are received. The second is that the way teacher educators view White preservice teachers also matters. I will discuss both of these implications in greater detail.

Building a common racial vocabulary

I frame this discussion about how race pedagogy mattered for the Urban Cohort by drawing from their reactions to the Race Seminars and from their interviews, which were pedagogical to the extent that I purposefully asked them to reflect on aspects I felt were crucial to their racial identities (Appendix D). First and foremost, I feel the members of the Urban Cohort benefitted from engaging in activities in which they defined racial terminology and built conceptual understandings of racism as a structural force sustained by individual actions. Although these topics also came up during the Multicultural Course readings and discussions, the first two Race Seminars focused on these topics exclusively (see chapter 3). The first Race Seminar provided definitions for race, racism, colorblindness, and several other terms. Through the use of Tatum's racial metaphors in the second Race Seminar, the Urban Cohort discussed passive racism,

active racism, antiracism, and structural racism. These conversations paid significant dividends for the cohort members. In our interview, Zach spoke of how the seminar discussion about race as a social construction "lifted a veil" for him. Although he did not think of race as simply biological, he had not considered the implications of its socially constructed nature. Thomas also referred back to the definitions from the first Race Seminar. He spoke extensively about how thinking of racism as a "system of advantage" (Tatum, 2003) caused him to think more deeply about his "level of born responsibility" as a White person. He suggested that considering this definition strengthened his antiracist resolve. As another example from the Race Seminars, Grace used the concept of passive racism to reflect on the ways that she perpetuated racism even though she did not participate in egregious, racist actions.

When I designed the Race Seminars, I operated from the premise that the Urban Cohort needed to adopt a common racial vocabulary in order for productive race conversations to occur (Bolgatz, 2005). I also built the seminars from reflections on my experiences as a graduate student learning critical racial discourses for the first time. I often felt like I lacked some of the foundational knowledge about race that seemed necessary to understand the texts I read. Anytime that an author took the time to define terminology (Marx, 2006; Tatum, 2003) or walk me through a complex idea like structural racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), my racial knowledge grew. Over time, as these concepts became more familiar, I could see how they informed the work of other scholars and how they played out in the world around me. I hoped that by helping the Urban Cohort understand some of the basic concepts of critical race theory and critical

Whiteness studies, they would have frameworks in place to make sense of their own participation in race relations. I feel strongly that antiracist teacher education should focus on helping students build foundational knowledge about race that they can apply throughout their engagement with race pedagogies.

Attention to the historical trajectory of racism

Another key element of the racial pedagogies the Urban Cohort experienced involved attention to the historical underpinnings of racism. They read several chapters from Takaki's (1993) *A Different Mirror*, and I selected a series of clips from the documentary, *Race: The Power of an Illusion* (Adelman, 2003), to show during the Race Seminars. These video segments discussed a variety of historical topics related to race, including US federal housing policy after World War II and racial identification cases that reached the US Supreme Court. An exposure to even this small amount of racial history appeared to resonate with the Urban Cohort quite profoundly. In our interview, Paige mentioned that learning how the US government supported discriminatory housing policy allowed her to make sense of current racial segregation:

> I think [the video] helped me understand that…I don't know, because otherwise I think you can come to it with this perspective of like [pause] these people are responsible for where they are. Which is the argument I hear a lot from White people. But with that it actually helps me to be able to explain to somebody else like, no, actually there are all these institutional reasons for how things came to be the way they are. (Paige, interview, 2012)

During the second Race Seminar, Patrick discussed the impact of learning about some of Supreme Court cases related to race, "I consider myself knowledgeable about our history, but going through some of these court cases and really seeing the concerted efforts by our government to racialize non-white groups I think is really valuable" (Patrick, verbal

communication, 2012). The Urban Cohort members frequently drew upon this historical knowledge related to race in order to make sense of current racial inequities. In particular, this background knowledge helped them to understand the structural aspects of racism. An effective antiracist teacher education program should expose students to the historical trajectory of racial inequality, making explicit efforts to connect past injustices with present inequities (Schmidt, 2005).

White privilege pedagogy

My final note on antiracist pedagogy relates to an approach I did not use with the Urban Cohort. Levine-Ravsky (2000) uses the term "White privilege pedagogy" to describe antiracist approaches that focus on urging White teachers to acknowledge their individual White privilege (McIntosh, 1989). In this pedagogical approach

> The individual occupies a site of transformation through confession in which no means for contextualising white privilege is provided. Standing at the centre of the theoretical and empirical frame, the individual is expected to work through whiteness along a personal journey of redemption. Failure to achieve the desired goal of the abandonment of racism or the perquisites of whiteness is easily explained as a function of individual choice or propensity. (Levine-Ravsky, 2000, p. 284)

White privilege pedagogy flattens out White identity and creates a single acceptable path for the White preservice teacher: personal redemption through confession. Any attempt to stray from this journey of acceptance positions the preservice teacher as resistant. Lensmire et al (2013) also critique this pedagogical approach, noting that the frequent use of McIntosh's (1989) seminal article on White privilege is a synecdoche, or stand-in, for the difficult nature of antiracist work.

White privilege pedagogies position White preservice teachers in negative ways. These approaches homogenize White teacher candidates and position them as objects of antiracist pedagogy rather than subjects. Lowenstein (2009) suggests that teacher educators who use these approaches act in a hypocritical fashion. While they ask their student teachers to avoid deficit thinking toward their students, the teacher educators carry deficit orientations toward the White teachers in their classrooms. Conceptualizing White preservice teachers in this way can produce resistance to antiracist pedagogy (Trainor, 2002, Winans, 2005). As I planned the Race Seminars for the Urban Cohort, I went to great pains to avoid discourses that essentialized White identity or placed White students in a position where they felt they had to confess complicity in racist structures or risk marginalization from the group:

> White students must be challenged to find a space in which they may see themselves not only as part of the legacy of oppression but may envision a role for themselves as allies or challengers of the status quo. In this way, they may define a role for themselves that is empowering rather than wallowing in ineffectual guilt. (Wagner, 2005, p. 265)

I designed the seminars so that they focused on building conceptual understandings of racism as a structural force. Despite these efforts, both Litzy and Kevin expressed that they perceived an essentialization of Whiteness, although these statements were made about their experiences in the Urban Teaching program as a whole. They did not mention specific elements of the Multicultural Course or the Race Seminars. As a whole, however, the Urban Cohort did not appear to engage in resistant discourses as a response to a pedagogy that delegitimized their knowledge and experiences. Their resistance took the form of subtle negotiations rather than outright rejection. I would like to think that

their engagement resulted from a compassionate pedagogical approach (Conklin, 2008) that offered de-essentialized portraits of Whiteness for the preservice teachers to consider.

Implications for social studies education

As noted in chapter 1, the field of social studies has a problematic history with addressing race and racism. More than a decade ago, Ladson-Billings (2003) called for the social studies to become the "curricular home for unlearning the racism that has confounded us as a nation" (p. 8). However, the failure to center race consistently in considerations around curriculum (Loewen, 2007), teaching (Howard, 2004), teacher education (Gay, 2003), and student learning (Epstein, 2009) keeps the social studies from helping the nation "unlearn" racism. Periodic calls for deeper consideration of race in the social studies (Pang, Rivera, & Gillette, 1998; Tyson, 2003) have yet to produce substantial race-conscious research or curricula that portray race as a persistent and structural force. In a recent review of race and social studies, Chandler and McKnight (2011) suggest the topic is still "conspicuous in its absence in our formal and enacted curricula" (p. 217). These longstanding gaps in social studies education produce teachers ill equipped to challenge the problematic curricular representations of race and racism and to engage their students in conversations about the historic and contemporary mechanics of race. Without a concerted effort by social studies teacher educators to engage preservice teachers in sustained dialogue about race and racism as structural forces, these problems will only persist.

Even as race scholarship in the social studies has increased in recent years (Brown & Brown, 2010; Epstein, 2009; Howard, 2004; Salinas & Castro, 2010), very little literature considers issues of Whiteness in the social studies (Chandler, 2009). In that sense, the most basic implication of this study for the field of social studies is that the community needs to start investigating the operation of White norms in social studies teaching and learning. The US teaching force is overwhelmingly White (Banks et al., 2005) and projects to remain that way in the years to come. Social studies occupies a unique position in schools because it is tasked with preparing citizens (Parker, 2003) and guiding students through the triumphant master narratives of progress and democracy espoused in history textbooks (Loewen, 2007). If the White preservice teachers who currently walk the halls of colleges of education leave their teacher preparation without critically examining their racial identities, the field of social studies will suffer.

More so than any other discipline, social studies teachers work with curricula rife with opportunities to discuss the workings of race and racism both historically and contemporarily. It is not enough for social studies teachers to know historical content. Without a critical orientation to the world, these teachers can easily espouse bland historical narratives that re-inscribe American Exceptionalism (Zinn, 1990). It is more important that White preservice social studies teachers understand racism as a structural force rooted in historical processes and reproduced by individual and institutional actions. This type of knowledge is akin to what legal scholar Lani Guinier (2009) calls racial literacy:

> Racial literacy is the capacity to conjugate the grammar of race in different contexts and circumstances. Like the verb "to be," race takes a different form

> when we speak about "I am" versus "you are" compared with "he is." It may not reveal itself through the spewed invective of a Bull Connor. It is less overt but nonetheless real. It is sometimes a virulent subtext, at other times a nuanced dynamic. But always the meaning of race needs to be interrogated and conjugated carefully in light of relevant local circumstances and their historic underpinnings. (Paragraph 17)

Without the ability to read the material and discursive elements of race in school policies, curricula, and teaching methods, White novice teachers will undoubtedly reproduce educational inequities along racial lines. During their own schooling experiences, they likely learned of racism as akin to “bad men doing bad things” (Brown & Brown, 2010) rather than as a social force supported by institutional arrangements. These racial blind spots in their own educational backgrounds, compounded by the pervasiveness of colorblind and meritocratic discourses in US society, make it difficult for them to read the operation of race and racism in the official and hidden curricula of schools (Apple, 2000). For many of these social studies teachers, their teacher education coursework might represent one of the last opportunities for them to develop the racial literacy required to do effective work in schools. The field of social studies must make a concerted effort to develop racial literacy in its preservice teaching force.

FINAL THOUGHTS ON THE URBAN COHORT

It has been over 18 months since I began my inquiry with the Urban Cohort. They are now in their final semester of the Urban Teaching program. They are on the job market, seeking teaching positions that will situate them as full-time agents in the racial milieu of urban schools. There is no telling what they will do with the knowledge they have acquired during their time in the Urban Teaching program. I cannot say with certainty that they will push back against the status quo racism that permeates education.

It is possible that the socialization processes of their school sites will temper their radical commitments. I intend to maintain my connections with the Urban Cohort and I will continue to gather data in the years to come. I would like to investigate the evolution of their transgressive and conventional White racial knowledge over time. Jones and Enriquez (2009) provide an exemplar of such a study through their four-year investigation of two teachers who learned critical literacy practices during their teacher preparation. A longitudinal study that investigates how the Urban Cohort members negotiate their antiracist commitments during their first few years of teaching would provide great insights for CWS, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education.

I chose the Urban Cohort for this study because they willfully joined a teacher preparation program that demanded commitments to social justice and openness toward talking about race and other axes of oppression. However, the Urban Cohort was also a convenience sample. I was working as a facilitator in the Multicultural Course and I was adhering to a predetermined timeline of when I would complete my doctoral studies. Once I began my inquiry with the Urban Cohort, I was committed to see the project through to completion. As I collected data and engaged in initial analysis, I was excited—and impressed—by their willingness to transgress against White racial knowledge. As the inquiry evolved and I spent more time with the data, it became clear that the Urban Cohort engaged in subtle practices of resistance alongside their transgressive attitudes. This realization enriched the portrait of the Urban Cohort and allowed their experiences to offer important lessons for CWS, antiracist teacher education, and social studies education. Yet, throughout the time I spent with this group, I kept asking myself: "What

are they risking by engaging with these ideas?" As I noted in my positionality statement in chapter 3, my social location mitigates the material risks that I take in most situations. I had the sense that, at any moment, the Urban Cohort could retreat into the privileges of Whiteness (Wagner, 2005). Their transgressive dispositions might end up as mere intellectual pursuits, or perhaps even forays into what bell hooks (2000) calls "eating the Other." I cannot escape those feelings of trepidation about what the Urban Cohort will do when they go out and enter the teaching profession. When my gaze narrows in on specific comments they made or commitments they espoused, I am taken in by the transformative potential of the teacher education space. When I pan out to a broader perspective, my sociological imagination tells me that Whiteness is everywhere, always offering escape routes from an antiracist path.

However, a decision to wallow in the impossibility of combatting Whiteness is an egregious example of White privilege: "Despairing that no one ever learns is an excuse to give up too easily and a luxury available mainly to dominant white folk" (Schick, 2000, p. 84). Helping White preservice teachers become fully-actualized antiracists may not be possible in the time allotted in teacher education. Instead, what the antiracist teacher education project can do is create ruptures and ontological shudders (Mills, 1997). It can create cracks in the façade of Whiteness such that White teachers begin to recognize how they participate in the reproduction of racial hierarchies. The pedagogical task is to help White preservice teachers begin to walk an antiracist path. This perspective makes me much more hopeful about the prospects of the Urban Cohort. From my vantage point, I feel that most of them "took the red pill." They experienced a "loss of guarantee" (Jhally

& Hall, 1996). They now know that the rabbit hole exists, even if they are still just peering into it from their *terra firma* epistemological standpoint. Based off of conversations I have had with many of them over the past year, I can tell that they remain deeply interested in issues of race and social justice. When I consider their commitments to the antiracist project, I feel cautiously optimistic. Their good intentions are not necessarily bigger than the racism they confront, but the potential of these good intentions is too important to ignore.

Somewhat surprisingly, I find myself taking comfort from the Urban Cohort's feelings of fear and hesitation about working in urban schools. I am buoyed by their sense that they do not know all of the answers. I feel this positions them in a generative space. We want our young teachers to feel inspired, confident, and committed when they leave their teacher education, but we do not want them armed with simplistic understandings of complex social forces (Brown, 2012). Teachers must be armed with conceptual frameworks and habits of mind that allow them to interrogate their experiences and integrate new knowledge (Swartz, 2003). Racial pedagogies that offer redemption through participating in confessional practices leave White teachers in a conceptual cul-de-sac with little sense of how to move forward as antiracist educators. The Urban Cohort engaged with the topic of race in complex and thoughtful ways. They negotiated their desires to enact antiracism with their personal investments in Whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995) and their self concepts as progressive, caring individuals (Schick, 2000). Their antiracist potential is strong because they have displayed the wisdom to realize they have only begun their journeys.

APPENDIX A: MULTICULTURAL COURSE SYLLABUS

Fall 2012 Weekly Schedule

Date	Topic	Readings/Due Dates
8/29	-Review of syllabus/class assignments; -The production of knowledge: What's in the curriculum and who gets to decide?	Banks (1993); Apple (1992)
		Seminar- Field work orientation, no readings
9/5	-Reviewing some initial responses; -Constructivism and instructional design	Banks (2002)- Ch. 2& 3; Apple (1990) -Ch. 1 & Ch. 4
		Seminar- Being the teacher in the room ***Assignment*:** Read *Love and Logic,* pp. 309-338
9/12	-Critical multicultural education and Critical Pedagogy and *Assignment discussion*-Analysis of constructivist instructional design (Lesson Design)	Sleeter and McLaren (1995); McLaren (2003) (Ch. 4 & 5); Dell'Oli & Donk (2007)-Ch. 2; Banks (1999)-Chapter 2-Assessment Strategies; Bloom handout; Lesson Analysis form
		Seminar- Field work debriefing, no readings
9/19	So you wanna be a teacher: Exploring context and prior thinking and future possibilities	Little (2002); Oakes (1995); Grossman (1991); Giroux (1997)- Introduction, Ch. 1 & 2; Cochran-Smith (1991).
		Seminar- Field work debriefing, no readings
9/26	Thinking about our thinking:	Shulman (2004) chapters 6 & 7; Fordham & Ogbu (1986); Lee & Fradd (1998); San Miguel & Valencia (1998)
		Seminar- Depositing before you withdraw: Building relationships with your students ***Assignment*:** Read *Love and Logic,* pp. 11-22; 115-132
10/3	Why a different mirror	Takaki Ch. 3 & 7 Lesson plan analysis #1 **DUE**
		Seminar- Race and racism: Talking terminology and

		conceptual understandings ***Assignment-*** Respond to Reflective Prompt #3 prior to the start of class on 10/3
10/10	Why a different mirror	Takaki Ch. 8 &10
		Seminar- Racial identity and power: What is our stake in this? ***Assignment-*** Respond to Reflective Prompt #4 by Monday, 10/15.
10/17	Why a different mirror	Takaki Ch. 12 &13
		Seminar- Racial case studies: Bringing our racial knowledge to the classroom ***Assignment-*** Respond to Reflective Prompt #5 by Monday, 10/22
10/24	What our students bring to the table and how to know it: Funds of Knowledge.	Moll & Gonzalez, Ch. 33 (2004); Lenski et al (2005);
		Seminar- Field work debriefing, no readings
10/31	Just a thought-what if money matters And *Assignment discussion-* Critical multicultural education and the curriculum	Anyon (1981); Heath XX; Pinar (1992); Lesson plan analysis #2 **DUE**
		Seminar- Field work debriefing, no readings
11/7	Pedagogy and practice	Ladson-Billings (1995); Delpit (1998); Gay (2002); Ball (2008); Sleeter (2012)
		Seminar- Culturally responsive classroom management ***Assignment-*** Read *Love and Logic,* pp. 43-54; Respond to Reflective Prompt #6 prior to start of class on 11/7
11/14	CUFA/NCSS and NCTE conference-work session/no class	Community Plunge Paper **DUE**
11/21	***Thanksgiving Break***	
11/28	*Critical Race Theory* And follow up *Assignment discussion-* Critical multicultural education and the curriculum	Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal (2001); Yosso (2005); Ladson-Billings (1998); Chandler XX; Lesson plan analysis #3 **DUE**
		Seminar- Field work debriefing,

		no readings
12/5	Critical multicultural education and the curriculum and presentation of final papers.	Milner (2012)
		Seminar- Reflecting on our field experiences, no readings
12/7	Final paper **DUE**	

Reading List

Required texts

J. & Funk, D. (1995). *Teaching with love and logic: Taking control of the classroom.* The Love and Logic Press: Golden, Colorado.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America.* Canada: Little, Brown & Company.

Required journal articles and book chapters

- Apple. M. (1990). Ideology and Curriculum. New York: Routledge. (Chapter 1- On analyzing hegemony; Chapter 4-Curricular history and social control)
- Apple. M. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher,* 21 (7), p. 4-11.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11 (1), p. 3-42.
- Ball, A. (2009). Toward a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Education Research Journal*, 46(1), 45-72.
- Banks, J. & McGee-Banks, S. (1999). *Teaching strategies for the social studies: Decision-making and citizen action.* New York: Longman.
- Banks, J. (2002). *Introduction to Multicultural Education*. San Francisco: Allyn Bacon (Chapter 2- Dimensions and School Characteristics; Chapter 3-Curriculum Transformation)
- Banks, J. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher,* 22 (5), p. 4-14.
- Cochran-Smith, (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(3), p. 279-309.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 38 (3), 280-298.
- Dell'Olio, J. & Donk, T. (2007). Models of Teaching: Connecting student learning with Standards. Thousand Oakes: Sage Publication. (chapter 2- Philosophies of Curriculum and Instruction)

- Fordham, S. & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the 'burden of 'acting white'". *The Urban Review*, 18 (3), p. 176-206.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53 (2), p. 106-116.
- Giroux, H. A. (1997). Teachers as intellectuals: Critical educational theory and the language of critique. (chapter 1-Rethinking the language of schooling AND chapter 2-Toward a new sociology of curriculum).
- Grossman, P. (1991). Overcoming the apprenticeship of observation in teacher education coursework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(4), p. 345-357.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32 (3), p. 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), p. 7-24.
- Lee, O. & Fradd, S. H. (1998). Science for all, including students from non-English-language backgrounds. *Educational Researcher*, 27 (4), p. 12-21.
- Lenski, S., Crumpler, T., Stallworth, C. & Crawford, K. (2005). Beyond Awareness: Preparing culturally responsive preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*,
- Little, J. (2002). Professional community and the problem of high school reform. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(), p. 693-714.
- McLaren, P. 2003). *Life in Schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Pearson Education. (Chapter 4- The emergence of critical pedagogy; Chapter 5- Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts).
- Milner, R. (2012) But what is urban education? *Urban Education*, 47(3), p. 556-561.
- Moll, L. & Gonzalez, N. (2004). Engaging Life: A funds of knowledge approach to multicultural education. In Banks, J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (2nd Ed.), p. 699-715, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oakes, J. (1995). Two cities' tracking and within-school segregation. *Teachers College Record*, 96 (4), p. 681-690.
- Pinar, W. (1992). "Dreamt into existence by others." Curriculum theory and school reform. *Theory Into Practice*, 31 (3), p. 228-235.
- San Miguel, G. & Valencia, R. (1998). From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(3), p. 353-412.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education,* 47(3), p. 562-584.
- Sleeter, C. E. & McLaren, P. L. (1995). Sleeter, C. E. & McLaren, P. L. (Eds.) *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany: State University New York Press. (Introduction section).

- Shulman, L. (2004). *The wisdom of practice: Essay on teaching, learning, and learning to teach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (chapter 6- Those who understand AND chapter 7- Knowledge and Teaching).
- Solorzano, D. & Delgado-Bernal, D., (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory and framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education,* 36(3), p. 308-342.
- Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity & Education,* 8(1), p. 69-91.

APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Social Studies Urban Cohort Members

Name[9]	Discipline	Race	Geographic origin[10]	Experiences with diversity	Prior racial knowledge
Grace (Female)	Social Studies	White	Southwest	Grew up in large diverse city, but lived in racially isolated area	Interest in global ethnic conflicts but less knowledge of US racial dynamics
Samuel (Male)	Social Studies	White	Southwest	Grew up in racially isolated area, but had teaching experiences in Asia	Very extensive historical knowledge of race in US and global contexts
Patrick (Male)	Social Studies	White	Southwest	Grew up in racially isolated area, but had teaching experience in Asia	Some knowledge of US history but less knowledge of US racial dynamics
Zach (Male)	Social Studies	Biracial (Asian, White)	Midwest	Grew up in fairly diverse neighborhoods and attended diverse schools, as well as family diversity	Knowledge from family background as Chinese immigrants, fair amount of historical knowledge about race
Michael (Male)	Social Studies	White	Northeast	Grew up in diverse neighborhoods and attended diverse schools, diverse teammates in college athletics	Extensive historical knowledge about race and theoretical perspectives on race from undergraduate studies in Sociology

[9] All names are pseudonyms

[10] All participants were born and raised in United States. The region listed refers to their primary region of residence.

English Language Arts Urban Cohort Members

Name[11]	Discipline	Race	Geographic origin[12]	Experiences with diversity	Prior racial knowledge
Kevin (Male)	English Language Arts	White	Northwest	Grew up in large, diverse city, but lived in racially isolated area	Fair knowledge of history of race, interest in themes of difference in literature
Litzy (Female)	English Language Arts	White	South/ Southeast	Grew up in racially isolated areas, limited diversity in schools attended	Minimal knowledge of historical or contemporary racial issues
Maria (Female)	English Language Arts	White	South	Grew up in diverse city and had teaching experiences in Asia	Moderate amount of knowledge of historical and contemporary racial issues
Paige (Female)	English Language Arts	White	South/ Southeast	Grew up in small town with minimal diversity	Interest in race in literature, but less knowledge of historical aspects of race
Thomas (Male)	English Language Arts	White	Mid-Atlantic	Grew up in diverse city but lived in racially isolated area, moderate diversity in schools	Strong literary and historical knowledge of race, interest in contemporary racial dynamics

[11] All names are pseudonyms

[12] All participants were born and raised in United States. The region listed refers to their primary region of residence.

APPENDIX C: RACIAL CASE STUDIES

Case Study #1

Jesse is a senior at Forrest High School in a small town in Tennessee. Along with his friend, Kenneth, Jesse has spent the last several months engaging in a campaign to change his high school's nickname, the Rebels. Jesse and Kenneth contend that the name evokes memories of slavery and the Confederate government that fought to secure the maintenance of slavery during the Civil War. Additionally, they feel that the presence of the Confederate flag and Rebel mascot at school pep rallies and sporting events is disrespectful to the school and community's substantial African American population. While some in the town criticize Jesse and Kenneth's efforts as an attack on tradition, the campaign has gained some support within the school and attention from local and state media outlets. Although Kenneth initially proposed the idea of protesting the nickname to Jesse, Jesse has received the bulk of the media attention from the campaign. Jesse has done interviews with local news stations and with a statewide newspaper. Jesse's father is a prominent lawyer and Jesse has used his father's connections to spread the word about their petition. Kenneth has done significant grassroots campaigning in his neighborhood and some surrounding areas, but he has felt unwelcome in particular areas of town. Kenneth has also felt rebuffed by some of his teachers and classmates, who seem to view his actions as self-interested and, generally, as causing trouble. When Kenneth approached Jesse about these concerns, Jesse told him he was being too sensitive. Jesse said that, while he perceived some criticism at school, overall, he enjoyed the attention. Kenneth said it is different for Jesse because Jesse is White, and that Jesse couldn't

understand how Kenneth, being Black, was positioned differently. Again, Jesse dismissed Kenneth's comments.

1. Are Kenneth's concerns well founded or should he heed Jesse's advice and stop being 'so sensitive?'
2. What might be going on to account for why Jesse and Kenneth are perceived differently and why they respond differently to their treatment?
3. How might the notion of the "sociological imagination" help us understand Jesse and Kenneth's experiences?

Case Study #2

Dr. Maria Rodriguez is a professor of education at a large state university in the Southwest. She specializes in research on the impact of standardized testing on students. Dr. Rodriguez contends that her state's testing policies have disparately impacted the state's African American and Latino populations. She has used the results from her research to lobby at the state legislature and to serve as an expert witness in lawsuits brought against the state by civil rights organizations. Dr. Rodriguez is held in high regard in much of the academic community both for her research and her advocacy work. Yet, she is not without her critics. Many legislators and individuals in the business community feel that her research is politically motivated and that she has a grudge against standardized testing. They contend that, as a Latina, she only advocates for *her people* rather than considering the interests of all children. At a recent panel discussion on standardized testing, Dr. Rodriguez again outlined the ways in which her research showed the damaging effects of testing. Mr. Whitman, a White male panelist and former banker now representing a thinktank on education policy, critiqued Dr. Rodriguez for turning testing into a racial issue. He claimed that such language was divisive and that it

distracted people from making improvements to the current testing system. In its place, he suggested schools should invest more in vocational education and that it was not feasible to provide every student with an education that prepared them for college. He said that many jobs you train for in vocational education pay as well as the jobs students get when coming out of college. When Dr. Rodriguez commented that past vocational programs had consistently tracked Black and Latino students into non-college tracks, Mr. Whitman insisted that the program could neutrally assess students and that the most important thing was to provide students with a path toward finding a job. Dr. Rodriguez closed her comments by saying that unless the underlying inequity in the educational system was addressed, both testing and vocational programs would only maintain existing gaps between White students and students of color. Mr. Whitman closed his comments by again scoffing at the suggestion of Dr. Rodriguez, scoring some applause by suggesting that, unlike Dr. Rodriguez, he didn't believe there was a *conspiracy* against children of color.

1. What might account for the way that Dr. Rodriguez' research and advocacy gets positioned negatively by some people? Is there merit in the way they critique her research?

2. Based on what we have learned thus far, how do you explain Dr. Rodriguez and Mr. Whitman's differing views on the possibility of implementing vocational education?

3. How might the notion of the "sociological imagination" provide insight into Dr. Rodriguez' experiences and her heated interaction with Mr. Whitman?

APPENDIX D: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Part I: Biographical information, prior race experiences

1. Let's start with talking a bit about where you grew up. Describe your family, the neighborhoods you lived in, your town/city, and the schools you attended.

2. How do you identify racially? Was the topic of race discussed much in your home or community? How was it discussed and in what context did the topic arise?

3. Please talk a little bit about the racial dynamics of the schools you attended. Where did you see race present in the daily workings of your school? What did it mean to be White in your school? What did it mean to be White in your community?

4. If a student of color was going to transfer into your school, what sort of advice would you give them? What would you say are some the differences between growing up White versus growing up as a person of color in this country?

5. What is your first memory of race? When was the first time you realized that you were white? What feelings did you experience in this situation? What lessons did you take away from the experience?

6. Do you think there are advantages to your racial identity? Disadvantages?

Part II: Experience in Race Seminars and Multicultural Course

1. What sort of expectations did you have for the multicultural education course? What topics did you think might be covered in the course? How did you feel about discussing these topics?

2. What were your thoughts going into the three seminars I led that focused specifically on race? What were your expectations for the topics that might be discussed?

3. [After reviewing some of the topics and activities from the race seminars], how were these seminar sessions different from other class sessions?

4. Please tell me your thoughts on the following terms and topics we discussed during the race seminars.

    - Race as a social construction
    - Racism as a system of advantage
    - Examples of structural racism

- Differences between passive and active racism
- Thinking about race with a sociological imagination
- The different ways White people participate in race relations

5. What do you feel you learned from your experiences in these seminars? Can you give me any examples of specific things you have taken away and thought about since the seminars?

6. How would you describe your emotions during the seminars? How would you describe the emotions of your classmates? Do you feel like you or any of your classmates viewed the topic as unimportant? Why might that be?

7. As a White person, is there a privilege in choosing to engage in these discussions? Have you experienced fatigue from participating in these discussions? Do you ever wish you could disengage from these conversations?

8. In your first reflective response, you wrote about __________. Could you talk a little bit about that now and let me know if you have other thoughts on this topic?

9. In your second reflective response, you wrote about __________. Could you talk a little bit about that now and let me know if you have other thoughts on this topic?

10. In your third reflective response, you wrote about __________. Could you talk a little bit about that now and let me know if you have other thoughts on this topic?

11. What were some things that you disliked about the seminars or some things that you might like to see done differently?

12. Do you think the discussion would have been different had there been more people of color in the room? What if the instructor was a person of color?

13. How do you best learn in your education classes? What is most helpful for helping you understand how these issues impact your teaching?

Part III: The impact of race in urban teaching

1. What role do you think an understanding of race and racism will have on your teaching?

2. What is your sense of how race and racism impact the schooling experiences of children of color? How do they impact white students?

3. If you could address the topics of race and racism in any way you desired, how would you do it? What would you do in your classroom?

4. Do you feel that being a social studies/language arts teacher is particularly suited for addressing racial issues in the classroom?

5. What kind of an understanding of race/racism would you want your students to walk away with after a year in your classroom? Is there a difference in what you would want a White student to know compared with a student of color?

6. What do think an urban teacher needs to know about race and racism before entering the classroom to teach? Which learning experiences during your time thus far in the urban cohort have been the most meaningful for you?

7. Is there anything that we did not talk about that you would like to share at this time? Do you have any final thoughts about the seminars, your experiences in the multicultural course or anything at all?

REFERENCES

Adelman, L. (2003). *Race: The power of an illusion*. California Newsreel.

Adichie, C. (2009). Chimamanda Adichie: The danger of a single story [Video file]. *Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_ danger_of_a_single_story*

Alcoff, L. M. (1998). What should white people do? *Hypatia*, *13*(3), 6–26.

Alcoff, L. M., & Potter, E. (1993). *Feminist epistemologies*. New York: Routledge.

Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Allen, R. L. (2004). Whiteness and critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(2), 121–136.

Apple, M. (1998). Foreward. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodriguez, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America* (pp. ix–xiii). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.

Applebaum, B. (2005). In the name of morality: Moral responsibility, whiteness and social justice education. *Journal of Moral Education*, *34*(3), 277–290.

Applebaum, B. (2008). "Doesn"t my experience count?' White students, the authority of experience and social justice pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*(4), 405–414.

Applebaum, B., & Stoik, E. (2000). On the Meaning and necessity of a white, anti-racist Identity. *Philosophy of Education*, *5*, 307–316.

Bailey, A. (1998). Locating traitorous identities: toward a view of privilege-cognizant white character. *Hypatia*, *13*(3), 27–42.

Baldwin, J. (1985). *The price of the ticket: Collected nonfiction, 1948-1995*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Baldwin, J. (1998). On being "White"...and other lies. In D. R. Roediger (Ed.), *Black on white: Black writers on what it means to be white*. New York: Schocken Books.

Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. *Review of Research in Education*, *19*, 3–49.

Banks, J. A., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L. C., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., … McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232–275). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *64*(2), 173–194.

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*(3), 518–533.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, D. (1993). The racism is permanent thesis: Courageous revelation or unconscious denial of racial genocide. *Capital University Law Review*, *22*, 571–587.

Bell, L. A. (2002). Sincere fictions: The pedagogical challenges of preparing white teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *35*(3), 236–244.

Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (1998). *Rethinking Columbus: The next 500 years*. New York: Common Courage Press.

Bolgatz, J. (2005). *Talking race in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2010). Strange fruit indeed: Interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence toward African Americans. *Teachers College Record*, *112*(1), 37–61.

Brown, A. L., & De Lissovoy, N. (2011). Economies of racism: Grounding education policy research in the complex dialectic of race, class, and capital. *Journal of Education Policy*, *26*(5), 595–619.

Brown, K. D. (2013). Trouble on my mind: Toward a framework of humanizing critical sociocultural knowledge for teaching and teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(3), 316–338.

Brown, K. D., & Kraehe, A. M. (2010). When you've only got one class, one chance: Acquiring sociocultural knowledge using eclectic case pedagogy. *Teaching Education*, *21*(3), 313–328.

Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: white male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(1), 30–55.

Cary, L. J. (2006). *Curriculum spaces: Discourse, postmodern theory, and educational research*. New York: Peter Lang.

Case, K. A., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education*, *40*(5), 606–626.

Causey, V. E., Thomas, C. D., & Armento, B. J. (2000). Cultural diversity is basically a foreign term to me: The challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*(1), 33–45.

Chandler, P. T. (2009). Blinded by the white: Social studies and raceless pedagogies. *Journal of Educational Thought*, *43*, 259–288.

Chandler, P. T., & McKnight, D. (2011). Race and the social studies. In W. Russel (Ed.), *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 215–242). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Chubbuck, S. M. (2004). Whiteness enacted, Whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 301–333.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks & Banks, C. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931–975). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cockrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with "'diversity'" and "'multiculturalism'" in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *15*(3), 351–366.

Cole, T. (2012, March 21). The white-savior industrial complex. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/2/

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, *33*(6), S14–S32.

Conklin, H. G. (2008). Modeling compassion in critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*(4), 652–674.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3–21.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1988). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. *Harvard Law Review*, *101*(7), 1331–1387.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crowley, R. M. (2013). "The goddamndest, toughest voting rights bill": Critical race theory and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(5), 696–724.

Crowley, R. M., & Smith, B. (2011). Whiteness and social studues teacher education: Tensions in the pedagogical task. Presented at the American Educational Studies Association Annual Conference, St. Louis, MO.

De Lissovoy, N., & Brown, A. L. (2013). Antiracist solidarity in critical education: Contemporary problems and possibilities. *The Urban Review*, *45*(5), 539–560.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 1–44). London: Sage.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2010). Why can't we all just be individuals?: The discourse of individualism in anti-racist education. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *6*(1), Article 4.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2012). Nothing to add: The role of white silence in racial discussions. *Journal of Understanding and Dismantling Privilege*, *2*(2), 1–17.

DiAngelo, R. J., & Allen, D. (2006). "My feelings are not about you": Personal experience as a move of whiteness. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *2*(2), http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6dk67960.

DiAngelo, R. J., & Sensoy, O. (2012). Getting slammed: White depictions of race discussions as arenas of violence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *iFirst article*, 1–26.

Dickar, M. (2008). Hearing the silenced dialogue: An examination of the impact of teacher race on their experiences. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*(2), 115–132.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1992). *Black reconstruction in America, 1860-1880*. New York: The Free Press.

DuBois, W. E. B. (2003). *Darkwater: Voices from within the veil*. New York: Humanity Books.

Ellison, R. (1970). What would America be like without Blacks? *Going to the Territory*, 109–10.

Ellison, R. (1986). *Going to the territory*. New York: Vintage Books.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297–324.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). Double binds of whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power and society* (pp. 259–269). New York: Routledge.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities*. New York: Routledge.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fellows, M. L., & Razack, S. (1998). The race to innocence: Confronting hierarchical relations among women. *Journal of Gender, Race & Justice*, *1*(2), 335–352.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176–206.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gay, G. (1994). *At the essence of learning: Multicultural education*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

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

Gay, G. (2003). Deracialization in social studies teacher education textbooks. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 123–148). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, *36*(1), 1–16.

Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in pre-service teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, *42*(3), 181–187.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*(4), 485–505.

Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism in education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* New York: Routledge.

Gillborn, D. (2010). The white working class, racism and respectability: Victims, degenerates and interest-convergence. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *58*(1), 3–25.

Giroux, H. A. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of Whitenes. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(2), 285–320.

Gordon, J. (2005). Inadvertent complicity: Colorblindness in teacher education. *Educational Studies*, *38*(2), 135–153.

Gordon, L. R. (2004). Critical reflections on three popular tropes in the study of whiteness. In G. Yancy (Ed.), *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question* (pp. 173–193). Routledge.

Grant, C., & Wieczorek, K. (2000). Teacher education and knowledge in “the knowledge society”: The need for social moorings in our multicultural schools. *Teachers College Record*, *102*(5), 913–935.

Grofman, B., Handley, L., & Niemi, R. G. (1992). *Minority representation and the quest for voting equality.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gross, A. J. (2009). *What blood won’t tell: A history of race on trial in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 191–216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guinier, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-divergence dilemma. *The Journal of American History*, *91*(1), 92–118.

Haney Lopez, I. F. (1994). The social construction of race: some observations on illusion, fabrication, and choice. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, *29*(1), 1–62.

Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707–1791.

Hasen, R. L. (2012). *The voting wars: From Florida 2000 to the next election meltdown*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Haviland, V. S. (2008). “Things get glossed over”: Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *59*(1), 40–54.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Howard, T. C. (2004). "Does race really matter?" Secondary students' constructions of racial dialogue in the social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *32*(4), 484–502.

Hurtado, A. (1996). *The color of privilege: Three blasphemies on race and feminism*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, N. E. (2005). Being a good teacher of black students? White teachers and unintentional racism. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *35*(4), 429–459.

Hytten, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *61*(1), 65–89.

Ignatiev, N. (1994). *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge.

Jensen, R. (2005). *The heart of whiteness: Confronting race, racism and white privilege*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Jhally, S., & Hall, S. (1996). *Race, the floating signifier*. Media Education Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.mediaed.org/videos/MediaRaceAndRepresentation/RacetheFloatingSignifier

Johnson, L. (2002). "My eyes have been opened": White teachers and racial awareness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 153–167.

Jones, S., & Enriquez, G. (2009). Engaging the intellectual and the moral in critical literacy education: The four-year journeys of two teachers from teacher education to classroom practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *44*(2), 145–168.

Jupp, J. C., & Slattery, G. P. (2010). Committed White male teachers and identifications: Toward creative identifications and a "second wave" of White identity studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *40*(3), 454–474.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Evolution for survival. In J. L. Kincheloe & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 9–42). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2002). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Y. Zou & E. T. Trueba (Eds.), *Ethnography and schools: Qualitative approaches to the study of education* (pp. 87–138). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of whiteness: Reconfiguring white identity in a pedagogy of whiteness. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodriguez, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America* (pp. 3–30). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., Rodriguez, N. M., & Chennault, R. E. (Eds.). (1998). *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, *60*(2), 133–146.

Kohl, H. R. (1967). *Teaching the unteachable*. New York: New York Review.

Kolchin, P. (2002). Whiteness studies: The new history of race in America. *Journal of American History*, *89*(1), 154–173.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2004). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a black professor teaching white students. *Theory into Practice*, *35*(2), 79–85.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is Critical Race Theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7–24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (Ed.). (2003). *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47–68.

LaGravenese, R. (2007). *Freedom writers*. Paramount Pictures.

Landsman, J. (2001). *A white teacher talks about race*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Laughter, J. C. (2011). Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among White preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(1), 43–50.

Lawrence, S., & Tatum, B. D. (1997). Teachers in transition: The impact of antiracist professional development on classroom practice. *Teachers College Record*, *99*, 162–178.

Lee, S. J. (1996). *Unraveling the "model minority" stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lei, J. L. (2003). (Un)necessary toughness?: Those "loud black girls" and those "quiet Asian boys." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *34*(2), 158–181.

Lensmire, A. (2012). *White urban teachers: Stories of fear, violence, and desire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lensmire, T. J. (2010). Ambivalent white racial identities: Fear and an elusive innocence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*(2), 159–172.

Lensmire, T. J. (2011). Laughing white men. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *27*(3), 102–116.

Lensmire, T. J., McManimon, S. K., Tierney, J. D., Lee-Nichols, M. E., Casey, Z. A., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. M. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on white privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review*, *83*(3), 410–432.

Lensmire, T. J., & Snaza, N. (2010). What teacher education can learn from blackface minstrelsy. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(5), 413–422.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *5*(1), 29–50.

Leonardo, Z. (2007). The war on schools: NCLB, nation creation and the educational construction of whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(3), 261–278.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z., & Porter, R. K. (2010). Pedagogy of fear: toward a Fanonian theory of "safety" in race dialogue. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*(2), 139–157.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2000). Framing Whiteness: Working through the tensions in introducing whiteness to educators. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(3), 271–292.

Levitt, J. (2007). The truth about voter fraud. *The Brennan Center for Justice*. Retrieved from http://www.brennancenter.org/content/section/category/allegations_of_voter_fraud

Levstik, L. S. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of historical significance. In P. N. Sterns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 284–305). New York: New York University Press.

Lewis, A. (2008). *Race in the schoolyard*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lipsitz, G. (1995). The possessive investment in whiteness: Racialized social democracy and the "white" problem in American Studies. *American Quarterly*, *47*(3), 369–387.

Loewen, J. (2007). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone Books.

Loewen, J. (2009). *Teaching what really happened: How to avoid the tyranny of textbooks and get students excited about doing history*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lowenstein, K. L. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education: Reconceptualizing white teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(1), 163–196.

Lui, M., Robles, B., Leondar-Wright, B., Brewer, R., & Adamson, R. (2006). *The color of wealth: The story behind the U.S. racial wealth divide*. London: New Press.

Marable, M. (2002). *The great wells of democracy: The meaning of race in American life*. New York: Basic Civitas Books.

Marx, S. (2006). *Revealing the invisible: Confronting passive racism in teacher education*. New York: Routledge.

Matsuda, M. (1993). We Will Not Be Used. *UCLA Asian Am. Pac. Is. LJ*, *1*, 79.

May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York: Routledge.

Mazzei, L. A. (2008). Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(5), 1125–1136.

McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(3), 265–280.

McCarthy, C. (2003). Contradictions of power and identity: Whiteness studies and the call of teacher education. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(1), 127–133.

McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, *July/August*, 10–12.

McIntyre, A. (1997). Constructing an image of a white teacher. *Teachers College Record*, *98*(3), 653–681.

McLaren, P. (1998). Whiteness is...the struggle for postcolonial hybridity. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodriguez, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

McNamee, S. J., & Miller, R. K. (2009). *The meritocracy myth*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(5), 405–416.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzales, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(2), 132–141.

Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes: A critical review of literature on Asian Americans in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *31*(1), 95–130.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

O'Brien, E. (2008). *The racial middle: Latinos and Asian Americans living beyond the racial divide*. New York: NYU Press.

Oliver, M. L., & Shapiro, T. M. (1997). *Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2005). *Why segregation matters*. New York: Peter Lang.

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

Pang, V. O., Rivera, J., & Gillette, M. (1998). Can CUFA be a leader in the national debate on racism? *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *26*(3), 430–436.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *12*(2), 197–215.

Pitt, A. J. (1998). Qualifying resistance: Some comments on methodological dilemmas. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(4), 535–553.

Pitt, A. J., & Britzman, D. (2003). Speculations on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning: An experiment in psychoanalytic research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(6), 755–776.

Pollock, M. (2009). *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pollock, M., Deckman, S., Mira, M., & Shalaby, C. (2010). "But what can I do?": Three necessary tensions in teaching teachers about race. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(3), 211–224.

Rattansi, A. (1999). Racism, "postmodernism" and reflexive multiculturalism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 77–112). London: Falmer Press.

Richardson, V. (2003). Constructivist pedagogy. *The Teachers College Record*, *105*(9), 1623–1640.

Rickford, J. R., & Labov, W. (1999). *African American vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ringrose, J. (2007). Rethinking white resistance: Exploring the discursive practices and psychical negotiations of "whiteness" in feminist, anti-racist education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(3), 323–344.

Rodriguez, N. M. (1998). Emptying the content of whiteness: Toward and understanding of the relation between whiteness and pedagogy. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, R. E. Chennault, & N. M. Rodriguez (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Roediger, D. R. (1991). *Wages of Whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. New York: New Left Books.

Roediger, D. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Black on white: Black writers on what it means to be white*. New York: Schocken Books.

Roediger, D. R. (2005). *Working toward whiteness: How America's immigrants became white*. New York: Basic Books.

Roediger, D. R. (2008). *How race survived US history: From settlement and slavery to the Obama phenomenon*. New York: Verso Books.

Rosenberg, P. M. (1997). Underground discourses: Exploring Whiteness in teacher education. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power and society* (pp. 79–89). New York: Routledge.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. New York: Sage.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London: Sage Publications.

Ryan, W. (1976). *Blaming the victim*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Salinas, C. S., & Castro, A. J. (2010). Disrupting the official curriculum: Cultural biography and the curriculum decision making of Latino preservice teachers. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *38*(3), 428–463.

Scheurich, J. J. (1993). Toward a white discourse on white racism. *Educational Researcher*, *22*(8), 5–10.

Schick, C. (2000). "By virtue of being white": Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(1), 83–101.

Schmidt, S. L. (2005). More than men in white sheets: Seven concepts critical to the teaching of racism as systemic inequality. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *38*(2), 110–122.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Segall, A., & Garrett, J. (2013). White teachers talking race. *Teaching Education*. doi:10.1080/10476210.2012.704509

Seidl, B. L., & Hancock, S. D. (2011). Acquiring double images: White preservice teachers locating themselves in a raced world. *Harvard Educational Review*, *81*(4), 687–710.

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How White teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 157–171). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education*, *1*(4), 5–8.

Sleeter, C. E. (1995). Teaching whites about racism. In R. J. Martin (Ed.), *Practicing what we teach: Confronting diversity in teacher education* (pp. 117–130). Albany: SUNY Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 559–582). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(4), 421–445.

Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Smith, J. N. (1995). *Dangerous minds*. Buena Vista Pictures.

Solomon, P. R., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B. J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism, and "white privilege." *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(2), 147–169.

Spring, J. H. (2004). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Swartz, E. (2003). Teaching white preservice teachers: Pedagogy for change. *Urban Education*, *38*(3), 255–278.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. New York: Back Bay Books.

Tatum, B. D. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *The Teachers College Record*, *95*(4), 462–476.

Thandeka. (1999). *Learning to be white: Money, race and God in America*. New York: Continuum.

Thompson, A. (1999). Colortalk: Whiteness and off white. *Educational Studies*, *30*(2), 141–160.

Titone, C. (1998). Educating the white teacher as ally. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodriguez, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America* (pp. 159–176). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Trainor, J. S. (2002). Critical pedagogy's "other": Constructions of Whiteness in education for social change. *College Composition and Communication*, *53*(4), 631–650.

Trainor, J. S. (2005). “My ancestors didn’t own slaves”: Understanding White talk about race. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *40*(2), 140–167.

Tyson, C. (2003). A bridge over troubled water: Social studies, civic education, and critical race theory. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 15–26). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Ullucci, K. (2011). Learning to see: the development of race and class consciousness in white teachers. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *14*(4), 561–577.

Ullucci, K., & Battey, D. (2011). Exposing color blindness/grounding color consciousness: Challenges for teacher education. *Urban Education*, *46*(6), 1195–1225.

Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Vaught, S. E., & Castagno, A. E. (2008). “I don’t think I’m a racist”: Critical race theory, teacher attitudes, and structural racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*(2), 95–113.

Villegas, A. M., & Davis, D. E. (2008). Preparing teachers of color to confront racial/ethnic disparities in educational outcomes. In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (3rd ed., pp. 583–605). New York: Routledge.

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

Wachowski, L., & Wachowski, A. (1999). *The Matrix*. Warner Brothers.

Wagner, A. E. (2005). Working through the challenges of anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(3), 261–275.

Wasburn, L. H. (1997). Accounts of slavery: An analysis of United States history textbooks from 1900-1992. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *25*(4), 470–491.

Watson, D. (2012). Norming suburban: How teachers talk about race without using words. *Urban Education*, *47*(5), 983–1004.

Wellman, D. T. (1993). *Portraits of white racism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Winans, A. E. (2005). Local pedagogies and race: Interrogating White safety in the rural college classroom. *College Engligh*, *67*(3), 253–274.

Winant, H. (1997). Behind blue eyes: Whiteness and contemporary U.S. racial politics. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power and society*. New York: Routledge.

Winant, H. (2001). *The world is a ghetto: Race and democracy since WWII*. New York: Basic Books.

Wynter, S. (1979). Sambos and minstrels. *Social Text*, *1*(1), 149–156.

Yancy, G. (2004). Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness. In G. Yancy (Ed.), *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question*. New York: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London: Sage.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 69–91.

Young, E. Y. (2011). The four personae of racism : Educators' (mis)understanding of individual vs. systemic racism. *Urban Education*, *46*(6), 1443–1460.

Zeichner, K. M. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. New York: Routledge.

Zinn, H. (1980). *People's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: HarperCollins.

Zinn, H. (1990). *Declarations of independence: Cross-examining American ideology*. New York: Harper Collins.

VITA

Ryan M. Crowley was born in Norfolk, Nebraska, in 1977, and attended Norfolk Catholic schools from kindergarten through twelfth grade. After high school, he attended college at Princeton University, graduating in 1999 with a Bachelor of Arts in History. Ryan taught middle school social studies for three years in Houston, Texas, before moving to Austin, Texas, where he taught high school social studies for five years. Ryan began graduate studies at The University of Texas at Austin in 2007, earning a Master's of Education in 2009. He began his doctoral studies in 2009 at The University of Texas at Austin with an emphasis in Social Studies Education and will complete his degree in May of 2014.

Permanent contact information: rcrowley5@gmail.com

This manuscript was typed by the author.