Cynthia Cole Robinson, PhD
and Pauline Clardy, PhD

Abstract: *The disparity between the cultural and linguistic diversity of the teaching population and the student population continues to grow as teacher education programs enroll and graduate primarily white teacher candidates (83.7%). At the same time, the diversity of the K-12 student body has increased with 65% of public school students being from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). This chasm between the diversity of the teaching force and student population is of concern as many teachers report that they do not have the cultural knowledge and experience of working or living in diverse environments, yet will be faced with teaching a very diverse student population. Hence, the need for teacher candidates and current teachers to be explicitly taught the skills needed to successfully teach diverse student populations is urgent. In this article, we explore the following phenomena: how linguistic and cultural diversity is regarded in teacher education programs, as well as teacher candidates' and current K-12 teachers' dispositions towards students who do not share their cultural backgrounds or language (including those who vary in their dialects). Finally, we will present strategies that teacher educators can use to embrace and empower culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) teacher candidates, as well as prepare teacher candidates to teach diverse student populations.*

Key Words: *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, African American Student Needs, Strategies to Embrace Diversity*

It Ain't What You Say, It's How You Say It: Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in the Classroom

The disparity between the cultural and linguistic diversity of the teaching population and the student population continues to grow as teacher education programs enroll and graduate primarily White teacher candidates (83.7%) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). This majority has decreased somewhat over the past ten years (the percentage was 89% in the year 2000) as more minorities have entered the teaching field due to programs designed specifically to diversify the teaching force such as the Grow Your Own Teacher Act (2007). However, the diversity of the K-12 student body has increased. This chasm between the diversity of the teaching force and student population is of concern as many teachers report that they do not have the cultural knowledge and experience of working or living in diverse environments. Hence, the need for teacher candidates (pre-service teacher education students currently matriculating through teacher education programs) and in-service teachers (educators who are currently teaching in K-12 classrooms) to be explicitly taught the skills needed to successfully teach diverse student populations is urgent. While research literature on pedagogy documents this need and advocates for culturally relevant teaching (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2009a), we first need to explore how cultural and linguistic diversity is regarded in teacher education programs. This is important because it affects the content of the curriculum which is offered in teacher education programs and how it is structured. It also affects what is expected of teacher education faculty as it relates to their knowledge and dispositions regarding the cultural and linguistic diversity of their students, i.e., teacher education candidates. If teacher educators do not value or have experiences with cultural diversity, it is unlikely that they will be able to teach these cultur-

Cynthia Cole Robinson, PhD, *is an associate professor, Department of Teacher Preparation, Purdue University Calumet in Hammond, IN 46323-2094.* **Pauline Clardy, PhD,** *is an assistant professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790-5330. Dr. Robinson, corresponding author, may be reached at: E-mail: robinsonc@purduecal.edu.*

students. In order to examine this issue, we explore how cultural and linguistic diversity is addressed in teacher education programs. Specifically, is it segregated into diversity courses or is it integrated throughout all teacher education program coursework? Is addressing diversity primarily considered the responsibility of faculty who teach diversity-focused courses? Lastly, we acknowledge that culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) includes all people whose first language or dialect and cultural backgrounds are other than the mainstream. During our time of teaching these CLD teacher education candidates and current K-12 teachers, they have shared their experiences and reflections of the time they spent in teacher education programs and how their CLD status was regarded by their fellow classmates, as well as their professors (teacher educators). The second phenomenon we will address is teacher candidates' and current K-12 teachers' dispositions towards students who do not share their cultural backgrounds or language (including those who vary in their dialects). Finally, we will present strategies that teacher educators can use to embrace and empower CLD teacher candidates, as well as prepare them to teach diverse student populations. We explore these issues from our perspectives as teacher educators who are of African American descent teaching in predominantly white universities in the Midwest in an effort to lessen the cultural knowledge gap among White teacher educators, teacher candidates, and current K-12 teachers and the CLD students whom they will teach in the future.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

We selected Critical Race Theory (CRT) as our framework because as a theory in education it enables us to challenge inequity and racism in education and society (Ladson-Billings, 2009b). It also challenges prevailing ideologies revealing the privilege of dominant groups in schools and society (Solorzano and Yosso, 2009). In addition, CRT is committed to social justice and has a research agenda that seeks to eliminate racism and other forms of subordination (Solorzano and Yosso, 2009). Furthermore, it emphasizes the significance of the experiential knowledge of men and women of color and views their stories as valid for teaching about racism and other forms of oppression. Moreover, CRT helps us analyze race and racism at macro and micro levels as it affects our society and our schools/institutions. Finally, it enables us to identify the individual and institutional forms of racism and provides an alternative to dominant ideologies (Solorzano and Yosso, 2009).

These themes of CRT are relevant to our work because we look at our experiences as women of color and those of our students as we operate in a system that is run by the dominant culture which decides the content of the curriculum, the pedagogical delivery and what is acceptable as appropriate language for the classroom.

CRT offers a lens through which to see racism as it fuels linguistic and cultural hegemony in education. As African American teacher educators, our experiences as members of a culturally and linguistically diverse group and teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse populations offer a unique perspective to this discussion.

For the methodology, we selected autoethnography which is defined as "an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p.739). Autoethnography is fitting as the methodology for this study as it connects our personal lived experiences to the cultural contexts of schools as societal institutions. As Ellis and Bochner state:

> *...back and forth autoethnographers gaze, first through an ethnographic wide-angle lense, focusing outward on social and cultural aspects of their personal experience; then they look inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through, refract, and resist cultural interpretations....in these [autoethnographic] texts, concrete action, dialogue, emotion, embodiment, spirituality, and self-consciousness are featured appearing as relational and institutional stories affected by history, social structure and culture...(2000, p. 739).*

Central to both autoethnography and CRT is the use of voice. CRT complements autoethnography as they both view storytelling as a valid form of research. Autoethnography may take on many forms among which are narrative, drama, poetry, journals, and emails to name a few (Ellis, 2004). In this article, we present data through a narrative vignette and journal excerpts.

Data Sources

The data sources are recollections of past events (as we remember them), artifacts and documents. The memories of past events are derived from our experiences as teacher educators. The documents include our reflective teaching journal entries and class notes.

Examining Efforts and Means of Addressing Diversity in Teacher Education Programs

Teacher education programs are well aware of the fact that the majority of our teacher candidates and current teachers are from cultural backgrounds different from those who they currently teach or will teach. In fact, in order to gain and retain accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), teacher education programs must demonstrate how they prepare teacher candidates to address diversity in their classrooms. The acceptable rating for the diversity standard reads:

> *The unit [teacher education program] clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework that candidates are expected to develop during their professional programs. Curriculum and field experiences provide a well grounded framework for understanding diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates connect lessons, instruction, or services to students' experiences and cultures. They communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences. Candidates incorporate multiple perspectives*

provided. They develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity.... (NCATE, 2008)

This emphasis on diversity by the national accrediting body makes it an important priority for all teacher education programs. However, the means by which programs go about the business of addressing diversity varies, as well as their effectiveness. We suggest that there are three approaches programs use to address the diversity standard and that the way in which it is addressed affects the faculty's views and subsequently, the teacher candidates' views of diverse students. The three approaches are: (1) the *segregated diversity course approach* where diversity courses are created to address the standard and are thought to be the panacea for addressing the standard and as a result, diversity is not integrated throughout other coursework in the program or it is at least not expected to be (2) the *programmatic diversity integration approach* where faculty are told that everyone is to address diversity in their classes and (3) the *combination approach* where some mixture of the above listed approaches are viewed as the appropriate response.

There are issues with all of these approaches. The segregated diversity course approach is an issue because it creates an environment in programs where the responsibility to teach teacher candidates to address diversity rests only on those who actually teach diversity courses. It is segregated into a course, and faculty who do not teach those courses are not held to integrating the standard into their coursework. This is problematic because if diversity is addressed only in specific diversity-focused courses, will students think that it is important for integration throughout the curriculum?

While it is admirable and a step in the right direction to integrate diversity throughout all coursework, the problems with the programmatic diversity integration approach stems from the assumption that all faculty have the knowledge and experience needed to adequately prepare students to teach diverse populations of students. Furthermore, the statistics on the race/ethnicity of full-time faculty and staff in the field of education shows that 83.5% of faculty are White, 6.8% are Black, 3.8% are Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.2% are Hispanic and 2.8% are other (NCES, 2008). Interestingly, this closely parallels the statistic that was presented earlier regarding the racial/ethnic composition of the K-12 teaching force. While we cannot assume that this overwhelming majority of White teacher educators equates to lack of knowledge or experience with diverse populations, this data raises the following questions: How prepared are teacher educators to teach CLD teachers candidates? Can limited knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity affect teacher educators' ability to teach those pedagogical skills to teacher candidates? What are teacher education programs doing in the way of professional development to assist teacher educators who lack knowledge and experience with cultural and linguistic diversity? What are teacher education programs doing to diversify the faculty?

The combination approach is most likely to be effective, however, diversity of the faculty as well as professional development and administrative support to be truly effective.

Inside Our Classrooms: Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Teacher Candidates

Though teacher education programs offer coursework in diversity, multicultural education and bilingual education, how often are the tenets of these courses or pedagogy of this coursework put into practice when teaching teacher candidates? The failure to incorporate these teaching strategies into teacher education courses demonstrates to teacher candidates that there is linguistic and cultural hegemony (Arce, 1998) in K-12, as well as higher education classrooms that regards other languages, dialects and nonstandard varieties of English as inferior and unacceptable as Taxel states (2000):

...schools confer preeminence on the language forms, world views, ideological, historical, and cultural perspectives of the dominant social groups, thus legitimating–as logical, natural, and/or the result of merit–the power, prestige, and status of these groups in society. (p. 302)

The notion of language as ever-evolving might be a truth that some academics accept, but it is seldom incorporated into the coursework or the curriculum. In short, acceptable forms of the English language are rigid in the academy. This rigidity is problematic not only because it functions as a gatekeeper (or "fatekeeper") which can effectively foreclose or substantially impede the education of speakers of languages and dialects other than Standard English, but also because it lessens our opportunities to learn about other ways of knowing.

With this in mind, we explore the following autoethnographic account of a conversation between Dr. Robinson and one of her African American female students, Deja, a student in a Master of Arts in Teaching program educational foundations class. This particular academic term, the racial/ethnic composition of the course was more diverse than usual—the majority of the class consisted of White students with three African American females and one African American male. This was the most diverse class she taught over the course of four years; most classes typically had only one or two minority students. The following exchange took place between Dr. Robinson and Deja as she was preparing to be the student discussion facilitator for the next class meeting. This interaction focuses on Deja's use of Ebonics, a nonstandard form of English spoken by African Americans primarily but not solely. It has also been referred to historically as Black English Vernacular. Unlike regional and/or geographical dialects, Ebonics is derived from African language origins. Taylor (1998), details the history of Ebonics and states, it is has a legitimate linguistic basis and that it is, "derived from African language origins in ways that are common to the evolution of any language system that comes into contact with another" (p. 37). While Ebonics is regarded by the mainstream, as not only nonstandard but substandard, it is viewed by most African Americans as an integral part of African American culture. However, Taylor warns against thinking that all African Americans value Ebonics stating, "...it is often the case that some members of lower-status groups elevate the status of the

own group's language. This is especially true for those members of lower-status groups who have managed to assimilate into the dominant group" (p. 35). Nevertheless, the need to be fluent in Standard English in order to succeed in academic and professional pursuits is acknowledged and considered imperative by most. This struggle towards fluency in Standard English is what Deja describes in this autoethnographic account.

While in my office preparing for classes for that week, I heard a soft rapping on the door. "Come in," I answered and Deja came through the door with a heavy look on her face. By this point of the term, I knew her pretty well and I could tell that this was going to be something serious.

"Dr. Robinson," she began, "I need to talk to you about how I feel when I'm in class and when I am with other students in the class. I feel that when I made certain comments I was being criticized for my grammar and verbal usage. [She was referring to was a dialect which was a blend between Ebonics and Standard English.] To give you an example, in the Monday class, [a course taught by White instructor which Deja also took with the same students with whom she took my course] we were given our peer evaluations relating to our class presentation, and one of my evaluations sited grammar usage. For the past year, I have been working on increasing my vocabulary and improving my speaking skills. I thought I was successful until now. I realize that certain cultures have certain styles of communication, but I did not think that I would have to compare my grammar usage to everyone else's in the class."

I was surprised to learn she felt this way about her verbal communication skills because I thought she was quite well-spoken. Also, she was very verbal and one of the main contributors to the discussions in class. "But Deja you are so outspoken and passionate in class. You bring insight and personal experience to the conversation. When we were reading the Jean Anyon's "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work," you were the first to share your own personal experience with being steered towards a vocational high school and how it caused you to have to attend junior college. Your connection with the piece really got students to thinking and took the discussion to another level causing everyone else to open up about how the piece resonated with them. It took us to a new level of discussion." My words seemed to be somewhat reassuring to her; still they did not remove the hurt I saw in her eyes and heard in her voice.

"Yeah," she slowly responded, "but I guess I feel more comfortable talking in this class because you're African American and bring a social justice view to what we are studying. You know where I'm coming from. In our other class [with a White male instructor], the other students have corrected the way I talk and now I feel uncomfortable. I am a hard working individual. Sometimes when I don't feel like I measure up, I beat up on myself pretty bad. I feel like they measuring me and after all these years and a successful career [she was nothing. I'm just tired [with tears in her eyes]."

The Silencing of White Students' Dialogue in the Presence of the African American Professor: Playing Nice when Power Dynamics are Atypical

In this particular instance, the students who publicly corrected Deja's language usage happened to be White; however, it is important to note that this phenomenon of devaluing CLD students' dialects is not solely racially based. As Taylor (1998) suggests, this devaluing of nonstandard forms of English can be enacted by CLD people who have achieved fluency in Standard English and have assimilated to the mainstream to the point where they devalue their own group's language. In sum, African American students also could have been a part of the group who taunted Deja, but were not in this situation.

The issue of some of the White students publicly correcting Deja's use of Ebonics did not occur in Dr. Robinson's class. Despite readings and discussions about white hegemony and racism in this country's educational structures, some of the White students were unwavering in their attribution of educational experiences of students of color to lack of desire for learning, lack of parental support and cultural deficiency. This resistance troubled Dr. Robinson as well as other students in class who found their views to be unfounded (minority, as well as White students). The White students who taunted Deja in the other class expressed their views without launching ad hominem attacks on her while in Dr. Robinson's class. However, they exercised less restraint in the class with the White professor. A possible explanation for the difference of their behavior in Dr. Robinson's class as opposed to the other class may be the students' understanding of the power dynamics. They might have assumed that publicly challenging Deja's use of Ebonics could mean inviting chastisement, which may have resulted in an unfavorable bottom line, i.e., an undesirable grade. Since the power dynamics were atypical, an African American professor instructing a predominately white class, the students possibly acquiesced by deciding to "play nice" in the presence of the African American professor. Instead opting to address Deja's use of Ebonics in the class with the White professor who allowed them a forum to correct her publicly.

Linguistic Bullying: Focusing on Form of Speech Rather than Content

When the form of speech (in this instance Ebonics) is used as a means to mute the voices and opposing critical views of CLD students, we term this act of silencing *linguistic bullying*. This overcorrection of dialectic patterns of CLD students in an attempt to have them use Standard English, while using the mode of delivery—the grammar, etc.—is a dismissal of the content of students' comments. Inherent in this approach to silencing is the assumption that non Standard English is inferior to Standard English and that anyone who uses it is less intelligent, hence can be rightfully dismissed (Delpit, 2006). This is a notion that Deja also brought up in her conversation with Dr. Robinson.

Deja also often spoke out against inequality in school funding (after reading Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*, 1991), curriculum designed for students of color out of low

color in special education courses. While some of the White students also shared her views around the issues, they did not speak out about them in the same manner. The White students with opposing views often defaulted to arguments of students not wanting to learn, lack of parental support, etc., as the reasons for issues related to the education of students of color, recounting stories of their grandparents and parents who immigrated to the United States and were academically successful. As a result of the dichotomous views, these particular White students might have found it easier to ignore the content of her comments and instead focus on her form of speech while at the same time deciding her views had no merit because she was using an inferior dialect to convey them, i.e., a mixture of Standard English and Ebonics.

This overcorrection by some White students activated what Krashen (1982) terms as the "affective filter." When activated, the speaker experiences feelings of anxiety which negatively impacts verbal and academic performance. This African American student's affective filter (Krashen, 1982) was activated as she was beginning to struggle with being forced into silence due to anxiety related to her use of Ebonics.

The effect of activating the affective filter is also exemplified in Dr. Clardy's experiences as she taught an undergraduate course. The following is an excerpt from her journal:

> *As a bilingual teacher educator, my first surprise when I began teaching at a large university in the Midwest was that there was very little racial, ethnic, linguistic or gender diversity among the student body. The majority of the students in the program were White females who came from the suburbs of Chicago. Given the program's emphasis on the education of Latino students, I had expected more Latino teacher candidates. Regardless of the fact that there was little diversity among my students, I found them to be very interested in learning to address the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students.*
>
> *Then one semester, two Latina and two Asian students enrolled in one of my undergraduate classes. I was excited to have more student diversity in the class because I thought that with the addition of Latina and Asian students, the discussions about race, language and culture would be more rich. To my surprise, the Asian and Latino students did not speak out in class but they wrote extensively in their journals about race and language.*
>
> *Knowing that second language learners go through a silent period in which they are learning the language (and the culture) around them and that it is not a good idea to force them to speak before they are ready, I assumed that the same might apply for my CLD students who know English but are not confident in speaking in front of heritage speakers of English as they are still acclimating to the university setting.*
>
> *One day, I took a risk by posing some direct questions that I thought might elicit responses using my experience as "other" to frame the discussion. When I American bilingual/bicultural student when I went away to college, I saw what I interpreted to be looks of interest and enthusiasm in the faces of the non heritage speakers of English.*
>
> *As the students chimed in, a Latina student stated, "I had never been in a place that is all white before. I have nothing against White people but they want me to speak a certain way. Now I am not sure how to speak because I think that what I say is wrong. So it's just easier to say nothing."*
>
> *Then an Asian student followed her lead and commented, "I'm glad to say this. I never felt I could anywhere else. When I asked for help with my English, another professor told me to go to the Disabilities Office, like I was disabled."*
>
> *Another Asian student stated, "I can relate. I am very assimilated but I know people who feel like English speakers think of them as being in need of repair."*
>
> *One by one, the CLD students told of their experiences as "other" on the campus of a predominantly white university. My conclusion is that when I, as the professor, opened the door by first sharing my own experience and encouraging them to share theirs, it created a safe place for them to express themselves and gave legitimacy and validation to their experiences. Since that day, my CLD students have spoken up in class on a regular basis but they tell me that the same is not true in their other classes because they do not feel that their cultures and languages are accepted.*

Safe Havens: Spaces in which "Silenced Dialogue" is Spoken

The autoethnographic vignette and journal excerpts presented in this article raise some of the issues that CLD students face in educational settings where the expectation, by those who speak the language of the "culture of power" (Delpit, 2006, p. 24), i.e., Standard English, is that they assimilate to speaking "the King's English." Though the experience that these students describe is unfortunate, it is one that transpires in schools across all educational levels, i.e., elementary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate, as these teacher education candidates are in undergraduate as well as graduate programs. Lisa Delpit's notion of the "silenced dialogue" will be employed to analyze these students' experiences.

In *Other People's Children* (2006), Delpit presents "silenced dialogue" as the cessation of conversation in educational settings between people of color (in her examples she includes statements of teacher candidates as well as current teachers) and White people around issues of how to best educate children of color. The subjects in her study describe their silence as a response to White people's unwillingness to accept their opinions and experiences as valid. They posit that no matter how much evidence they offered to refute claims made by White colleagues about the learning abilities and cultural backgrounds of students of color, they were dismissed. As one of Delpit's interviewees poignantly states:

It becomes futile because they think they know everything about everybody. What you have to say about your life, your children doesn't mean anything. They really don't want to hear what you have to say. They wear blinders and earplugs. They only want to go on research they've read that other white people have written. It just doesn't make any sense to keep talking to them. (2006, p. 22)

Hence, the dialogue is silenced—not out of acquiescence, but out of frustration. But what happens to this silenced dialogue? As the conversations that Delpit had with her interviewees and the exchanges between our students exemplify, the dialogue is given voice—it simply takes place among people with similar ideological orientations, mostly among people of color. The term we use to describe these places are safe havens. They are spaces in which one can speak freely without fear of reprimand or confidence being broken. In the case with Dr. Robinson and Deja, they shared an ideological orientation, i.e., social justice, race and gender (they are both African American females), and similar socioeconomic backgrounds (they both grew up in working class neighborhoods on the South Side of Chicago). Dr. Clardy shared similar ideological orientations as her students, i.e., equity in education for CLD students. She did not share the same race, ethnicity or social class as her students; however, she and all of her CLD students had membership in cultural groups that have traditionally been marginalized in society. Both Drs. Robinson and Clardy provided what their students viewed as safe havens which are not always present for students of color at predominantly white institutions, especially since there are very few faculty members of color in the university system (Smith, Turner, Osefi-Kofi, & Richards, 2004; Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999).

So what happens when these safe havens are not found in the classroom? Students seek out faculty members of color with whom they feel they might find a safe haven. In the case of Deja, she sought out Dr. Robinson to share how the students in their class treated her differently in the White professor's class. Sometimes they might confide in other students of color, if they are not the only one in the class. They might share the incidents with family and friends. And the last option is that, in the face of no safe haven to tell them otherwise or validate their experiences, they might internalize it and/or experience the frustration that Deja describes or as one of Delpit's interviewees states as she fights her anger, "Please Lord, remove the bile I feel for these people so I can sleep tonight." It's funny, but it can become a cancer, a sore" (p.22). Why would Deja internalize the White students' correcting of her use of Ebonics to the point that she was so dejected? These students' strong reactions can be attributed to the connection between students' identity and their cultural dialect. As Hilliard (1983) states, "...a language is not simply a means of communicating in a narrow sense. Psychologically, it is a prime source of cultural identity. It is also a cognitive structuring of the world which is linked to one's worldview, identity, self concept, and self-esteem" (p. 27).

In Dr. Clardy's classroom, the students found a safe haven after realizing the common experiences as "other" that they shared with Dr. Clardy. In other classes and in Though Delpit describes silencing as a last resort but voluntary act on the part of people of color who have grown weary of their White colleagues who will not "listen," silencing can also be involuntary and inflicted upon people of color who dissent from the views of their White counterparts. In the case of Deja, silencing was not voluntary but an attempt was made by some of her White colleagues to silence her. The attempted silencing was two-fold: (1) they wanted to silence her because of her personal views (supported by her own experiences as well as literature from the course such as "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work" (1996) by Anyon, *The Miseducation of the Negro* (1933) by Woodson and *American Education* (2004) by Spring on the education of people of color challenged their own views on the subject and (2) they found it easier to focus on her linguistic mode of delivery, a blend between Standard English and Ebonics though primarily Standard English, to dismiss and silence her.

Teacher Candidates' and Current Teachers' Dispositions towards Diverse Students

Preparing teacher candidates to effectively teach diverse students is a core tenet in every teacher education program and a mandate from accrediting organizations, e.g., National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQUIP), Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and content area professional organizations. Specifically, when we think of educating teacher candidates about embracing cultural and linguistic diversity, the concern usually resides with their pedagogical preparedness. However, their attitudes and dispositions towards students are key as their thoughts about their current and future students greatly impacts their willingness to learn and employ pedagogies needed to effectively teach CLD students. They display their attitudes towards diversity long before they enter the classrooms as teachers. They exhibit their views of cultural and linguistic minorities while they are in pre-service courses by how they interact, relate and engage literature on diversity and classmates who are from backgrounds different than their own. Over the years of serving as teacher educators at predominantly white institutions in the Midwest, we have had several opportunities to prepare students for cultural diversity. At times it has been a labor of love and many times, just a pure labor as some of our students have brought some disturbing perspectives about cultural and linguistic diversity into the discussions in the classrooms, making statements such as, "This is America and everyone needs to speak English." These statements are intended for non-native English speakers as well as persons who speak any variance of Standard English.

The following journal excerpt describes Dr. Clardy's experiences while teaching a Bilingual Education course for graduate students who were currently elementary school teachers and held assimilationist views of students with diverse language backgrounds.

When I entered the classroom in the suburban school district that had contracted my university to provide coursework to their teachers on how to address the needs of their culturally and linguistically diverse

siastic about the class but as soon as the introductions began, I learned that some of the teachers had prejudices toward a certain group of individuals which included their students whom I later learned that they viewed as a threat to their community and way of life.

The school's community consists of Mexican immigrants, both documented and undocumented. The teachers expressed their disdain for the children and their families initially. Some of the teachers carried their views about undocumented Mexican immigrants into their classrooms which manifested in the form of cultural and linguistic hegemony. These teachers often made statements to denounce both the language and culture of their Mexican immigrant students while failing to realize the relevance of both of these important aspects of their students' identities.

As stated previously, CRT focuses on racism at macro and micro levels; racism present in the broader society is also present in its institutions (Solorzano & Yosso, 2009). Cultural and linguistic hegemony, by products of racism, are also present in schools and society. During the course of the semester, the teachers reported that their attitudes and worldviews changed over the short period that the class met. As reported by the teachers, the readings presented facts and perspectives that they had not known or considered. The teachers also reported that Dr. Clardy's candor about her own experiences and her nonjudgmental attitude enabled them to speak openly and honestly. Moreover, journal reflections gave them an opportunity to communicate their views candidly to the professor and receive substantive responses without fear of reprisals from their peers. Finally, the assignments enabled these teachers to process the content. The most powerful of these, as reported by the teachers, was one on identity texts (Cummins, Bismilla, Chow, Cohen, Giampapa, Leoni, Sandhu, & Sastri, 2005) which required the teachers to research their own ethnic heritage. Most found that their families experienced similar struggles as their current students.

Following is an excerpt from Dr. Clardy's journal which demonstrates the change in attitude of one of the students over time:

Early in the semester, the student stated, "I just have to admit it. I want to be a good teacher but I just can't find it in my heart to teach the people that I view as intruders who have taken away jobs and social services from Americans. Just by entering this country without proper documentation, they are illegal and should be deported."

Toward the end of the semester, the student stated, "I am so ashamed of what I have been feeling. After reading about how the U.S. conquered lands from Mexico and the agreement that was made to allow Mexican citizens in those lands to continue to practice their culture, religion, and language, I now see what is meant when Mexicans say: "We didn't cross the border. The border crossed us." Also, since I learned about how the North American Free Trade Agreement bankrupted the Mexican economy to the benefit of U.S. capitalism, I come to the United States. It is a matter of survival and the United States has always been a place where immigrants have come. Why should we discriminate just because they came from south of the border? Is it because their skin is brown and not white?"

Strategies Teacher Educators Can Use to Teach Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Teacher Candidates

In our experiences as African American teacher educators, we have spent most of our academic careers preparing teachers to educate culturally and linguistically diverse students. Most of our classes have included White speakers of Standard English; the majority of whom did not have a connection to their own ethnic roots. In other words, when asked what is their culture, they respond, "American" without acknowledging a different cultural origin. Through journals, classroom interactions, and discussions, we have found that these students count as valid the language and culture of the dominant groups. Indeed, they were socialized and educated within the context of learning from a European or white perspective. On the rare occasions that we have taught speakers of non Standard English varieties and heritage languages other than English, we have learned more about their needs as university students.

For the most part, our CLD students, though few in number, are African Americans or Latinos, primarily the latter. Historically, educators have had low expectations of both groups (Haberman, 1989; Nieto, 2000). Many teachers have made their position known (in words and through behaviors) that they believe African American students cannot perform at high levels (Grant, 1989; Haberman, 1989). Ladson-Billings (2000) makes the claim that literature referring to the needs of this group is generally "folded into a discourse of deprivation," (p.206) i.e., "culturally deprived," "culturally disadvantaged," etc. regardless of socioeconomic status. The culture of African Americans is "delegitimized" in the classroom, and these students are "often treated as if they were corruptions of White culture" (Ladson-Billings 2000, p. 206).

Nieto (2000) makes the claim that Latinos are also folded into the deprivation model. She contends that the schools that Latinos attend are "among the most high-poverty schools in the nation" (p. 182). Our CLD students, especially those who are either African American or Latino, are self-described products of substandard schooling, and survivors of what Haberman (1996) refers to as a "pedagogy of poverty" which typically includes a transmission model of teaching practiced by authoritarian teachers who view their students from a deficit standpoint and use directive pedagogy, often devoid of activities to promote critical thinking. In addition, these students report that their elementary and high schools had few and often inadequate resources as well as teachers who were not considered to be well qualified. Some of our Latino students contend that they never escaped what Garcia (2005) terms as the "ESL Ghetto," which means that they continue to be in ESL classes at the university level even though they have a longstanding history in similar classes in the elementary school and high school. This in itself shows that focusing on the teaching of language often to the exclusion of content (Garcia, 2005) while not considering the entire student

profile, i.e., cognitive, academic, linguistic, and socio-cultural needs, is problematic because it does not address the learner's needs in a holistic manner.

We try to address our students' needs holistically by challenging them cognitively. Specifically, we provide activities that require them to think critically as we teach them cognitive, metacognitive, social/affective, and cross-linguistic learning strategies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996). We also encourage the inclusion of their cultures and language varieties to stimulate our students' existing schemata and serve as a resource for them to make connections to the content/academics. We have found our practices to be affirming and empowering to our CLD teacher candidates (as reported by them).

In our classes, students learn that when children are not allowed to speak in their home language in the classroom, this lets the child know that his/her "language, culture, and previous experience have no place within the school or, by extension, within this society" (Cummins, 1996, p. 2). If this is true at the K-12 level, we propose that it also applies at the university level. We use many of the same strategies with our students whose cultures and heritage languages differ from those of the dominant group. For instance, we build background (Echevarria, 2007) by asking these students about cultural events and/or practices, including how to say various expressions in their heritage languages or dialects; encouraging them to use their heritage languages as a resource in class. Not only does this give students comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982) and help them make connections, but it also gives them a sense of belonging and entitlement, something that many of our CLD students have expressed that they never feel in most of their classes or the university community.

If CLD students' affective filter can be activated in K-12 classrooms leading to silencing, we propose that it is also true at the university level. Considering the cultural and linguistic adjustment that CLD students have to make at white majority universities, it is important for teacher educators to provide a non-threatening classroom environment or a "safe haven" in which CLD students are encouraged to express their views and fully participate in the class.

According to academic research on bilingual education, bilingual students and those who speak different dialects are more cognitively flexible than their monolingual counterparts (Collier, 1995, Cummins 1999, Garcia, 2005; Hakuta 1990). Stated differently, they are more apt to think outside of the box in which white institutions encage them in terms of their linguistic diversity. Recognizing and accepting their cultural and linguistic communities allows us, as academics, to learn about new conceptual frameworks and epistemologies that CLD students can potentially provide for us.

CONCLUSION

By the year 2040, CLD students will out-number White students in public education (Garcia, 2005). With this increasing diversity in our schools, we need to prepare teachers to address the needs of CLD students and to be accepting of their cultural and linguistic communities. Using the cultural and linguistic diversity that exists among teacher candidates and professors in teacher education programs as a starting point, we can address racism, showing that it fuels cultural and ciety.

Teacher candidates should be encouraged to challenge deficit theories that pertain to CLD students. Furthermore, they should be taught the politics of race and language in schools and society and made to understand how race is socially constructed. For instance, whiteness is a construct that gives a person power in this society. Dominant groups create the norms and use them for their own purposes. Deviations from the norm are considered "otherness," a category to which CLD students are relegated due to their diversity (Tatum, 1997).

America is rich in diversity, and with the exception of Native Americans, it is a country of immigrants, some of whom came willingly and others by force. CLD students usually have connections with their culture but many White students do not due to the length of time their families have been in the United States. As teacher educators, we should encourage teacher candidates to learn about their own linguistic and cultural origins because this will give them insight into understanding new immigrants and other people from non-dominant groups.

As current and future educators, we need to be willing to look deep within to know whether we can be accepting of others. The following passage from *The Courage to Teach* by Parker Palmer speaks to this:

> *Teaching, like any truly human activity emerges from one's inwardness, for better or worse. As I teach, I project the condition of my soul onto my students, my subject, and our way of being together. The entanglements I experience in the classroom are often no more or less than the convolutions of my inner life. Viewed from this angle, teaching holds a mirror to the soul. If I am willing to look in that mirror and not run from what I see, I have a chance to gain self-knowledge–and knowing myself is as crucial to good teaching as knowing my students and my subject... Good teaching requires self-knowledge: it is a secret hidden in plain sight. (1998, pp. 2-3)*

To ensure that teacher candidates have experiences working with CLD students before they become teachers, teacher education programs should require field experiences in schools where there is cultural and linguistic and cultural diversity among the students. It is problematic when teachers enter the field without knowledge of how to work with these populations or experience in teaching them.

As educators in general, we also need to be flexible in terms of the perspectives that we teach so that we can consider new ways of knowing. The first time that one of us learned to consider diverse perspectives occurred while taking a history class and the differences between a European and Native American perspective were made manifest. The former is one of linear progression such as in the case of Manifest Destiny when Europeans made linear conquests until they conquered lands from the east to the west coasts of what is now America. The concept is continual expansion regardless of the death and destruction that it took to conquer the lands whereas the concept of native peoples is a circular one that signifies continued renewal and respect for a

author's worldview.

Incorporating ideas such as these might require re-educating teacher education faculty so that they can effectively address the pedagogical needs of CLD students and prepare all teacher candidates to teach in a culturally and linguistically diverse society. This professional development could be supported through grants to provide summer institutes, symposia, research projects, conferences, etc.

Also, coursework that focuses on effectively teaching CLD students should be a requirement of all teacher education programs due to the growing numbers of these students in our schools. Many unsuspecting new teachers begin their careers without realizing that CLD students are in urban, suburban, and now rural areas (Garcia, 2005).

Lastly, initiatives such as "Grow Your Own" and programs funded by Title III of the U.S. Department of Education are in place at universities nationwide to recruit CLD teacher candidates to prepare them to teach in their own communities; however many of them lack the infrastructure to support the students as they need to be supported (Meacham, 2002). According to Meacham (2002), universities that recruit culturally diverse students need to address the following questions:

> *...is the 'common sense' (or 'generally accepted practice') regarding issues of culture and language in the teaching profession the same as that held by culturally diverse teacher candidates? If not, how do teacher education institutions respond? Does the teacher education program attempt to accommodate different dispositions, or does it demand that African American and other teacher candidates of color change their language and language attitudes to reflect the mainstream common sense? (p. 182)*

Until we address these questions, we have already foreclosed upon any opportunity to provide equity in education for these students.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1996). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. In E. Hollins (Ed.), *Transforming curriculum for a culturally diverse society* (179-203). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Arce, J. (1998). Cultural hegemony: The politics of bilingual education. *Multicultural Education*, 6(2), 10-16.

Bigelow, B. (2006). *The line between us: Teaching about the border and Mexican immigration*. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.

Carger, C. (1996). *Of borders and dreams: A Mexican-American experience of urban education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chamot, A.U., & O'Malley, J.M. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96, 259 – 273.

Collier, V. (1995). Acquiring a second language for school. (Report No. FL 025-697) Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED394301)

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, Canada: California Association for Bilingual Education.

distinction. (Report No. CS-217-007). Washington, D.C.: Opinion Papers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438551)

Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 63(1), 38-43.

Delpit, L. & Dowdy, J.K. (Eds.). (2003). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C. & Bochner, A.P. (2000). Autoethnogrphy, personal narrative, reflexivity; Researcher as subject. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oakes: Sage*.

Garcia, E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism and schooling in the United States*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grant, C.A. (1989). Urban teachers: Their new colleagues and curriculum. Phi Delta

Kappan, 70, 764 – 770. Grow Your Own Illinois. (2007). About grow your own Illinois. http://www.growyourownteachers.org/AboutUs/index.htm (accessed November 3, 2007).

Haberman, M. (1989). More minority teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 771 – 776.

Haberman, M. (1996). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. In W. Ayers & P. Ford (Eds.) *City kids city teachers*, (pp. 118 – 130). New York: The New York Press.

Hakuta, K. (1990). Bilingualism and bilingual education: A research perspective. (Report No. FL – 018-722). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321584)

Hilliard, A. (1983). Psychological factors associated with language in the education of the African-American Child. *Journal of Negro Education*, 52(1), 24-34.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American Students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51 (3), 206 – 214.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009a). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009b). Just What is Critical Race Theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In Taylor, Gillborn & Ladson Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education*. (pp. 17 - 36). New York: Routledge.

Meacham, S. (2002). The clash of "common senses": Two African American women become teachers. In Delpit, L. & Dowdy, J.K. (Eds.), *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom* (pp.179 – 201). New York: The New Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (2007). Digest of education statistics: 2006. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/ (accessed November 3, 2007).

Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) Institution Data Analysis http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007175 (accessed September 3, 2009).
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions.* http://ncate.org/public/standards.asp (accessed September 3, 2009).
Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 51 (3), 180-187.
Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Smith, D., Turner, C., Osei-Kofi, N. and Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual:
Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 75 (2), 133-60.
Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2009). Critical race methodology: Counter-story-telling as an analytical framework for educational research. In Taylor, Gillborn & Ladson Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education.* (pp. 131 – 147). New York: Routledge.
Spring, J. (2004). *American education.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
Tatum, B.D. (1997). *"Why are all of the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* U.S.A.: Basic Books.
Taylor, O. L. (1998). Ebonics and educational policy: Some issues for the next millennium. *Journal of Negro Education,* 67 (1), 35-42.
Taxel, J. (2000). Roll of thunder hear my cry: Reflections on the aesthetics and politics of children's literature. In G. Willis & W.H. Schubert (Eds.), *Reflections from the heart of educational inquiry: Understanding curriculum and teaching through the arts* (pp. 301 - 311). Troy: Educators' International Press, Inc.
Turner, C., Myers, S., & Creswell, J.W. (1999). Exploring Underrepresentation: The Case of Faculty of Color in the Midwest. Journal of Higher Education, 70 (1), 27- 59.
Woodson, C.G. (1933). *The miseducation of the Negro.* Washington, D.C. Associated Publishers.