

UC Santa Cruz

UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

No Child Left Behind: Compliance, Consent, and Beyond

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4cw280cb>

Author

Jones, Derrick Lamarr

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

No Child Left Behind: Compliance, Consent, and Beyond

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

SOCIOLOGY

by

Derrick Jones

June 2014

The Dissertation of Derrick Jones is approved:

Professor Hiroshi Fukurai, chair

Professor Julie Bettie

Professor David H. Anthony

Tyrus Miller
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by
Derrick L. Jones
2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Dedication.....	ix
Acknowledgements.....	x
CHAPTER 1—Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Conceptual Underpinnings.....	8
1.3 Statement of the Problem.....	17
1.4 A Note on Methods.....	21
CHAPTER 2—Sociology of Knowledge: Identity Destruction and Reconstruction as an Institutional Practice.....	31
2.1 Knowledge and Ideology.....	38
2.2 Rethinking Ideology and Practice on New Terrain.....	42
2.3 Meaning and Practice of Knowledge Constructions.....	43
CHAPTER 3—Sociology of Education.....	55
3.1 Synopsis of Educational Research.....	56
3.2 Functionalist Theory.....	59
3.3 Contemporary Conflict Theory.....	63
3.4 Critical Theory, Feminism, and Postmodernism.....	65
3.5 Empiricism.....	67
3.6 Symbolic Interaction and Interpretive Theories.....	69
3.7 Emancipatory Perspectives and Research.....	70

3.8 Cultural Studies and Recovery of Agency.....	72
3.9 Urban Change Agents and Preservice Teacher Identity.....	73
CHAPTER 4—The Colonized, Conquered and Enslaved Origins of Education in North America: And Its Legacy of Separate and Unequal Contemporary Educational Policy.....	79
4.1 Racial Categories and Schooling.....	81
4.2 Native American Indian Educational History.....	84
4.3 African American Educational History.....	91
4.4 Latino/a Americans Educational History.....	100
4.5 Asian and Pacific Islander Educational History.....	110
CHAPTER 5—Learning to Teach and Teaching to Live.....	120
5.1 Teacher Education Programs.....	120
5.2 Reproduction in Education.....	128
5.3 Resistance and Recovery in Education.....	132
5.4 Multicultural Education.....	133
5.5 Multiculturalism as Praxis.....	138
5.6 Goals of Multiculturalism.....	140
5.7 Transcommunal Multiculturalism.....	141
5.8 Transcommunality as Pedagogy.....	146
CHAPTER 6—Results and Findings: Closing the Achievement Gap: Teacher Quality or Teaching Inequality? The Continuing Separate and Unequal Education of Students of Color.....	152
6.1 School Histories.....	154

6.2 Crenshaw.....	155
6.3 Dorsey.....	155
6.4 Los Angeles.....	156
6.5 Whitney.....	157
6.8 Findings and Results from Data Analysis.....	158
6.9 Teacher Qualifications at Four High Schools.....	159
6.10 Academic Performance and Graduation.....	160
6.11 Graduation Rates and Targets.....	166
6.12 Teacher and Student Racial/Ethnic Demographics.....	168
Chapter 7—Discussion.....	171
7.1 “Troubling for the Future”.....	174
7.2 “Victims Blaming Victims”.....	180
7.3 “The Racelessness to Survive”.....	183
7.4 “Not Knowing is Left Behind”.....	186
7.5 “Taught to Live, Survive, and Thrive”.....	192
7.6 Conclusion.....	198
Chapter 8—Conclusion: Historical Genealogy of Educational Policies and the Future of Decolonial Emancipatory Projects.....	199
APPENDICES.....	205
A. Recruitment Announcements and Consent Forms.....	205-214
B. Teacher Survey.....	215

C. Student Survey.....	217
C. Institutional Review Board Approval Letter.....	219
D. REFERENCES.....	220

List of Tables

Table 6.1 Teacher Qualifications at Four High Schools in Los Angeles

Table 6.2 Academic Performances and Student Graduation

Table 6.3 Graduation Rates and Target Goals

Table 6.4 Teacher and Student Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds by School and District

Abstract

No Child Left Behind: Compliance, Consent, and Beyond

Derrick Jones
University of California Santa Cruz

Abstract

This study examines the genealogy of colonial education for people of color in North America and examines the different modes of incorporation of Native American Indians, African Americans, Latino/a Americans, and Asian and Pacific Islanders and how each groups' educational experiences have been framed by domination and subjugation. Therefore, I explored this legacy and "failure" to close the educational gap has been addressed in the form of current educational policy, specifically the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Lastly, I examined the displacement of teachers of color and maintenance of White teachers as the majority of educators and how educational policy and teacher education programs are structured to maintain this status quo. Educational Data from 2003-2014 was analyzed and structured interviews were used to understand how the NCLB shaped the educational experiences of a teacher and seven former students from four urban high schools in Los Angeles California. Themes developed from interviews include: troubling for the future, victims blaming victims, the racelessness to survive, not knowing is left behind, and taught to live, survive, and thrive. Ultimately, teacher accountability beyond becoming more qualified or getting their students to perform better on standardized test are not enough. Teachers need to be educated and active in ways that promote a

moral, ethical, and political pedagogy to address the differences and similarities of the impact of colonial education on people of color, as well as whites. I contend that Transcommunality is an excellent start in transforming educational experiences into a life affirming endeavor.

Dedication

For all those who have come before me and will come after me fighting for freedom,
justice, and equality.

A Luta Continua!

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my committee members Hiroshi Fukurai (Chair) for his belief in me and my project and his commitment to keeping me on task even in the most difficult of times. Your strength, discipline, and courage has been inspiring by the work that you do and your commitment to social justice. I would like to thank David H. Anthony for his wisdom and encouragement to think even more deeply about issues than I could have conceived of without his support. I would like to thank Julie Bettie for her critical contributions to expand the scope of my study and being supportive over the years and helping to bring clarity to many issues I was faced with. Finally, I would like to thank John Brown Childs who began this journey with me, but was unable to finish, yet still provided his support over the years both intellectually and personally with mentorship that extended beyond the walls of the academy.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Background

This dissertation examines the connections between education, schooling, and knowledge construction. These areas have historically been conceived of as flowing from different historical experiences. Specifically, this dissertation is interested in tracing the history of formal and informal educational policy in the United States as part of a larger ongoing Eurocentric colonial project, which has been manifested differently over time for different groups of immigrant, enslaved and conquered groups of people who continue to suffer under an educational enterprise that has always sought to maintain their intellectual disenfranchisement. Consequently, efforts to counter this “conditional” education generally has continued to rely on the dominant culture’s methods for securing an education grounded in self-determination and liberation. The connections I sought provide the opportunity to identify and reevaluate educational institutions' origins and histories and examine the ways that colonial legacies have been able to survive over time by various adaptive strategies, intentional and unintentional, formal and informal, institutional and non-institutional.

This project specifically focuses on student achievement, teacher education programs, praxis, and educators understanding of the historic conditions that continue to influence educational policy. This in turn has allowed me to examine the subjectivities that inform educators’ decision-making process when choosing to comply or resist implementation of federal educational policy. Also, I raise the

question: how do the current formations of knowledge and its evaluation in the form of standardized tests; inform teacher decisions about what is useful knowledge for their students? The purpose of this dissertation is to then contribute to the critical interrogation of normalization of the unequal racialized internal-colonizing history of educational policy in the U.S. and the historically accepted “neutral” narrative and politics that have informed it.

Two central aspects of knowledge construction that informed this project were studies of teacher education programs and their impact on educational policy, and the current context of standardized testing as the most predominant evaluative tool for educators and students. Finally, I wanted to contribute to the field by complicating the question of what kinds of educational experiences teachers should be expected to provide and what they actually produce. This inquiry seeks to lay bare the deeply embedded ideological formations in relation to the structures of power, culture, history, and knowledge in order to make what is always not visible when exploring teacher work, more visible and traceable from its origins to its current manifestations. Ultimately, I question who it is that teaches children of historically oppressed and marginalized groups, and what exactly are they teaching them?

I was primarily concerned with sociological theories of education and knowledge that have failed miserably with specifically naming and effectively examining how the effects of race and colonization continue to shape educational policies in the current era of neo-multiculturalism. Additionally, through a historical overview of the creation and change in educational policy from its informal cultural

beginnings to its legal construction in the United States, I wanted to contribute to complicating how the construction of the “social problem” of an achievement gap by created by whites, is directly connected to their simultaneous use of methods employed to closing the achievement gap, continues to serve the process of Eurocentric domination and colonization.

An implicit argument within this dissertation is that informal knowledge does not necessarily mean unrefined or uncivil, just as formal knowledge does not necessarily mean oppressive or dominating. Since a central aim of the sociology of knowledge is to map and order the ways in which knowledge in the social world is produced, it is important to take into account the many complex and competing ideological structures and legacies such as the Freedmens Bureau, Indian Residential Schools, and segregated school conditions imposed on Asian and Latino populations and that influenced their creation as well as sustainability. It is particularly significant to question paradigmatic formulations which created the conditions which inform learning strategies and standards that are used to classify what is a useful education.

The idea of viewing teachers as agents of change isn't a new. However, it was that Giroux (1992) was able to conceptualize that teachers were in a natural position (as intellectuals and cultural workers) to take an instrumental role in participating in and facilitating the potentially transformative aspects of teacher praxis as resistance that could improve the possibilities for true democracy. Giroux and McLaren (1986) proposed redefining teacher education in radical ways that emphasized an explicit dedication to counter-hegemonic work, which he saw as a more effective method than

the seemingly randomness ascription of resistance noted by previous scholars which at best manifest and on individual levels and have yet to take collective form effectively countering the domination experienced by within the school setting and beyond. For them, this effort goes beyond just critique within and of the school system; instead, they posited that there was a need for more public attempts to remedy not just domination, which is being experienced in school, but also it was imperative to explicitly draw connections to the domination experienced in larger society (p. 234). For this reason, teacher curriculum itself must take on the form of cultural politics, and thus, conceptualize school an “embattled arena brimming with contestation, struggle and resistance.” Analyses of resistance within schools have been limited and bound to mainly academic issues, ignoring the historical origins and the creation and utilization of the school as a mechanism of control through force and coercion. Current conditions in schools require a reexamination and emptying out of the pedagogical tool box in an effort to properly identify and address the potentiality of acts of resistance that reflect a desire and quest for self-determination that occur within schools that are intentionally and specifically politically motivated, and equipped to truthfully confront the unequal conditions of education, which are rooted in the founding of American society.

Who is teaching our children, what are they being taught, and how are they going about their work? It is Giroux who contends that teacher curriculum needs to be restructured in ways that are reflective of current cultural politics, is intentionally combative and active in the struggle to redefine the terrain of pedagogy and discourse

in a manner that is explicitly related to the politics of representation. Apple and Giroux (1991) put forth the idea that teachers should be “transformative intellectuals,” and the relative autonomy that they have can and should be instrumental in explicitly politicizing [colonizing] curriculum in ways that engender a “political education.” They have been critiqued at times for not giving enough attention to the power of the bureaucratic nature of educational institutions in general and subsequently over-romanticizing the potential for teachers to be effective as transformative agents in particular. Ultimately, they unproblematically assume that teachers can and will act in a unified way in exercising their relative autonomy collectively or individually, without problematizing what form such an effort would take considering the diversity of educational institutional settings. Without systemic changes to teacher training programs to educate with intentionality, efforts to penetrate the wall of neutrality that pervades teacher education programs will continue to reproduce a mentality that is accepting of the failure of students and their communities.

It has been most useful for my project to first acknowledge that knowledge and education are inseparable in the formal context of schooling, and necessary when evaluating what kinds of social values and information are being transmitted within educational institutions. Second, the embracement or disregard[ing] of information transmitted in schools has disparate outcomes for the life chances for students of color, women, and poor whites. Third, if we are to have a truly progressive, equitable and effective educational system, we must conscientiously reconsider and reformulate

actions grounded in history yet remain pragmatically-radical in a way that promotes forward thinking about the kinds of knowledges within and outside of academia are most appropriate and effective for our current situation. First and foremost, this would encompass the acknowledgement of knowledge contributions made in the past by marginalized groups as valid and useful for all students, despite their racial, ethnic, gender and religious backgrounds in hopes for a more democratic and more importantly, a just society. Fourth, in order to disrupt and dislodge the predominance and imposition of a Euro-centered view of the world and resist continued reliance on racist, sexist, and class-based forms of knowledge constructions which are exclusionary, we must re-educate children in a way that embraces multiples lens for evaluating the legacy which created the conditions in which they now exist, and for the futures they must face and re-create in this new and diverse global context which seeks the continuance of domination framed as “neutral” education, and it’s politically and psychologically neutralizing effect. Such an education will require working diligently to remain cognizant of incorporating alternative ways of knowing and seeing the world that respects and values the perspectives of each historically oppressed group, while at the same time, honoring differences in ways that are not disparaging or disempowering. Teachers are especially critical in this endeavor because it is they who are most present and active in the lives of students from childhood to adulthood, and despite their disavowal of the impact they can ultimately have because of circumstances out of their control, are the most culpable in supporting the unequal and systemic pervasiveness of educational injustice,

unintentionally or not. Finally, knowledge, in all its various forms is indispensable for any socially justice-based-movements, activism, and attempts to truly embrace self-determination and freedom.

My research uncovered that teachers, while having good intentions, nevertheless subscribe to cultural, political, and pedagogical practices that continue to be counterproductive to a liberatory education. I contend that they don't know, have not been made aware through a proper historically-based education, or don't care about the ideological basis for their thinking and approach to education, and therefore cannot see or refuse to acknowledge their own complicity in reproducing and maintaining a status quo. Specifically, that it is they, who have been trained and tasked with the job of [overseers] of the unruly, unwanted, and disregarded masses. This is not some hyperbole to make a point. This idea has its roots in the reality of educational institutions which were utilized to train all conquered, colonized and enslaved people to become Americanized as in the case of Africans, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans. The government, while espousing equality for all still has its attendants [teachers] monitoring the progress, or lack of, its program of accommodation for students of color by any means. Ultimately teachers' reactions to educational policy reform has historically been based on racialized notions of inferiority of students of color and has played itself out in most cases through acts of compliance when teachers themselves were not being held accountable for student outcomes. Under the NCLB, the focus was on teachers' abilities to get students to pass the test. This context brought about resistance to educational reform, specifically

the “accountability” requirement in urban schools. I argue that both responses to reform, especially resistance in this case even if well-intentioned are grounded in European colonial projects where the colonizer speaks for the colonized and formerly enslaved reproducing voicelessness and undermining self-determination continuing the practice of separate and unequal educations for students of color aligned with the historical project of European colonization of the hearts and minds of its “subjects.”

Conceptual Underpinnings

One of the most highly contested and publicly debated issues of the NCLB Act is the “highly-qualified teacher” provision, which encourages states to raise teacher standards for existing and new teachers. Most of the resistance to this provision comes from the battle that teachers have fought not to be the ones solely blamed for student failure. Teachers propose without question that regardless of their schools and students’ performance, they have done all they can be expected to do with the students that they are charged with. Additionally, any insinuation that they too, like many other professionals are in need of continuing their own education has been refuted by often blaming the victims, children, as being beyond the help that they can provide, while at the same time, maintaining that they are as qualified as they need to be to deal with the rapid demographic population change of our nations students. Magee (2003) contends this goes along with the long-standing “explanation” often relied on by teachers which is that, they have no control over who

ends up in their classrooms and the social experiences or “baggage” that students show up with (p. 26). This particular phrasing of “baggage” is nothing more than code for various racial, ethnic and cultural disparagement wrapped in language derived from teacher education training within the academy. This is one of the ways in which educators for some time now have unabashedly absolved themselves of the failure of the students that they teach.

Magee (2003) establishes that research has shown that “the effect of the teacher far overshadows classroom variables, such as previous achievement level of students, class size, heterogeneity of students, and the ethnic and socioeconomic makeup of the classroom” (p. 27). And since teaching is considered such an important job in our society, no one wants to “teacher bash,” but a closer look at the facts, beyond just the popular or public discourse reveal that there are severe deficiencies in the teacher resource pool that need to be examined as well as the research which supports such an exploration (Raths and McAninch p. 65). Due to the historical lack of access to education, intentional exclusion from the teaching profession, and unintentional job displacement of teachers of color after desegregation, educators of color remain underrepresented in a system of educational apartheid which continues to support a teacher population that has remained historically white, and currently predominately female. There has been relatively little research done on the influences of pedagogical training for teachers and its impact on the success of students. However, Porter and Magee (2003) conclude that the shift of focus concentrating more on content knowledge is grounded on research that suggest

a stronger connection of more qualified teachers produce a greater impact on student achievement, specifically in “math and science”, which are both important in an information driven society and economy (p. 27). Such decisions, while couched in language that implies the notion of neutrality at its core and is economically-driven, is nevertheless completely negligent of the social and historical impact of what critical scholars have called “transracial” teachers. Simply stated, a population of white teachers who teach children of color that come from historically oppressed and marginalized groups. What information is being transmitted in schools is extremely important, however, who is teaching that material is of utmost importance when attempting to examine the unbroken-history of group failure in American educational institutions by people of color.

The most significant predictor of whether or not a student does well in math and reading on standardized test is the proportion of well-qualified teachers in a state who are fully certified and have a major in the field they teach (Hannshek and Raymond 317; Smith and Desmond 226). This is, once again controversial because, it forces us all to think about what it means to be qualified to teach, and more importantly, who is the dominant population composed of those who are qualified to teach. Although the requirements for being highly-qualified are now mandatory for anyone going into the teaching profession, many existing teachers, who also have to “prove” that they are highly-qualified, resisted publicly and legally to having to participate in any sort of re-qualification requirements. Many teachers feel that since they have been teaching for years, they should not have to do so. In addition, the

names of teachers will be publicized because of their failing students and schools, and also for their successes as the law requires. While it is well known which schools have been failing in communities of colors for decades, teachers were extremely resistant to this provision in the law and hyper-vocal about the stigma that they would face. Conversely, students have had to manage not only the stigma associated with failing schools, they also endured the decimation of any hopes of attaining a useful education and chances for social mobility and opportunities for attending quality institutes of higher learning. Unfortunately, this connection was not made by educators, resulting in a missed opportunity for properly situated justice-based-empathy to be undervalued and overlooked. But what about the students and what they deserve? Do they deserve teachers that have the best education possible, therefore offering the students the quality of teacher that every student should have access to?

Therefore, it is impossible to identify and employ any significant efforts to combat the necessary solutions for the complexities for the current modern “educational disenfranchisement” of students of color children without beginning with those who have constructed and overseen their past education, and remain currently in charge of implementing the “solutions.” Ronald Edmonds (1979) has poignantly iterated the complicity of teachers and schools in under-educating students of color and states,

Schools teach those they think they must and when they think they needn't they don't. That fact has nothing to do with social science. There has never been a time in the life of the American public school when we have not known all we needed to know in order

to teach all those whom we choose to teach. The discussion of research literature may illuminate that fact, but it cannot change it (p. 15, 16).

Teachers who teach in marginalized schools are white and recruited disproportionately from college students who enter education programs who tested low test on such tests as the SAT and the ACT. Ferguson's and Ladd (1996) report that teachers ACT scores accounted for prediction of student achievement gains. Also, teachers who were educated at selective colleges that had higher standards for entrance and graduation had a "positive effect on student learning that exceeded class size reduction or general pupil expenditure". One of the more surprising statistics is that charter schools and Teach for America consistently get applicants with both grades and test scores that are well above the average of teachers who end up teaching in the public school system.

Why is any of this important? Through the many complex "explanations" that are given for why it is so difficult for teachers to raise test scores and overall achievement rates of their students and schools seem to be overcome when teachers have degrees and certification in their subject and are put through more rigorous pedagogical training. The current system of teacher certification contributes to adverse selection and placement of teachers. With the implementation of the NCLB, teachers now have the opportunity to do more to help close the educational divide by becoming more certified to do their job. However, the resistance is embedded in the historical fight that teacher unions have been waging for quite some time against the

possibility of differential pay scales. Where the NCLB rewards schools and teachers for their achievements and penalizes them for their failures, many see this road as problematic especially when federal funding is attached.

Goertz and Duffy (2003) state that while assessment has always been a part of the educational system, the focus on specific standards and who is to be held accountable when standards and the goals are not met, has changed the importance and impact of tests in the lives of students, teachers and schools. The importance of test results to policy makers comes from the focus on data from large-scale statewide assessments to make certification decisions about students and to hold schools and school districts accountable for the performance of and progress of their students (p. 4). Many can argue about the flaws in the design of accountability systems, but high-stakes testing has now become a very critical aspect of U.S. education and will serve all students, teachers and schools better if efforts were to make this current system better as it remains the most widely used method for filtering who goes to college and the increasing chances for social mobility.

The accepted historical narrative of educational policy reform in the United States evolved through a series of legislative actions that grew out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was put into place by the federal government in order to close the educational gap between children from rich families and poor ones. According to its mission

statement, the original purpose of the act was: “To ensure equal educational opportunity for all children regardless of socioeconomic background and to close the achievement gap between poor and affluent children by providing additional resources for schools serving disadvantaged students” (Wenning, Herdman and Smith, 2002: 3).

The needs for standards-based-education according to the Department of Education, “come from the needs of citizens change – through shifts in the economy, technology or society at large – so do the demands on education.” Until the early 1990’s, there was not any clear standards for what students should be learning. Moreover, the goals for particular levels of education varied from state to state, school to school and teacher to teacher (Education Commission of the States, 2002). States may decide on what methods of measurement they will use in the assessment process and content standards. In order to continue receiving Title 1 funding, individual states must participate in a national assessment of their accountability systems and how they define Adequate Yearly Progress, to see how states compare to each other. This national assessment will be treated as a “national report card.”

Although the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is nearly 40 years old, the changes that it has gone through definitely reflect more recent concerns, attitudes and approaches to dealing with the vast difference in educational achievement in the United States. [Through more data based assessment, state and local authority as well

as flexibility when isolated,] efforts to close the educational gap between children from rich families and poor ones all present the advantageous and ambitious picture of a move toward dealing with one of the country's most critical and persistent problems. However, there are a few concerns that immediately emerge from the most recent and comprehensive effort, the NCLB Act of 2001 which continue to ignore the immoral support for slavery, colonization and oppression and the lasting impact on our entire history. Avery Gordon and Michael Taussig capture the role of institutional legacies and their impact on oppressed or marginalized groups and identity.

In *Ghostly Matters*, Gordon (1997) sought to extend the “sociological imagination” by excavating what she calls the “haunting” of society and individuals, which take place outside of the categorizable, knowable, and recognizable structures of society that produce the “cold knowledge” that has been characteristic of traditional social science. Similar to Taussig's (1987) idea of “implicit social knowledge,” Gordon's concern is the ‘affective experience’ of haunting and the connection to the state.

In haunting, organized forces and systemic structures that appear removed from us make their impact felt in everyday life in a way that confounds our analytic separations and confounds the social separations themselves (19).

Gordon expands the sociological imagination by exploring the space in-between individuals and social structures. This space, Gordon states, is where “haunting” which has real material effects, occurs and reveals as well as hides the impact of organized social structures. Haunting is a symptom of socialization which points to

the contradictions between what we feel and what we remember, attempting to reconcile the present and the past which are inconsistently matched. This particular location therefore is about a necessary vulnerability that resists the politics of closure. Stuart Hall (1996) contends that identities within this context are constantly being undone and remade in ways that make it difficult to try to theorize about new ways of thinking about them, without at some point invoking the old ways of thinking about them. Speaking directly to Gordon's conception of ghosts and hauntings, and their structural manifestations in societal institutions, Smith (1999) states,

Few want to trace our current education problems to the past. Yet, the past holds us in its grips. Much of today can and should be explained with a clear view of the past in mind. Only by understanding and identifying these links with the past can we begin to understand that constitutionally supported slavery bred intractable racism, which bred de jure and de facto educational disenfranchisement of a people, which bred the modern subeducation of black children, and which has bred race/gender educational pedism (p. 2).

For Gordon (1997), ghosts are real, and in this instance I agree with Smith that one of the ghost is the constitution along with the legacy of educational institutions colonizing beginnings, which still informs the idea of separate educations for non-whites.

The ghost is not simply a dead or missing person, but a social figure, and investigating it can lead to that dense site where history and subjectivity make social life. The ghost or apparition is one form by which something lost, or barely visible, or seemingly not there to our supposedly well-trained eyes, makes itself known or apparent to us, in its own way, of course. The way of the ghost is haunting, and haunting is a very particular way of knowing what has happened or is happening. Being haunted draws us affectively, sometimes against our will and always a bit magically, into the structure of feeling of a reality we come to experience, not as cold knowledge, but as a transformative, recognition (p. 8).

The “hauntings” of educational policies for non-whites continue to be experienced as reality, just as much, if not more than any other so-called “factually-based” based historical/material forces that would be used to explain how people feel and see themselves as part the valued population of many social institutions, especially education. In the lived convolutedness of space and time created by both “hauntings” and the ghosts that invoke them. Gordon finds a rich source for the possibility for social inquiry and change fostered by the “affective experience.” But this change, according to Gordon, will require new vocabularies, resources and interdisciplinarity, not simply in the sense of crossing disciplines, but interdisciplinarity which also creates new objects of study. Gordon’s *Ghostly Matters*, forces all to rethink of the ways in which “real” and “imagined” knowledge constructions work together in a complex manner to influence student and teacher perceptions, and how social scientists deem what is worthy of study.

Statement of the Problem

African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans continue to test well below the national averages on standardized test. Schools that have high populations of African-American and Hispanic-Americans students are now, whether intentional or not, obvious targets of the stringent rules enacted by the NCLB Act of 2001. The NCLB Act mandates that schools and teachers specifically be held accountable for student’s academic progress. If the standards are not met by the appointed time, administrators, teachers and students face the possibility of school closure or take over by the state

and labeled as one of the nations “poorly performing” schools. The loss of jobs, federal funding and opportunities for students have put all on alert to the difficult times that presumably and some say inevitably lay ahead. Teachers who work in these schools understand that their students and schools overall have historically and continue to struggle meeting the national standards by the specified deadlines. All schools were given 12 years, from 2001 to 2013 to raise the standards and scores of their students nationwide or to come under harsh penalties such as layoffs, school restructuring and takeover by the state. As a result, I am interested in and will explore how educational policy and specifically the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 as a technology of social control, is resisted or complied with by teachers that work in urban schools. I am also interested in how teachers as potential agents of social change, understand, and resist or comply with the requirements of the NCLB legislation and the future implications for themselves, the students they teach, the urban schools they teach in and the communities they are purport to serve. I will explore if teachers have re-constructed educational strategies and goals, and their ideological roots, that are separate from or in compliance those of the NCLB Act and the resulting intentional or unintentional consequences for students in urban schools. Specifically, I am interested if there is collective decision making amongst teachers that serves as the basis for how they consider and utilize alternative teaching strategies to reach the alternative goals they have established for their students and schools separate from the NCLB requirements. Additionally, what are the manifest or latent cultural and theoretical logics and ideologies that teachers subscribe to in order

to recognize and identify what the “problem” is for their students and the connections with historical narratives that sought to deal with marginalized and oppressed groups, and how these logics and ideologies are used to create and justify solutions or alternatives that are most “appropriate” for their students.

Most of the research on the connections between better qualified teachers and student performance on standardized tests, as defined in the NCLB Act, indicates, that above all other socioeconomic factors that children bring to schools with them, and have been attributed to them not performing well on tests, highly-trained teachers outweigh these social factors and ultimately produce students who test better overall (Hannshek and Raymond, p. 317). My dissertation project is a combination of an historical overview of the change in educational policy over time and how policy decisions and implementations have often been a reflection of the way in which the educational gap between whites and nonwhites in the United States has been constructed as a “social problem” is explicitly linked the countries founding racialized programs for Americanization. This is an important aspect of my project because it helps situate current analyses and proposed solutions to the educational gap (crisis) as well as the reasons that some educators are resisting this new method (more emphasis on standardized testing) as proposed in the NCLB. Also, my research tries to find out why so many educators in under-performing schools are against “teaching to the test,” and also, how they understand and talk about what this means. Additionally, I am interested in finding out how do teachers desire to be evaluated since there is a push against having teacher's effectiveness evaluated on how their

students perform on standardized test in addition to other methods.

It is on this point that several assumptions become the guidelines for my thinking through this part of my project. The implication is that teachers do have an influence on the institutional culture and its stated objectives. This can be seen in the ways in which teachers comply or resist to educational policy reforms such as the NCLB for instance. Willmott (2001), notes as an example, that the negotiating skills that teachers wield concerning themselves and their jobs are not something that can be linked directly to the social relations of production, but instead, in the Foucauldian sense, are products of the educational system itself, therefore showing the relative autonomy of the educational institutions. Government agencies are not able to monitor with such intense scrutiny the daily happenings of educational institutions. Although the NCLB is a federally mandated program, its' institutionalization and maintenance depends upon teachers, who can change and modify it according to their own “sensibilities” when they deem it appropriate.

However, these reforms which for the most part are seen as restrictive by forcing teachers to comply with federal guidelines, have also positioned teachers to make more explicitly intentional and personal/political decisions when “resisting” the policy reform. An example of such teacher autonomy and agency would be that in past instances of where educational policy reform has mandated that teachers follow particular standard or implement specific pedagogical practices, teachers had simply been able to ignore them, and continue to teach as they saw fit for their students. This of course was actualized mostly on regional, local and communal levels. Ultimately, I

examined the use of alternative teaching strategies, (outside of the NCLB mandates) utilized by teachers and as told by students, as well as the “informal” goals that they set for students in urban schools, and how these “informal” goals exhibit the potential for reproducing the status quo or instigating desired social change. Finally, following Bourdieu (1979) and some of his conceptions presented in *Distinctions*, my research seeks to expose the lingering cultural artifacts influencing teachers’ pedagogical choices in urban schools that reinforce or subvert dominant ideology and work to sustain or dismantle class differences and/or unequal social relations in larger society? What are some of the potential dangers and “unintended” consequences when teachers who work in urban schools engage with a specific discourse of “resistance” that may be more appropriate for schools that are not in danger of failing. Therefore, I also wish to examine the shared features of teacher “resistance” in urban schools. In other words, how is the utilization of a context specific discourse of “resistance” grounded in history, linked to properties of the urban school setting? What are the connections between the “informal” and localized forms of resistance of teachers in urban schools and the more “formal” and nationalized or publicized forms of resistance to the overall legislation? How do teachers negotiate, if at all, between these two forms of resistance?

A Note on Methods

The United States has been moving in the direction of standardized and systematic data-driven outcomes more rapidly than ever after the publishing of the publishing of the Coleman (1966) report which implied a need for a more systematic

(concrete) way of evaluating children's educational achievement. My project, explored how scoring well on standardized tests could be conceptualized as a form of social mobility in the current context under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, instead of its commonly understood culturally biased contribution to reproducing social inequalities which exist in larger society. Thinking about standardized testing and its connection to teacher quality, which above any other socioeconomic factor contributes to better testing scores and grades for students, has assisted in guiding this study and methodological considerations. If teachers are against "teaching to the test", then what do they believe that students in poor-performing schools should be learning? This greatly problematizes debates and studies as to whether teaching students to test better is equitable. Therefore, I was interested in how teachers and their notions about what it means to be highly-qualified at poor-performing schools understand and talk about their impact on better test scores and decide what is educational strategies are most appropriate and advantageous for their students. Also, how do they understand and talk about the connection of standardized testing to their overall job performance and evaluation.

The support for or disregarding of, particular kinds of information transmitted in schools have disparate outcomes for the life chances of students of color, women, and poor whites. If we are to have a truly progressive, equitable and effective educational system, we must seriously reconsider and reformulate in a forward thinking manner as to what knowledges are most appropriate for our current situation. Teachers are especially critical in this endeavor because it is they who can have a

greatest direct impact pedagogically on the students they teach. Finally, knowledge, in all its various forms is indispensable for any socially justice based movements, activism, and attempts to truly embrace self-determination and freedom.

Proposed Research Methods:

In this study I utilized quantitative and qualitative research methods. I interviewed one teacher and seven students from Los Angeles School District schools with varying predominate student racial populations. My unit of analysis was four high schools and each school was chosen with purposeful sampling in mind.

Study Sites

There are several rationalizations for choosing each specific school. First, I chose schools that were urban and composed of specific majority minority racial groups and one mixed-minority school. Each school served populations that have experienced adverse and unequal historical treatment and domination in Euro-centered educational institutions. Second, each group, while experiencing these similar historical legacies, have nonetheless experienced them differently and with different modes of incorporation into society and into educational institutions, and some with the additional burden of language differences. Thirdly, teacher quality, training and readiness for these populations has consistently been below other schools and has not kept up with the rapidly changing minority populations for which the serve. Finally, the guidelines under the NCLB required more scrutiny on teacher

performance, I was interested in how teachers and the institutions themselves have responded due to the fact that school information is has been published yearly for the time period examined. In all school cases, there is one exception from to the history of school failure and underperformance which is the Whitney H.S. This Los Angeles area high school is unique because it is one of only several recently majority populated Asian schools within the last 20 years in the district and greater Los Angeles area. The students also perform well above the other schools examined in this study. The rationale is that while the Asian population the US has historically performed above other minority groups, it is equally important to understand the quality of the teachers who work in such a unique setting understand and describe the history, success, and mobility of a student population who also has faced racism, discrimination, and language differences.

Additionally, each one of the aforementioned schools continue to reflect the need in urban schools which support the historically economically challenged, and are Title I schools, which qualify for free and subsidized lunch programs. Also, each school has had a history of poor performance on standardized tests, a difficult history of recruiting and retaining highly-qualified teachers, a significant number of English language learners, and serve a predominately minority population.

1. A majority African-American population 69 % (Crenshaw Senior High School)

2. A majority Hispanic-American population 75 % (Los Angeles Senior High School)
3. A mixed population of African-Americans 55.4 % and Hispanic-Americans 43.7 % (Susan Miller Dorsey High School)
4. A majority Asian-American population 82.1 % (Gretchen A. Whitney High School)

Analytic Instruments

(A) California Department of Education, Los Angeles District School Data, and Ed-Data

Variables I examined were from data sets comprised by the California Department of Education, The Los Angeles Times Public Reporting of School Data, and from data collected and reported by the individual schools themselves. The variables chosen were teacher credentialing, teacher racial composition, teacher experience, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), SAT scores, student graduation and college ready rates, for each school between the years of 2001 and the enactment of the NCLB, to 2013 when the mandated expected improvements were to be attained.

(B) Personalized Interviews

I interviewed one teacher and 7 students who attended each of the schools studied except for Whitney. While research activities were guided by questions

developed from concerns about teacher quality and their impact on student performance, I also wanted to be open to be able to understand from a student's perspective, the experience of being in school during the enactment of the NCLB. Therefore, in interviews with students I explored the differences and similarities of perception that they had about the education they received, and the teachers who taught them during their high school years. I also was interested overall shared features linked to properties of all the school settings combined.

The method of data collection I found most appropriate for this aspect of my study and research questions were structured interviews. The philosophy and procedures presented by James Spradley in his work *Ethnographic Interviews* were used as a guide in designing this research. Spradley distinguished ethnographic qualitative research from quantitative approaches, noting that interviews are designed to discover and describe the "meaning" that actors give to their social activities and encounters. This meaning search necessarily involves an analysis of language used in everyday interactions, as a shared symbolic universe is created and known through language. Understanding a shared social world comes from identifying and decoding the meaning of "encoded" keywords or phrases, what Spradley calls "cover terms."

In this study, conducting interviews uncovered everyday words and phrases which were useful in generating themes that represent the informant's perspective. The informants brought me into their shared symbolic reality by explaining their experiences; I developed concepts utilizing their terminology. Conversely, informants

provide insight about the setting being investigated. According to Webster's New Collegiate dictionary, an informant is "a native speaker engaged to repeat words, phrases and sentences in his own language or dialect as a model for imitation and a source of information." Conducting interviews introduced words, phrases and themes that became the tools for understanding the universe from the informant's perspective. The informants brought me into their shared symbolic reality by explaining their experience in their own concepts and jargon or terminology. Informants are defined as "a native speaker engaged to repeat words, phrases and sentences in his own language or dialect as a model for imitation and a source of information" (Spradley, 1980).

The task of identifying willing informants who attended all of the high schools I was interested in occupied my initial concerns. The selection of informants developed from analytical concerns. I wanted to interview students who had attended each of the high schools between the time periods of 2003-2013 and were knowledgeable about the schools and could elaborate on their experience of attending and eventually graduating from schools which have historically had abysmal graduation and college ready rates. In a sense, students that had "made it" through during a time of intense testing and school scrutiny managing still to be socially mobile and get into college.

I decided to request the assistance of the Admissions office at University of California Santa Cruz, with the approval of the Deans office. The admissions office was able to send out a request on my behalf requesting students to participate in

interviews for my dissertation research. The admissions office only sent out the letters of request to student who had attended each of the schools in the study. In all, I had 8 responses that generated 7 interviews. A student from every school was interviewed except Whitney.

The interview schedule I constructed for students had twenty-three questions and was modified accordingly for each particular school that I was interested in. The interview schedule for the one teacher I was composed of sixteen questions. I decided to limit the length of the interviews to no longer than an hour because I didn't want to interfere with schoolwork of the students and in the work schedule of the teacher. Each perspective interviewee was given a consent form that was approved by the IRB process to protect the "rights of research subjects." All of the student interviews were conducted in my office on campus. The one teacher interview took place in his home. Since all the interviews were being audio-recorded, it was imperative to find a place with minimal background noise. I transcribed my tapes and kept a journal on the broad concepts and ideas that surfaced during the interview that served as a guide while listening to my tapes. During my transcription process, I attempted to abide with Spradley's verbatim principle of recording the exact information given by the informant. Themes are best presented using the informant's native language and experiences, however, due to the lack of interviews I also had to rely on previous qualitative studies which examined teacher reactions and responses to the NCLB. The units of analysis in this instance were words and phrases used to characterize teachers' resistance. The method of data collection most appropriate for exploring this topic is

content analysis. This method allowed me to study written recorded human communication in the form of educational research and gave me the opportunity to further explore and extend ideas and concepts extracted from my own interviews. This would aid in discovering how ideas about racial attitudes and responses to educational policy are expressed and by whom. The strength of using discourse analysis is that I will be able to study the process of how teachers' responses to NCLB evolved or remained the same over a period of time or in a particular context, specifically urban schools that serve students of color. It also has the advantage of being an unobtrusive measure, which seldom has any effect on the subject being studied. The research I studied was conducted for reasons unaligned with my own concerns and therefore is one of the weakness of this particular method.

Hypothesis

My research project uncovered that teachers, while having good intentions, nevertheless subscribe to cultural, political, and pedagogical practices which are counterproductive to a liberatory education. I believe that they are not aware of the ideological basis for their thinking and approach to education and therefore cannot see their own complicity in reproducing and maintaining the status quo. Ultimately, I contend that their justification for resisting policy reform under the NCLB is connected to continuing the practice of separate and unequal educations for students in urban schools, which is rooted in the historical legacy of colonization, conquered, and post-enslavement educational approaches and practices.

This was an important aspect of my project because it helped to situate current analyses and proposed solutions to the educational gap as well as the reasons that some educators are resisting this new method (more emphasis on standardized testing) as proposed in the NCLB. Also, I'm wanted to find out why so many educators in under-performing schools are against "teaching to the test," and also, how do they understand and talk about what this means. Additionally, how do teachers desire to be evaluated since there is a push against having teacher's effectiveness evaluated on how their students perform on standardized test in addition to other methods?

The chapters that follow are structured as follows. In chapter 2, I examine theories of the sociology of knowledge and examine the ideological basis and justification of for the use of dominant knowledge constructions as a form of domination, control, and cultural identity destruction. Chapter 3 explores theories on the sociology of education and efforts to find agency within educational institutions. Chapter 4 is a brief genealogy of the history of educational experiences by people of color in North America. Chapter 5 critically examines teacher education programs and their efforts to adjust a rapidly changing student population that is becoming more diverse as the teacher population remains predominately white and female. Chapter 6 provides an analysis of data on four urban high schools located in Los Angeles with predominantly minority populations and their performance from 2003-2013 under the NCLB. Chapter 7 is an analysis of teacher and student interviews and

relevant data on what it was like to teach and learn under the NCLB. Finally, Chapter 8 is a summary of findings and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

Knowledge in Service of Identity Destruction and Reconstruction as an Institutional Practice

Within field of the sociology of knowledge, knowledge construction and its uses must be a central part of theories and studies that seek to examine and make substantive change in the ways in which formal institutionalized knowledge in schools has been used to continually deny the validity and humanity of the many diverse peoples and their ways of knowing and living in the world. Many of the paradigmatic frames in which knowledge construction have been analyzed are inherently disparate in their power structurings and renderings and rely heavily on the remnants of colonialism, racism, and sexism as the base for their conceptual frameworks, inevitably limiting the possibilities for liberation-based knowledge and education, which informs critical analyses which seek move beyond hegemonic forces of the past which continue to operate in more subtle and complex ways and maintain the status quo of domination and exploitation on a wider scale.

The central theme of this chapter is to address the following three critical questions (1) knowledge construction and the history of education beyond westernized notions for non-European groups in the united states, and committed to decimation of

individual and community survival, and self-determination; (2) the necessity of new ways to train and select teachers for an ever growing and diverse population that is based in social dynamics 3) once acknowledgment, acceptance, and incorporation of the many diverse forms of historical group knowledge and experience that can serve as a encompassing foundation for any enduring vision for a democratic society for previously colonized, enslaved, and conquered group.

Many sociological theories about education make claims about knowledge but yet do not theorize how the effects of race or colonization in relation to political progress are advanced within and outside of formal institutions, specifically those influencing teacher identity and how they understand their role and impact on the lives of students they teach who come from historically oppressed groups. In an effort to complicate what is made visible within the field, but also that which is rendered invisible, I argue for the interrogation of the dominating Eurocentric approach to teacher education and other limited paradigms to highlight the way in which the project of imperialism and domination is excluded or is determined to be neutral in the work of theorizations and ideologies about schooling in an effort to remain objective. It is important to take into account the many complex and competing ideological structures and legacies that influenced the creation of schools as well as their sustainability. It is particularly significant to question paradigms or formulations that classify the global world, i.e. first-world, third-world; core, semi-periphery, periphery; developed, developing, underdeveloped, because of their direct influence on knowledge

formations, i.e. area studies, and international politics and policies, i.e. legal constructions.

Many of the problems that are now explored in the education have had a long history of exploration but under different social contexts. In the US, the socio-historical climate created by the immigration and domination of Europeans in North America created unique contemporary problems that still remain prominent created in US society, and are rooted in a history of exclusion that precedes the founding of America.

It is especially imperative when living in a diverse society, or a society on the verge of becoming diverse, to critically examine the context in which certain knowledges operate and confront other contradictory forms of knowledge with the change in the racial, cultural and social demographics. Conversely, the competition of knowledges inevitably creates conditions which cultivate fear of the new and encourages the dominant culture through force or coercion, to decide to weed out what is deemed irrelevant. This decision however results in refining and reifying ways of knowing and seeing the world that are familiar, so that what has been perceived as most useful ways of knowing, end up purporting to be the real intended meanings of the newly stated knowledges or actions that are struggling for existence in society. This most often is facilitated through efforts forged with the media as well as academia and solidified through legislative measures. A grounded and rigorous study of historical construction knowledge is most useful and necessary today because of its ability to clarify the much contested and murky waters of the many knowledge-claims made regarding social issues we face and their connection with the past. At the least, it

provides a way to clarify the rules of what we are talking about when we make such claims, especially when invoking rules of knowing that are based in experience. Uniformly accepted ideas must be critically and vigorously interrogated with specific intention of connecting them to the historical conditions in which they evolved and how they have evolved, and continue to be utilized by the dominant culture.

The sociology of knowledge has been concerned primarily with the origin of ideas and their usage, not necessarily their validity. Therefore, the conflictual nature of many ideas competing for validity was intriguing, in that they were divergent and produced conceptions of the same world from different perspectives producing different meanings and representations. In this way, the inquiry into where particular ideas originated was of no relevance to the validity of the idea itself; therefore, the idea must be explored within the context in which it was created in order to examine its relevance and validity. The sociology of knowledge has been essentially an interpretive endeavor and not necessarily an inquiry into the nature of being or existence. The task of the sociology of knowledge then has been to examine and explore closing the gap between man's thoughts and actual living, as well as understanding the conditions which brought about the development of particular formations of cultural phenomena such as educational institutions. Therefore, when examining the ubiquitous impact of slavery on education Pamela J. Smith (1999) surmises that,

The immoral support for slavery has affected our entire history. These moral compromises continue to haunt the nations conscious and actions...No area of human endeavor was left untouched: all were brought to the fore to justify and protect this nations foundational slavery tainted religion, science, sociology, biology, culture, history, literature, education, and many other aspects of human existence at that time and thereafter were employed to justify and ensure the inferior status of a people (p.7).

Society has been expected to rely on [men] of “knowledge” to utilize their skills to organize their work in society. According to Scheler (1980), the ways in which knowledge is organized is closely entwined to the quality of the knowledge that develops within that context as a result. Many critics of the sociology of knowledge point out that despite the convergence of many forms of knowledge that emerge within a societal context, only a few arise that are sustained and end up “representing” the whole lot of truths available. Proponents of functionalism have deemed such homogeneity as necessary for order and standards of normality have proposed this filtering of “appropriate” truths; otherwise, the belief is that society would fail to communicate on common [Euro-centered] ground.

In every era, claims to knowledge, discoveries, and truths have often been over-exaggerated. It is only in hindsight that such claims actually are made. During times of crisis, there tends to be a reinterpretation of the turbulence, which led to historical change. Smith most accurately makes a point that the freeing of African slaves and gains of the civil rights movement were compromises made between whites at the expense of Blacks dispensable rights,

As with the moral compromises in the Constitution, at the heart of the long-term liberty interests and civil rights of the enslaved, the newly freed enslaved, and the modern Black lies a condition. Blacks can only be free and equal if their rights are not bargained away. In essence, freedom, liberty and civil rights for Black people depends on whether they are cache for compromises and disputes between whites or whenever whites can obtain a benefit from the sacrifices of Blacks (Smith, p. 13).

Conversely, times of stability tend to focus only on the details of the history and fail to properly frame the context in which it developed. Both methods tend to obscure the varying truths of an era, which is why it is important to have as many voices possible represented. According to Scheler and Weber, ideas come into existence under particular guiding values and involve a definite way of understanding the world that rely on subjectivity for their emergence. At the same time, these ideas are dependent on the use of a sense of cultural “objectivity” for their longevity and maturation, such as teaching and education as a path to Americanization as a “normal” good. Ultimately, the sociology of knowledge has been concerned with ideas that are contextual and are aligned with the realities in which they occur.

According to Gunter Remmling (1973), there have been two predominant approaches to the sociology of knowledge. The diffuse, which treats the field broadly and attempts to relate the mental sphere with social realm and attempts to make connections with the sub-fields within the discipline, involves the inclusion of empirical research. The next is the focused approach, which treats the field more specifically, and emphasizes its origin, present state, and development. As a result, it also makes part of its work to reveal the social forces that created the context for examining the construction of the framework of knowledge and schooling.

Mannheim (1924), points to the notions that, what men do and don't do, then, should be the proper way to evaluate any theory, no matter its origins. Mannheim expanded the concept of ideology to include the thinking processes of all social actors and this was important to his development of a general concept of ideology. He states,

“Every group is seen as rising out of its life conditions.” This allowed for Mannheim to explore behavior more in depth from a social-psychological method without foregoing some of the larger political and economic societal problems. George L. Jackson (1990) encapsulates the hypocrisy of white involvement in creating the current conditions of Blacks which at the same time they despise,

When the white self-congratulatory racist complain that the Blacks are uncouth, unlettered; that our areas are run-down, not maintained; that we dress with loud tastelessness, he forgets that he governs. He forgets that he built the schools are inadequate, that he has abused his responsibility to use taxes paid by Blacks to improve their living conditions, that he manufactured the loud pants and pointed shoes that destroy and deform feet. If we are not enough like him to suit his tastes, it is because he has planned it that way. We were never intended to be part of his world. The only way the exploiter can maintain his position is to create differences and maintain deformities (p. 183-84).

Durkheim always stressed that personality is constituted in society, and hence, the importance of his reoccurring theme of solidarity. Along with this, his notion of anomie was the result of a pluralistic society, suggesting that the fragmentation of personality and a changing society are intimately interrelated. His critique of the deeply disturbing and depersonalizing effect of living in a mass society, and the anomic consequences, was the impetus for him to strive to find a stable and “authentic” social existence. For Durkheim then, one of the most important functions or purposes of knowledge was intercommunication amongst groups. In order for man to sustain and maintain his relations with others in a society, they must take on, and in some instances, conform to the collective ideas developed by the society in which he lives. The ways in which knowledges are organized is related to the quality of the knowledge that develops within that context as a result. Smith (1999) therefore states,

In this same vein, we cannot forget that it is the school system that fails to educate. It is, therefore, time to blame those who are trained to educate, but fail. It is time to blame those who primarily control the day-to-day educational lives of Black children. At a minimum, we must shift the burden of education from Black children to the teachers (p. 34).

Therefore, when ideas come into existence, they do so under particular guiding values which themselves are not pure and in this case were enforced by the dominant majority of whites and characterized by a definite way of understanding the world which relied on their own subjectivity cloaked in scientific objectivity. It is Scheler (1980) who points out that at different historical moments, and in the context of varying cultural systems, different "real factors" do tend to predominate. He states, "[Th]ese real factors open and close, in determinate ways and determinate order, so that different aspects are grasped at particular points in time, and in particular cultural systems." It is these particular moments that require examination in form of ideological, structural, and legal adjustments which continued the unequal ways that people of color were permitted from educational opportunities.

Knowledge and Ideology

The term ideology had traditionally been reserved for practices that directly and effectively work toward a particular group's legitimacy and power, which veiled the group's strategies for willing themselves into desired positions. The use of any ideology by an individual, group, community, or society, only matters, and is effective, if it communicates meaningful ideas and messages to those who utilize them. In this way,

despite the freedom attained after the Civil War was undermined as Smith (1999) explains the unique and subtle transference of “responsibility and ownership” which continued to characterize the unequal relationship between blacks and the country at large,

Blacks in the mind of the nation were still slaves: non-persons to be treated with great disrespect, little recognitions, and great criminality. Only the master changed, becoming less individualized to being nationalized, that is whites as a group became the new enslaver under white supremacy. The emancipation of the slave is submitted to only in so far as chattel slavery in the old form could not be kept up. But although the freedman is no longer considered the property of the individual master, he is considered the slave of society (p. 11).

Doyle (1996) states that historically, ideology was understood as “an enlightened secular standard of what knowledge should be, objective and not subjective, rational and not doctrinaire, and marked by equanimity not fanaticism. For this reason, ideology has often applied to impassioned and doctrinaire group practices which were fueled by interest and ambition (fundamentalist faiths, racist creeds), but also anything that was indicative of ethnocentrism or separatism” (p. 28). However, they can also be utilized in seemingly innocuous ways that hide their true intentions.

When ideologies are put to use, they generally claim a special or superior place and function, when contrasted with other ideas and practices, such as teachers/educators uncritically questioning their Eurocentric training, yet claiming to know what is best for the growing diverse population of students, and the best way to teach them. This has been accomplished disavowing any ideological influence, and instead, they emphatically propose that the ideas which form are the basis for the

political positions they take both rational and universal principles, therefore masking their true ideological position. E. Doyle McCarthy (1996) states,

Karl Mannheim and Paul Ricourer most recently has insisted, “the history of the idea of ideology has never entirely lost its original political imprint, its denunciatory intention to undermine and unmask a political opponent....ideology is always a polemical term used about the other and calls into question the validity of an opponent’s thought (1986, p. 160–1).

Ricourer (1986) further states, “Ideology is a notion that cannot be used without circumspection” (p. 40), and that it is imperative in any analysis to examine how power and truth are linked, needs to begin by a survey of discourse, and discursive practices that move beyond simply institutions and ideologies. Instead, he suggests that we examine “archives and sites, new kinds of labor and public rituals where the genealogy of historical forms—moral technologies and regimes of rationality come into being” (p. 41). Smith (1999) most succinctly captures the ways in which the continued separate and unequal education has promoted the unrealistic and unattainable equity and states,

The current miseducation of Black children cannot be properly understood unless one realizes that the past educational disenfranchisement continued unabated from slavery, through segregation, through desegregation and through all other attempts to equalize the education of Black children with that of white children. Indeed, we cannot properly discuss the myth of separate but equal education without realizing that educational equality was and is a myth (p. 13).

When examining the concept of ideology, it was the theorist Louis Althusser (1971), who has had the most significant and lasting impact by putting forth his

construct and analysis of the “ideological state apparatus.” He explained that an ideology exists in a material sense as an “apparatus,” and Doyle McCarthy (1996) elaborates as an “assemblage of institutional forms and practices that reproduce the conditions and relations of the industrial capitalist order: its schools, households, trade unions, communications media, its sports and leisure, its courts, its political parties, its universities, and so forth” (p. 41). Therefore, the “life” of an ideology is found in the ways that they are organized and practiced, and how the interactions between the two play out. He went on to specify that at the core of the existing social order, was how “dominant” ideologies were inextricably linked to the state and economy. Foremost of his concerns were how the state and state sanctioned institutions assisted in reproducing the forms of capitalist relations, which he posited led to exploitation and ultimately functioned to maintain the status quo. However, Althusser unquestionably missed a crucial element in his analysis of ideological state apparatuses, and that is that while they were utilized as facilitators and co-producers of dominant ideologies, they were most effective in furthering a Euro-centered colonial project. This was accomplished, according to Althusser, by all members of society believing in some ideology to some extent, and in contradistinction to Marx, even those that benefited from these particular social arrangements. Althusser (1971) pointed out that most ideologies are linguistically structured in ways that present them as based in some form of reciprocity, pointing to what Doyle McCarthy (1996) summarizes as,

[H]ow social divisions are institutionalized in such pivotal social institutions such as schools; how the practices of institutions of education operate to install people through

democratic means into the existing relations of classes; and how social myths about equality, the individual, equality of opportunity, and individual achievement are incorporated into texts and practices of education (p. 43).

It was Althusser's examination and analysis showing how ideologies “materially” exist in the form of institutions, which suggested and propelled the critical reexamination of how identities are influenced and affected by the organizational practices that govern these social entities. As a result, he posited that the many ways in which we subjectively come to know ourselves and the world we live in are reified by institutions, therefore significantly influencing how we come to know and understand our social self, and world, as “real.”

Rethinking Ideology and Practice on New Terrain

John B. Thompson (1990) states, “Ideology...is meaning in the service of power.” Therefore, ideologies function as the “guardian of identity,” and according to Terry Eagleton (1991), and is one of the ways which humans look to attend to the fractures and contradictions that they experience in their lives about such issues as “freedom, responsibility, womanhood, and so forth.” Althusser makes this point clear when he articulates that even class ideological formations, intentionally utilized by groups, no matter their class position, are nevertheless held “captive” by the ways in which their identities are produced and subjected by their institutional origins.

Conversely, many of the knowledges relied upon and used by experts, educators, and specialists are culturally influenced, politicized, and interest-based. They also tend to transmit biases and misjudgments, which can be, normalized which can be profoundly antithetical to the interests of traditionally marginalized groups or any set of interests that lie outside of the dominant majorities' conception of "mainstream."

Meaning and Practice of Knowledge Constructions

Michel Foucault (1977) undertook a critical examination of the ways in which theory was derived by studying and analyzing how the discursive productions inside insane asylums and prisons, ultimately became standard and normalized practice. He stated, "[the] theory does not express, translate, or serve to apply practice: it is practice" (p. 208) It is through his unparalleled investigations that he concluded that through "institutions of our own making," we create the practices, which facilitate and determines whom and what is criminal, and what it means to be mentally ill. According to Foucault's analysis this has contributed to the foundational process of how we come to know and understand the conceptions of "truth and madness and the marginal and the normal." He makes the case that many of the attempts to cure the so-called criminal and insane had less to do with the institution's ability to heal or cure them, but more to do with the power of "moral authority," derived from the performative function for which society decided the institutions were to serve (p. xix). It is here that Foucault makes his most penetrating analysis and contribution to the

sociology of knowledge by stating, “To think is to experience, to problematize. Knowledge, power, and the self are the triple foundation of thought (p. xxiv).” Implicit in his statement is the multiplicitous and contingent nature, and articulation of knowledge. This “politics of experience” put forth by him opened the horizon for the ways in which social scientists had previously understood, and examined institutional rules that influenced and contributed to the reification of the “subject's” daily life (p. xxv). Explaining how daily practices of exclusion despite legal discrimination being dismantled still survived and thrived to underserve in new and even more deleterious ways Smith (1999) argues that,

Today black children face the many-headed hydra of educational and intellectual disenfranchisement. Today it is more vicious and dangerous than the original beast. Indeed the current educational disenfranchisement of black children has long and historical roots – roots that extend back to de jure segregation, black codes, education preclusion, and beyond. While de jure segregation may have been dismantled, many similar and vituperative disenfranchisements have sprung up in its place (p.2).

Michel Foucault states, in societies like ours, “[T]ruth is centered on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce” (Foucault, 1984:73). For Foucault, then, the epicenter of what has come to be known as “western civilization” has been the conceptualization and use of science and reason. He has stated that these concepts have been promoted as “the way” to attaining a better way of life and are crucial for the establishment of true democratic societies. The aspirations to live “free” and rid ourselves of “prejudice, domination, and brutality” have been explicitly connected to scientific truths. Conversely, despite the efforts to minimize and disregard forms of culture and cultural agency, various forms of nationalism, religion,

race, and gender, continue to be prominent in the fight against oppression and domination in society even though these approaches had long been considered largely irrelevant in the face of the “scientific enterprise” threatening to its goals.

Specifically, the work of Donna Haraway (1989) had a significant impact on the scientific conceptions of race, gender, and the notion of the “civilized.” She examined and discovered how the investigation of climatology and cultures (e.g., Indian, Japanese, American) resulted in very divergent ideas about nature and society, and how these ideas could be explored according to Longio (1990) as “particular national, and cultural political discourses that served as legitimizing schemes of political domination” (p. 209- 14).

Foucault's (1979) genealogical approach to analyzing rationality and the “microphysics” of power enabled him to formulate a “politics of experience,” that was very divergent from approaches that embraced political militancy in order to fight against domination and oppression. He was most concerned with experience and the ways in which individuals became subjects. This prompted him to explore new forms of activism that examined and challenged the “political technologies” of institutions involved in the production of “truths.” Through this enterprise, he was able to utilize critical analysis as a form of political activism for intellectuals working within institutions in an attempt to avoid the pitfalls of previous theorists, who misguidedly looked to speak for those actively living and engaging in struggles

against oppression (p. xviii). However, the prior work of activist and gains made have unintentionally transferred the struggle of oppressed groups, and Smith (1999)

reminds us that in general and educationally,

[Unfortunately], adults have primarily relied on children to bear the burden of moving away from its racist past. Among children, black children, carry the heaviest burden. Yet remaking a segregated society cannot, and should not depend solely on or even largely on children, especially as long as parental prerogatives also deserve some respect. It is however about teacher or educational prerogatives and how transracial educational prerogatives bear heavily on black children” (p. 2).

What many saw as the progressive aspects of an “ideology of sexual liberation,” Foucault foresaw it as hegemony, and another “disciplinary technique,” which ended up transforming sex into a form of discourse that redefined homosexuals and their practices into a recognizable and knowable static mode of life. It is here that I would also suggest that the same hegemonic compulsion Foucault felt can also be attributed to the way in which critical pedagogy has been heralded and ultimately co-opted by academia. Therefore, Foucault's (1971) project was aimed at discovering the origins (or genealogy) of how the modern subject historically came to be a cultural reality (xxiii). For Foucault then, “technique of the self,” or the process by which the self comes to be, is linked to ideas about the morality of an individual and social philosophically that informs how the “subject” is constituted (xxiv). Additionally, he saw knowledge and not necessarily truth as transformative and informed by an individual’s own self-knowledge, which he considered to be close to an “aesthetic experience.”

In *The Order of Things*, Foucault (1971) questions the difficulty involved in studying the “speaking, living, working subject” (p. 30). As a result, he focused on the origins of grammar and the history of economics, which led to his examining the ways that reflexivity of the individual interacted with the discursive forms of “truth, rationality, and the effects of knowledge” (p. 31). It is here that the study of ideas, their formation and their “ordering” became objects of knowledge at specific times in their lives. He also performed these same types of inquiries in his studies of the criminal and various historical forms of punishment. It was not Foucault's concern to attempt to differentiate between how an object could take shape as an object of knowledge, but more interestingly, what were the social and cultural conditions that gave life to knowledge creation at a particular moment, and the corresponding connections to other forms of knowledge?

Sekou Toure (1969) states, “Although culture has been used as a weapon of domination, it has the potential to be a weapon of liberation” (p. 459). He points out that when scholarship and cultural work efforts are implicitly or explicitly liberatory, they contain great potential for community re-education in how they understand themselves and their conditions. As a result, they inevitably problematize the dominant scheme of the social order when steps are taken to “decolonize” their minds, and understand the structural manifestations that are often utilized to justify how they see themselves and their place in society and history. The effort by any

peoples to reclaim their history and culture is indispensable to their “sense” authenticity in the world.

Much like other oppressed and colonized groups, African-Americans have retained many aspects of their own cultural heritage, despite the tremendous efforts by their oppressors to obliterate them. And while Hall (1993) does believe that there are a very distinct set of historically defined black experiences that have been foundational for the alternative ways in which blacks understand and live in the world, and informs their knowledge, counter-identities and practices, he remains skeptical of the category of black in and of itself to be liberatory in ways that are cognizant and supportive of diversity and eschews notions of homogeneity that are inherently problematic for such a conception. Although an essentialized black experience based on static notions of unity cannot produce a politic that is guaranteed to be successful beyond its limited and narrow way of framing experience, it has been and still remains a useful construct in ways that escape the tendency of postmodernism's deconstruction and proliferation of identities and subjectivities which can potentially address the “new moment” in which blacks find themselves. Therefore, Luis Outlaw (1983) suggests that any reclamation efforts need to be grounded in the day-to-day lives of African-Americans, and are the guiding principles for developing emancipatory practices, so as to stay close to the needs of the people.

Banks (1993), utilizing “ideal-types,” suggests that there are five kinds of knowledge (personal/cultural, popular, mainstream academic, transformative, and school knowledge). However, it is his focus on transformative knowledge that is most useful in that it challenges the power/knowledge relation in all of its manifestations, institutional and otherwise, and has the most potential for not only assisting African-Americans in improving their conditions, but he contends, is also essential for the betterment of society overall. When African-Americans understand the historicity of “race” and how its shifting meanings have been used to justify their subjugation and legitimate the political goals of whites, they are better equipped with a form of transformative knowledge that can serve as a weapon for resistance to domination and discrimination (Darder & Torres, 2004; Lipsitz, 1998; Malik, 1996). According to Dutro et al (2008), since race has been the prevailing way in which African-Americans (and other groups of color) have come to understand themselves in their experience in the United States and globally, it must become the primary focus of analyses to be undertaken in their struggles and remain the most important cultural and pedagogical project for liberation, however, not at the expense and dismissal of the many other ways that those within the Diaspora are subjugated by multiple forms of oppression. A racialized perspective of the world is the one thing that whites and people of color have in common, even if there is disagreement about the degree to which it affects us all. For Leonard Lieberman (1968), the sociology of [justice-based] knowledge provides the optimal tool for understanding how “reason” itself has

been at the forefront of conceptualizing and racializing African-Americans and distorting the histories of non-whites around the globe.

In *Terra Cognita*, Zerubavel (1992) explains that even the advent of European knowledge of the “new world” was characterized by a paradigmatic shift that sought to integrate new experiences into old ways of knowing and understanding reality. Additionally, Stephen Cornell (1988) discovered that the American Indians also experienced this kind of (coerced) reshaping of the ways in which they interacted in a newly emerging reality when they redefined themselves as “tribes” in order to negotiate with whites and the United States government, as they would only do so with “tribal groups.” Therefore, it is fundamental to question the varying forms of “authority” which have been critical of and negatively affected alternative forms of knowledge construction. It is especially relevant for the liberatory efforts of marginalized groups struggling to be self-defined and self-determined.

In *Dusk of Dawn*, Dubois (1975) pointed out that it was Africans collective experience of a “common disaster,” their inheritance of the “social heritage of slavery,” and their endurance of “discrimination and insult: that bound them together. In fact, “this heritage binds together not simply the children of Africa, but extends through yellow Asia and into the South Seas” (p. 117). Also, it is notable that Du Bois in *The Souls of Black Folk*, contributions are foundational in the areas of self-reflexivity and interdisciplinary work. However, his theoretical formulations of race

are rarely noted. Significant to race studies is his conception of race that connects historical accounts of global war and economy detailed from his perspective and location in the “white world.” It is these diasporic and global experiences, which he believed to have definitively shaped the ways that African-Americans and other people of color have come to understand the world. These experiences in turn provided cognitive maps which outlined a “body of habit, thought and adjustment” which may now be most useful for attempting to not only come to terms with and overcome Blacks contemporary issues, but also possibly have implications for global movements. The experiences of dominated, oppressed and marginalized groups have not been by one essentialized identity, but instead, through the multiple and dynamic ways in which power works, thereby making one particular solution not capable of solving all of the marginalized problems. However, it is a starting point. Many marginalized groups have in the past, and continue to, connect their struggles here in the US with other global struggles for social justice. Afrocentricity posits that liberation of peoples of African descent is complex and simply cannot be beholden to one particular path toward attaining freedom. Donna Haraway (1988) asks,

How do we have simultaneously an account of radical historical contingency for all knowledge claims and knowing subjects, a critical practice...and a no-nonsense commitment to faithful accounts of a real world, one that can be partially shared and that is friendly to earthwide projects of finite freedom, adequate material abundance, modest meaning and suffering and limited happiness (p. 579).

Dubois (1975) similarly states in *The Education of Black People*,

The method which we evolved for opposing slavery and fighting prejudice are not to be forgotten, but learned for our own and others' instruction. We must understand the differences in social problems between Africa, the West Indies, South and Central

America, not only among the Negroes but those affecting Indians and other minority groups. Plans for the future of our group must be built on a base of our problems, our dreams and frustrations; they cannot stem from empty air or successfully be based on the experiences of others alone (p. 143-144).

The next section of this chapter brings together scholars of race and knowledge-production legacies who have attempted to provide a synthesis of the two which open up possibilities of connection the global through the local, while at the same time respecting boundaries. This section maps interconnections amongst different sites of power, in the context of race, class, gender, sexuality, and education. The discussion that follows is varied by fields of study, methodology, and approach, while mapping the historical current of colonialism and constructions of race, class, and gender informed in a manner which is relevant to the contemporary moment. However, what remains in their turn away from the Eurocentric project of modernity is still a commitment to a Eurocentric postmodern project, which at its core is inherently disconnected from the realities of non-white cultures and dismissive of the lens through which they view and live in the world. Specifically, it has almost never been the case that any freedom-based movement within American history has been able to make progress without organizing around some unifying concept. Harris (2005) suggests that while historically organizing around concepts such as race and ethnicity, many groups of color continued to be equally flexible with the ways in which they framed themselves and their efforts.

In an attempt to rescue the potentially useful aspects of racialized identities and possibilities while attending to the problematics of such conceptions, Collins

(1998) utilizes a model of “visionary pragmatism” which she drew from her experiences of being around black women and believes it can be fruitful because it “approximates a creative tension symbolized by an ongoing journey...at the same time, by stressing the pragmatic, it reveals how current actions are part of some larger, more meaningful struggle” (p.189-190), very much like Child's (2003) conception of Transcommunality, which is drawn from Native-American ancestral roots. We must utilize all strategies at our disposal and that includes the imaginative. According to Eric Dyson (1994), the most glaring omission is the ways in which blacks survived enslavement, Jim Crow, and segregation through the universally understood meanings and practice of unity, while at the same time holding on to regional, ethnic, religious and linguistic differences. Finally, postmodernist fail to explain this historical phenomenon adequately.

The attention and embrace of the marginal as a concept has been “co-opted” by academia in ways that permit critiquing power relations without acknowledgment often of their own complicity. Additionally, the irony which is suffocating is that at a time when those on the margins have begun to speak out from their positions, they are at the same time being dislodged from those positions by many who have more interest in theoretical foraging than in the actual real life experiences which fomented such resistance and positions in the first place. Norma Alarcon (1991) concurs when revisiting *This Bridge Called My Back* states,

It is clear, however, that even as bridge becomes a resource for the Anglo-American feminist theory of classroom and syllabus, there's a tendency to deny differences if

these differences pose a threat to the “common denominator” category. That is, solidarity would be purchased with silence, putting aside the conflictive history of groups' interrelations and interdependence (p.5).

The influence of Europe cannot be totally denied nor disregarded as inconsequential, for its influence in all that we now do is undeniable. However, Carter G. Woodson (2000) perhaps said it best more than sixty years ago:

We do not mean to suggest here, however, that any people should ignore the record of the progress of other races. We would not advocate any such unwise course. We say, hold onto the real facts of history as they are, but complete such knowledge by studying also the history of races and nations which have been purposely ignored. We should not underrate the achievements of Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome; but we should give equally as much attention to the internal African kingdoms, the Songhay empire, and Ethiopia, which through Egypt decidedly influenced the civilization of the Mediterranean world. We would not ignore the rise of Christianity and the development of the Church; but we would at the same time give honorable mention to the persons of African blood who figured in these achievements, and who today are endeavoring to carry out the principles of Jesus long since repudiated by most so-called Christians. We would not underestimate the achievements of the captains of industry who in the commercial expansion of the modern world have produced the wealth necessary to ease and comfort; but we would give credit to the Negro who so largely supplied the demand for labor by which these things have been accomplished. In our own particular history we would not dim one bit the lustre of any star in our firmament. We would not learn less of George Washington, "First in War, First in Peace, and First in the Hearts of his Countrymen"; but we would learn something also of the three thousand Negro soldiers of the American Revolution who helped make this "Father of our Country" possible. We would not neglect to appreciate the unusual contribution of Thomas Jefferson to freedom and democracy; but we would invite attention also to two of his outstanding contemporaries, Phillis Wheatley, the writer of interesting verse, and Benjamin Banneker, the mathematician, astronomer, and advocate of a world peace plan set forth in 1793 with the vital principles of Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations [years later]. We would in no way detract from the fame of Perry on Lake Erie or Jackson at New Orleans in the struggle with England; but we would remember the gallant Black men who assisted in winning these memorable victories on land and sea. We would not cease to pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln as the "Savior of the Country"; but we would ascribe praise also to the one hundred and seventy-eight thousand Negroes who had to be mustered into the service of the Union before it could be preserved, and who by their heroism demonstrated that they were entitled to freedom and citizenship (p. 22).

We must move beyond the self-defeating critiques often found amongst American cultural critics according to Hall whose notions that “nothing ever changes, the system always wins” leaves no real room for expanding theory and practice and ultimately, making change. Instead, blacks and all groups of marginalized and oppressed peoples must continue to be fluid in the ways in which they have been historically and utilize all tools at their disposal for their liberation (Moses 1991:86). The monopoly on knowledge construction and ways of seeing and experiencing the world must be considered critical when examining education. In the next chapter I address the ways in which scholars of education policy and theory have explained and attempted to intervene in the domination of students of color and also address the ways in which some efforts to do so have also resulted in reproducing the status quo.

Chapter 3 Sociology of Education

As much of the current research by scholars has noted, the changing demographics of the United States has brought to the forefront many historically problematic underlying racial, ethnic and cultural tensions about the future of our society. Of all of societal institutions, this racially explicit concern is most prevalent in our educational settings. The rapidly changing social landscape has brought into focus the immediate and impending crisis in schools across the country, for which all involved have agreed, they are ill-prepared. Over the last two decades, educational

researchers and teacher education programs have made attempts to address the ramifications of changing demographics of the new educational population. However, the changes, while well-intentioned, have yet to bring about the desired and necessary change envisioned. This has been of great concern to educators whose interests are rooted in social justice and equitable education. Since *Brown v. Board*, closing the educational gap among whites, blacks and the poor has been of major importance. According to many researchers, scholars and activists, many of the efforts to close the educational gap have often reproduced the existing socioeconomic disparities, which are just as pervasive now, as they were prior to desegregation of educational institutions. Ultimately, these adjustments have not addressed what many scholars consider to be the core issues, grounded firmly their rightful historical context, which will produce the efforts needed to move toward transformative educational reform.

Attempts have been made to examine and understand the ways in which students, teachers and parental participation in educational institutions, that are faced with the challenges of diversity have resisted, reproduced and ultimately contributed to maintaining the status quo. However, much of what has been explored has often focused primarily on macro-level, or micro-level issues exclusively, and in turn, has left many more unanswered questions and issues. Sociologists and other scholars have taken up this concern across many disciplines, most notably within the movement for multicultural education. Although the intentions have been noble, what has resulted is an agenda of accepting tolerance, which falls back on the melting pot

conception, more than proposing a transformative model of authentic multicultural education. Additionally, most attempts to implement alternatives to traditional educational methods have also been met and re-articulated by the very hegemonic bureaucracy that it sought to change.

At the forefront, and extreme end of the spectrum of multicultural educational reform, have been suggestions by multicultural scholars that what is needed is a new way of recruiting and educating potential teachers that far supersede what has been required in the past. Specifically, besides meeting requirements set forth by university programs only, there must also be a personal characteristic, or litmus test, in which potential candidates explicitly state their desire to educate urban children, and are also socially-justice oriented in their own lives in ways that work to connect educational inequities with those found in larger society. In addition, it has been strongly suggested that teachers themselves must be active participants in social movements that desire such change. Much research that has examined this possibility has focused on the cultural-knowledges that students bring with them to schools. While this has been useful, it is not enough, and possibly disingenuous, in proposing that students themselves hold the keys to changing social institutions alone, and making broad social change without the help of a wide-range of support, and most specifically the teachers that educate them.

Over the last century, sociologists have become increasingly interested in the system of education and schools as a unique and particular form of social institutions.

Their concerns have ranged from the defining the “proper” social and institutional role of schools in a society, expanding educational opportunities for the poor and marginalized segments of populations to become socially and economically mobile, to the critical exploration of social and cultural values taught in school curriculum and how they are compatible or incompatible with new educational principles brought to school by institutional participants in the setting. Sociologists have raised questions about what actually is being learned and taught in the school curriculum, and the role that schools play in the integration and assimilation of newly arrived immigrants into society.

The sociology of education has traditionally been divided according to the different levels of analyses: at the macro-level, the discipline looked to understand education as an important form of social institution within society, and at the micro-level, it looked to explore the dynamics of social interactions among members of schools and other educational and political institutions. In order to understand and examine social relations, and how schools work and function in our society, three main theoretical streams have been considered predominant and important in studying education. The first two, Functionalist Theory and Conflict theory in general both operate at the macro-level. The third, Interaction Theory, operates at the micro-level and explores the ways in which individuals and small groups interact within educational institutions. In addition to the above mentioned theoretical approaches to studying educational institutions have been interventions which sought to move away from grand narratives about the day to day experiences, and instead are grounded in

the situated positionalities of the individuals such as critical theory which embraces aspects of feminism, postmodernism, (incorporate later...empiricism, symbolic interactionist).

Functionalist Theory

Functionalism, also known as structural-functionalism, begins with the assumption that institutions within society, such as the system of education, are interdependent and work together, all contributing in their own particular way to equilibrium in order for the society to function properly and equitably. For functionalists, education is seen as the most important aspect for the transmission of (dominant) culture, cultivation of new knowledge, proper (accommodationist) integration of individuals into society, and providing properly trained individuals and workers for particular roles that are required for the society to function and survive.

For Emile Durkheim (1961), the maintenance of dominant values and morals constitute the foundation of social order and it was through education that the youth learned and acquired them. He envisioned the classroom as a microcosm of society and was the ultimate mediator between the competing morality and the values of the dominant society. Although Durkheim outlined the field of study for sociologists to come, his concerns focused mainly on the transmission of values to the students and ways in which they contributed to societal stability and often overlooked the roles that teachers and other factors played in the educational process. The dominant theme

that came out of Durkheim's sociology of education was that schooling contributed to consensus, mitigated conflict, and maintained stability through social institutions and society. The works that contributed the most to this exploration were *Moral Education (1961)* and *The Evolution of Educational Thought (1977)*.

From a functionalist point of view, according to Floud, Halsey and Martin (1958), education unproblematically supports the dominant group of society. At the same time, they fail to see the disconnect between desired outcomes and contested life chances for minority groups and women in educational institutions. Secondly, they fail to critically analyze social and personal interaction within the schools between teachers and students, the content of the curriculum, how knowledge is transmitted, modified, resisted and embraced within the school setting. The functionalist view also fails to account for, or examine social disruption in the educational process. As its theory places greater emphasis on its status quo orientation.

Conflict Theory

In response to the theoretical problems associated with a functionalist perspective, conflict theory began to examine a larger role of educational institutions in an attempt to explore the ways in which many different ideologies; interests, agendas and conflicting perspectives in the educational institutions create tension and competition. Additionally, critical theorists focus on the struggle for increased rights

and privileges of participants in schools, at the same time, exploring the struggle to preserve the existing order through the socialization of youth through the dominant prevailing attitudes, values, beliefs, and norms that were taught in schools. This theoretical approach was developed from the writings of Karl Marx and Max Weber. This power struggle was the cornerstone for how conflict-theorists viewed and studied educational institutions and their socio-political function in society. The strategic use of force, coercion and manipulation was important instruments used by the dominant culture to maintain their position, privilege, and power. However, conflict theorists also see this power relation as temporary, and change is an inevitable outcome of continuing power struggles. Conflict-theorists examine the struggles for social transformation in educational institutions by focusing (narrowly) on particular kinds of intentional acts resistance to domination and the status quo. The works of Marx and Engels do not explicitly speak to the role of education. Nonetheless, they implicitly point to education as a site for social and cultural reproduction. For example, throughout Marx's writings, there is a pedagogical stance illustrated by alluding to the necessity of "educating the educators" and the connection to transforming the consciousness of the working-class. In the *Communist Manifesto (1848)*, *The German Ideology (1845)* and *Capital (1867)*, Marx also speak to the role that public education could play in the goals of a revolution by the masses, as well as the ways in which it could be used by those in power to suppress it. Ultimately, Marx and Engels were not concerned specifically with educational institutions as sites for class struggle or social change because they were not yet seen

as places where social and class-consciousness of the working-class was integrated into. Over time the transformation of those sites for struggle and contestation would eventually emerge as class struggles and social movements to acquire legal and property rights of the working-class would focus on education as an important agent and facilitator of social change.

Max Weber's (1925) contribution to the sociology of education was built on the idea of competition amongst groups, and that the relationships between and within the groups form the foundation for the group members' identities, associated with their social status. Much like Marx, Weber's influence on education was belated, and he indirectly connected the social function of education through his seminal treatments of bureaucracy and complex organizations. He states that the primary goal of educational institutions was to teach "status cultures," which resulted in conflict. Here, Weber (1947) posits that there were many different groups within society competing for power, and in order for the dominant group to maintain their power, they in turn must shape the educational institution in ways that maintained the status quo. Weber was able to combine a study of the macro issues of the organization of schools with the micro-level individual and group conflicts that manifested within the schools which contributed to shaping how the school experience was interpreted by those different groups that participated. Weber rejected the proposed stability of functionalism and the over-deterministic position of conflict theory, pointing to the relationship of structure and agency and the possibilities for social action. He was

able to accomplish this through his conceptions of the “insiders” whose school experiences were reinforced by the school setting, and “outsiders” whose experiences were confronted with challenges because of their different social status in the school setting.

Contemporary Conflict Theory

Many conflict theorists today view educational institutions in a capitalistic society as an important mechanism of social control. For Bowles and Gintis (1977), the ability to make any significant change in the ways that schools are formed and function must depend on the social movement to eliminate the inequalities that exist outside of the educational institution. Furthermore, there must be large-scale political and economic change. Some conflict theorists such as Waller (1965) assume that society and its institutions are in a constant state of disequilibrium, and require examination of the experiences of individuals, teachers, students, parents, as well as other interest groups that participate in the educational institutional structure.

Within the theory of conflict orientations, cultural reproduction and resistance perspectives explore the ways in which those in power attempt to mold individuals through ideological control to serve their own purpose, in order to maintain the status quo. Morrow and Torres (1995), for example, have pointed to what is a “hidden curriculum” or educational program in schools and its latent impacts that ultimately contributes to the reproduction of their own social and class positions in schools and

communities. This theoretical branch gained traction in Europe in the 1960s and examined how families and schools pass down culture. They also pointed to the “cultural capital” of the group, family, individual, and the possibilities of type of education they were to receive or had received. This general approach to reproduction owes to the theory advanced by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) who posited that the autonomy and reproducing capabilities of the school are closely tied to class strategies in particular and legitimation of the system of stratification in general. Conversely, conflict theorists have also studied the ways in which these cultural aspects of school are embraced and resisted within educational institutions. The important value of conflict theory is that it critically examines societal problems as an integral part of educational institutions and the resulting disruptions to the “natural” flow of social order.

Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) contributions to conflict theory helped to penetrate the analysis of societal institutions even more deeply and exposed the power of domination and revealed the potential formation of resistance through his conception of hegemony operating in capitalistic societies. Through his exploration of “formal and informal” systems of education, he looked to excavate “counterhegemonic consciousness” and positions it as an important precursor to potential revolutionary transition. Morrow and Torres (1995), reading Gramsci state, “[T]he relationship between the dominant and subordinate classes always has a pedagogical or educational dimension of variable importance. Whereas political force is concentrated

in the state, ideological domination is more closely associated with the institutions of civil society” (p. 251). While Gramsci's critical perspective has pushed the field forward in many useful ways, it is not without its criticisms. Many have stated that the conflict theory failed to account for times when there is an apparent balance and the state of equilibrium that existed between different parts of social institutions and social dynamics of the individuals who interact within them. Consequently, the micro-level interactions among individuals and their voices often are lost in the analysis. Specifically, this theoretical perspective failed to analyze how individuals see and understand their world, and the ways in which they navigate, negotiate and survive within an educational system that seeks to remake them in ways that are counter to the natural desire to be self-determined.

Critical Theory, Feminism, and Postmodernism

From this theoretical intervention, the concept of education was problematized beyond the longstanding analysis of educational institutions and its curriculum in and of itself being accepted as a given social good. Dale (1992) claimed that this refocusing didn't have much of an impact on policy and was utopian at best because most of the critique and change was “impossible” to achieve. Even the most intimate studies of classrooms were unable to address the “real” concerns of education practitioners. The critical tradition within the sociology of education until the 1990s differed greatly from critical thought in the 1970s and early 1980s. They mounted a challenge to the dominating correspondence models made prominent in works of

Bowles and Gintis (1977) made advancements in areas which were overlooked, such as the potential for agency and resistance in the form of cultural knowledges.

Additionally, there began to be recognition that there were more ways that oppression or marginalization operated beyond the class-based framework, specifically through the categories of race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and other cognizable characteristics (Barton, 1996; Barton & Tomlinson, 1984; Hooks, 1981; Verma & Asworth, 1986).

As a result, the new theoretical perspectives provided a new more nuanced understanding of the interconnectedness of the mechanisms of oppression, inequality, and domination in education (Morrow & Torres, 1995).

These adjustments in critical theoretical approaches to studying education brought about a greater emphasis on research in the areas of gender, race and sexuality. Additionally, they affected and shifted the disciplinary language based on concerns of inequality such as “stratification, selection, and allocation” to difference and the ways in which identity, culture and recognition, which focused more on agency. Those systemic changes were partly due to the influence of postmodern and poststructural analyses fueling an increase in the volume of research from an interdisciplinary approach long absent in the work of sociologists who studying education. As Lynch (2000) wrote, “It was not that issues of race, disability or ethnicity had been completely ignored in the past; they were not, especially in the U.S. where race was such a crucial issue. They had, however, been defined as attributes of persons defined often in socio-economic (in functionalist analysis) or in social class terms (within the critical tradition). In the 1990s, however, race; ethnicity,

gender and/or disability were regarded as defining and essential counterparts of identities, shaping the foundation of all social experience” (Lynch, 2000). This shift was in part also in line with the ways in which conditions in society at large were also being challenged by marginalized groups active in social justice movements.

The new-found emphasis on identity politics helped to focus on the process of education and content, which moved the debate from strictly addressing statistically-oriented group outcomes and aided in recognizing the importance of individual experience within the system. The tendency, until critical reorganizations of educational research remained fixated on inequalities instead of possibilities for change. Many of these efforts sought to bridge the divide between the analysis and inquiry into educational institutions, and instead began to address the types of action and agents that sought to change them.

Empiricism

According to Lynch (2000), sociologists who specialized in the area of education made more progress in the analysis of empirical data than the advancement of theoretical models that looked to challenge and change the practice of education. Additionally, Karabel and Halsey (1977) in their survey of research on the sociology of education found a central persistent trend of “methodological empiricism” which focused on inequality and social mobility in the traditions of functionalist and neo-Weberianist orientations, which utilized empirical data sets to examine the allocation

and distribution of social status and educational opportunities for marginalized groups in society. The most influential empirical study on education in the U.S. was the Coleman Report (1966), which was produced at the behest of the government to find the source of educational inequalities between whites and blacks. Following a functional model, researchers wanted to find out what student resources in the school and home (inputs) affected student achievement (outputs). Consequently, this study was reanalyzed many times and influenced countless other studies conducted by other governmental organizations.

Finally, empirical studies became prominent because sociologists realized that quantitative studies particularly, were having a greater influence in shaping educational policies and practices. Studies which took this form were well received by those in governmental positions making decisions about educational policy, mainly because they operated from a cost/benefit bottom line and were foundational in implementing change through legislative measures. Specifically, these advances could be seen in the social and political arenas and concerns of the time such as “desegregation, affirmative action, bilingual education,” and other cultural issues associated with school reform. The empiricist approach to educational change contributed substantively by enhancing social scientists understanding of educational inequalities on a large-scale. Such work is necessary in order to present a more accurate picture of the educational crisis. The feminist and postmodernist traditions for studying education helped to bridge the gaps that are often found in empiricist

work and provided the critical reflexivity needed to help empiricists-oriented educational researchers become more cognizant of their own effects on the study of educational change.

Symbolic Interaction and Interpretive Theories

According to Hallinan (2000), the sociology of education has contributed to the understanding of the complexities of educational institutions, yet the approach has been limited by relying on broad theories about education. These problems are highlighted by the inability to understand the “inter-and-intra-institutional” variation of what actually takes place within schools in their day to day existence. Also, they are unable to explain the unique interactions between schools and other societal institutions, specifically, the ways in which schools are similar and dissimilar in their purported functions to other social institutions. For example, schools are unique, in that they provide important social sites that promote the transition of students from childhood to adulthood with varying degrees of differences across populations socially and culturally in both public and private schools.

Of key interest were the interactions between peers, teachers and students, and teachers and administrators. They were interested in the ways in which these levels of different interactions influenced the participants attitudes, achievements, aspirations, expectations, values and how their sense of “self” was shaped by these interactions. A classic example would be the effect of teacher or school expectations of students from

particular socioeconomic groups and how the students reacted to those expectations or lack thereof. Two theories commonly utilized in studying education are “Labeling Theory” and “Exchange Theory.” Labeling theory proposes that if a student is told something enough about themselves that they will embrace and incorporate that external label into their own “self-concept” and will act accordingly, whether positive, negative or even possibly some unforeseen rearticulation of the situation. Exchange theory, in turn, focuses on the cost and rewards that are involved in all interactions with others. This way of viewing interaction explores reciprocity and the potential for bringing participants together or breaking them apart and again, some unforeseen rearticulation of the situation in social situations. However, there are criticisms that the focus on such micro-processes is not well suited to address larger societal concerns or connections of education to other social institutions and social processes, mainly because they are so nuanced and qualitative in nature that the findings cannot be generalized beyond the specific settings of educational situations.

Emancipatory Perspectives and Research

For social scientists interested in the emancipatory potential of education, much emphasis has been placed on understanding counter-hegemonic resistance and the use of a radical pedagogy, which can facilitate transformation in recognizable ways for those operating within and from outside educational institutions. Within the critical and feminist traditions, there has been an intentional effort to explore the transformative potential of their writing through conscious reflexivity and exploration

of possibilities for action (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). This theoretical approach is based on the Freirian model, wherein educators are potential agents of social change. Nonetheless, this pedagogical approach has been criticized for its lack of attention to the cultural and political context and conditions in which Freire's theory emerged and the political and policy interaction, which it requires (Hallinan, 1996; Torres, 1990).

Paulo Freire's contribution (1970), much like Gramsci, was a political philosophy of education. The main thrust of his pedagogical approach is the emergence of participatory action research, where the "object" of research is defined and shaped by the "subjects" of research. Freire's attempt to extend and refine this thinking relied on people's ability to "read the word and the world" and critically understand the importance of the relationship of education and the politics of oppression, domination, and critical resistance in this process. However, It has been critiqued because of its inattention to the nature of the more vast nature of power relations within society and the necessity for reconstruction of the structure of education that people operate in for real transformation (Hallinan, 1996; Torres, 1990).

Ultimately, his theory relied too heavily on the use of people's common sense to result in emancipatory activity as a form of popular knowledge that would engage in education as a counter-hegemonic practice.

Cultural Studies and Recovery of Agency

It is in this sense that Giroux (1992) was able to conceptualize that teachers were in a natural position (as intellectuals and cultural workers) to take an instrumental role in participating in and facilitating potential transformative practices of resistance that could improve the possibilities for explicit and intentional democratic practices. Giroux and McLaren (1986) proposed redefining teacher education in radical ways that emphasized an explicit dedication to counter-hegemonic work, which he saw as more a more effective method than the seemingly randomness ascription of resistance many varying acts within the school setting. For them, this effort goes beyond just critique within and of the school system, instead they posited that there was a need for more public attempts to remedy not just domination which was being experienced in school, but also believed that it was imperative to draw connections to the domination experienced in larger society. For this reason, teacher curriculum itself must take on the form of cultural politics, and thus, conceptualize school an “embattled arena brimming with contestation, struggle and resistance.” Analyses of resistance within schools have been limited and bound to mainly academic issues. There needs to be a widening and reexamination of pedagogy which can address the potentiality of acts of resistance that while they occur within schools, can also understand that they are equally historically and politically motivated and speak to the current conditions of society. Ultimately, Giroux contends that teacher curriculum needs to be restructured and is reflective of cultural politics, is intentionally combative and active in the struggle to redefine the

terrain of pedagogy and discourse in a manner that is explicitly related to the politics of representation and reclamation.

Apple and Giroux both put forth the idea that teachers should be “transformative intellectuals,” and the relative autonomy that they have can and should be instrumental in explicitly politicizing curriculum in ways that engender a “political education.” They have been critiqued at times for not giving enough attention to the power of the bureaucratic nature of educational institutions in general and subsequently over-romanticizing the potential for teachers to be effective as transformative agents in particular. Ultimately, they unproblematically assume that teachers can and will act in a unified way in exercising their relative autonomy in many different and diverse situations within and across educational institutional settings without systemic changes to their programs that properly train them to do so.

Urban Change Agents and Preservice Teacher Identity

As the field has grown, there have been many efforts by educational researchers and critical theorists that have been taken up and have contributed to serious re-evaluation efforts on the behalf of teacher education programs to address of the presence of longstanding historical inequalities within the educational system. Most notably, the attempts of programs to focus intensely on the orientation of its potential student/teachers when they are in their pre-service stage and work with them to grasp the importance of service-learning in urban schools. These efforts focus on

re-orienting potential teacher's attitudes and beliefs about the populations and communities that they will be serving in ways that mitigate previously held negative stereotypes that may hinder them working effectively in urban schools.

It is well known through research that all teacher candidates enter teacher education programs with a preconceived perception of schools and their socio-economic backgrounds. Those preconceived notions of school-related environment come from their many years of experiences in and teaching at schools. Many of these perceptions, beliefs and attitudes are connected to experienced-based understanding and personal feelings about race, class, gender and sexuality (Leland & Harste, 2005; Sleeter, 2001). Research has been conducted on the socio-psychological attitudes of teachers and their perceptions, and beliefs towards students of color (Good and Brophy, (2003; Raths and McAninch 2003; Banks and Banks 2004; E. Brown 2004); and Oakes 2005). But new research on the beliefs of prospective teachers about racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity is also emerging. While much has been written on how teachers' perceptions of students of color affect their attitudes and methods or teaching, little research has been done to critically explore prospective teachers' understanding and beliefs on the issue of racial, ethnic and cultural diversity. According to Nieto (2005), teachers exhibited a general tendency to pick up many of the cultural messages and race-based misconceptions of students. Since these attitudes and beliefs are always present in shaping teachers' actions and ways of relating to students, it is imperative that teacher education programs explicitly

confront attitudinal biases held by teachers in the beginning of their pre-service training programs. However, often this is not the case and the presence of attitudinal biases and such programs do not explicitly deal with deeply held prejudices which have their roots in the unequal founding of the country and its intuitions effectively.

It is important to note that, while the majority of teacher education programs and the teaching environment continues to be dominated by white teachers and educators, the classrooms and educational environments at schools are more populated more by students of color. Smith (1999) points out the socioeconomic impact this has had on Black educators and students,

Since post-desegregation racial statistics have been collected, whites have always dominated the teaching profession. Yet, historically, they did not necessarily dominate the day-to-day educational lives of Black children. That has changed. Currently, more white teachers teach Black children than do Black teachers....In essence, ignoring any gendered statistics, white teachers dominate the teaching profession, being 86.5% of the total teaching population. As a result, there are simply more white teachers available to teach, that is 2,216,604, than any other racial group. When one compares the 2,216,604 white teachers to the 188,371 Black teachers, it becomes clear that there are eleven times more white teachers available to teach than there are available Black teachers available to teach...Furthermore, most white teachers teach in urban areas where most Black children live. Accordingly, there are more white teachers teaching in the urban areas than there are Blacks teaching overall. Almost one fifth of all white teachers teach in large urban areas. Numerically, this is over five times the number of Black teachers overall who teach in urban areas. Consequently, white people are the racial group that dominates the school system where Black children are educated, creating transracial teaching. This particular transracial interaction and impact on Black students cannot and is not minimized by the existence of Black teachers or other teachers of color within the school. Further, most administrators are also white, though primarily white men. Given these teacher and principal statistics, the fact is that most Black children are under the day-to-day control of an educator who does not share his or her race, creating the transracial teaching of Black children not previously experienced before. This post-desegregation phenomenon, hence, raises the possibility of unresolved transracial hostility.

Teachers' attitudes about students of color often interfere, rather than facilitate the teaching and learning process because racially implicit ideas and biases are deeply embedded in analytical thoughts, empirical research, and instructional practices. Prospective teachers must be exposed through a well-established and guided practice in history in order to understand how to analyze and examine their beliefs about social issues including cultural, racial and ethnic diversity (Gay, 2010).

Gay and Kirkland (2003) assert that teachers who are self-aware of their biases and prejudices are more likely to understand the social and cultural context in which they teach. As a result, they often critically question their own knowledge and assumptions as well as the information they are exposed to in their programs. These scholars propose that racial and cultural consciousness should be combined with guided self-reflection in both pre-service teacher education and in-service staff development programs. This critical process must also incorporate the examination and monitoring of personal beliefs and instructional behaviors in order to promote the value of cultural diversity. Landson-Billings (1999), suggests that an ideally effective teacher education program would be one in which the "emphasis on understanding race and racism is not a goal in itself but, a means for helping students develop pedagogical options that disrupt racist classroom practices and structural inequities" (p. 237). Teacher education programs have made an attempt to mitigate some of these concerns about teacher attitudes towards multiculturalism diversity. They have also

mainly focused on raising the “awareness” of its predominately white students to prepare them to teach in urban schools. Additionally, Gay states that “[G]enerally they [teacher ED programs] involve moving students ideologically from claims of color blindness to cultural consciousness; pedagogically from awareness of cultural differences to culturally responsive educational actions; morally from tolerance to advocacy of ethnic and cultural diversity; and politically from individual shame, guilt, and blame about historical atrocities and continuing oppressions to institutional and systemic-based critical race, cultural and ethnic analyses and activism.”

This awareness can potentially provide a sufficient beginning for creating collective action for social change needed to move forward with reexamining practices and strategies that have the potential to promote adequately suited policies for the crisis we face in education today (Gay, 2010). Prospective teachers need to confront their attitudes and beliefs if they are to develop critical abilities necessary to teach students in urban schools and provide diverse curriculum along with grounded action-oriented programs. The attempts put forth by some teacher education programs to deal with this have been in the form of challenging their white students “racialized-knowledge” on their own terms, not just exposing them to the “proper” literature. New teachers need to be prepared for their critical work and gain deeper understandings of sensitive issues on race and racism in the context of their own identities (Gay, 2010). Consequently, a major goal of multicultural focus in teacher education programs has been “to better prepare a mostly white and female teaching

force to work effectively with students from racial/cultural backgrounds different than their own.” Teachers need to be trained as active agents of social change. However, most of the programmatic structures are geared towards easing teachers into developing a comfortable consciousness, thereby failing them when it comes to dealing with the sense of dissonance they experience when they are placed to teach in a setting that they are ultimately and realistically unfamiliar with.

Although correctional efforts in the programs have been in the right direction, many white pre-service teachers often end up interpreting the meaning of social change wrongly. This failure is exemplified by the lack of their systemic focus and critical analysis on changing underlying structural inequalities. Additionally, teachers of color are also need to be properly trained, because, as Ladson-Billings (2005) warns, “scholars of color have as much, if not more, to learn about contemporary communities of color. So much of our lives have been submerged in whiteness that we too risk losing touch with what is happening in communities of color.” This task for teachers of color is arduous in that many feel that their “natural” positioning in a particular group excludes them from having to “re-learn” about themselves. Unfortunately, there is a lack of research on the impact of internal colonization through educational institutions and teacher education programs on teachers of color. Most just assume that it is a natural good to have teachers who come from similar communities as the students they teach.

The next chapter will explore the historical forces which shaped the path of incorporation of Africans, Asians, Indians, and Latinos into the American educational system. Through colonization, enslavement, and genocidal practices, each group was forced and coerced into school systems whose sole purpose was to “Americanize” them into submission and ultimately adoption of a Euro-centered worldview. It is these oft hidden histories, and their different trajectories to the same end, still plague each group today to varying degrees. However, the overall effect of the past and current practices of subordination through education has had more than just a devastating effect on the survival of each group’s cultural autonomy. They have also made the task of continuing struggles to resist fragmented and at odds both within and across racial and ethnic boundaries.

Chapter 4

The Colonized, Conquered and Enslaved Origins of Education in North America: And Its Legacy of Separate and Unequal Contemporary Educational Policy

In this new era of educational policy-making, many decision-makers are involved in debates that look to understand the historical origins of education in the United States for groups outside of the mainstream. According to Williamson, Rhodes and Dunson (2007) politicians, teachers, parents, and educational reformers are in intellectual gridlock concerning the historical stream of social justice in education and what that means. How do we define it accurately so that it represents the desires of groups that sought inclusion into, and exclusion from, an “Americanized” education simultaneously at times? Additionally, and more importantly, can an education based

in or seeking social justice even be achieved in a system characterized by discrimination, racism, sexism or assimilationists goals, which sought to destroy cultural frames of education utilized by minority groups to survive? Unfortunately these competing notions also glance over the possibilities of minority groups, all forced in one way or another to submit to the ubiquity of the American educational system, to see the pairing of collective group goals of cultural maintenance and societal advancement as part and parcel of an overall goal guided by the desire to reclaim their own humanity in the eyes of society at large and at the same time become socially mobile and attain a higher social status (Tyack, 1993). Hom and Yamamoto (2000) state,

Action on justice claims often turns on which memories are acknowledged by decision-makers. Those supporting and those opposing justice claims thus always hotly contest collective memory. Indeed, struggles over memory are often struggles between colliding ideologies, or vastly differing world views (p. 1765).

When closely examined, the history of education must be asked for intense interrogation of its past. For what has transpired has lasting impact on all involved, not just the oppressed, but also the oppressors. In order to gain an accurate portrait of how and why, and through which methods educational policy been created, it is imperative to understand how it has been formed and to what extent and continues to be managed, and for what purposes? Education, much like other social institutions, can be wielded to serve and support more than one purpose at a time, and usually are doing both, which can often cloud the historical snapshot and the ensuing patterns of

interaction which become the legacy of them for contemporary purposes (Donato & Lazerson, 2000; Franke, 2000)

Racial Categories and Schooling

For Omi and Winnant (1994), race in the US has often been given secondary status as the product of historical, political and economic forces. However, race has been and still is the fundamental issue in the formation of identity, social organization and social change in the US. The conception of racial paradigms such as ethnicity groups, class and nationality-based identity perspectives through political movements and legislative efforts were all, too narrowly defined to construct an adequate theory of race. As a result, the use of such paradigms as the basis for social change have been ineffective as “racial projects” overall, but have contributed to our understanding of how race has been central to the relations of social movements as cultural representations and the state as social structure in producing contemporary notions and usages of race. In an attempt to identify the process by which this happens, the Omi and Winnant examine these relations constructing a “racial formation theory” which is “the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created inhabited, transformed, and destroyed,” within what has been and still is a “racialized” state (p. 55). Therefore, even the category of whiteness, has been transformed over time. Originally, a more diversified category became homogenous with the arrival of new ethnicized European immigrants. However, it must be noted that, the opportunity and ability to forfeit consciously or unconsciously, culture and

language in an effort to take advantage of educational opportunities in the United States was not, and never will be afforded to non-white groups who seek to attain a quality educational experience (Palumbo-Liu, 1999, p. 149; see also Harris, 1993; Smedly, 1993). Even newly arriving ethnic European groups searching for quality educational experiences recognized that segregated schools were not simply separate, but also perpetuated existing racialized and ethnic hierarchies which treated non-settler-lineaged and southern Europeans with the same disdain and distrust that was traditionally reserved for people of color, and would ultimately place their children at a disadvantage in society. Additionally, all groups realized a high-quality education was only one aspect that could lead to the improvement of the overall social, political, and economic status of the group. At the heart of educational and intellectual disenfranchisement was the separate but equal myth which still remains staunchly embedded in more complex ways within the American psyche and still is the underlying impetus for educational reforms and the many resulting legislative attempts to remedy the devastating reality of our inequitable educational system.

In reaction to such disparate treatment and conditions within the history of “education,” marginalized groups have always had to operate from an explicit politicized, multi-positioned and situated point of reference when it came to the importance of attaining an education in American society, that did not rest on the sole desire of becoming white through total cultural assimilation (Williamson, Rhodes and Dunson p. 198).

According to Williamson, Rhodes and Dunson (2007) much of the scholarship examining educational advancement of people of color conflate their desire and struggle for equity with the desire to acquire the privileges of whiteness and eventual assimilation. What has been the result is the development and subscription to a narrative of the past in which immigrants and colonized minorities were only positioned to make one of two seemingly desperate choices; disregard and shed their cultural heritage for the benefits of Americanization, or the inevitable downward spiral depicted by holding on to ones' cultural sensibilities, and educational, and ultimately, societal alienation. Now, there are many examples across many racialized and ethnic groups of those who did made decisions based on this falsely reified dichotomy. However, the rigidity of these categorizations assured that for American Indians, Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese and African-Americans would still have been barred from the privileges of whiteness even if they had shed their identities. The idea that desegregated schools and assimilationist accomplishment represented a wholesale dismissal of cultural heritage couldn't become a reality no matter the efforts put forth by any of the aforementioned groups. Rather, it was the high status given to whiteness that each immigrant, colonized, conquered and enslaved group desired and the opportunities for social mobility and success that would be afforded their children with the attainment of equal educational opportunities. Access to such a curriculum would enable these marginalized groups to continue their historical activism already based in collective racial and ethnic uplift, which was the overarching goal of each group. The ability of each of these diverse groups struggling to reclaim their

humanity in a racialized society to see beyond the limitations of the privileges of whiteness in only educational institutions, and the much broader consequences of their actions exemplifies their consistency of a multi-positioned approach based in an acute political awareness of the times.

Native American Indian Educational History

Indian educational history, although similar to other groups in terms of domination and externally imposed assimilationist goals, is different and complex in that Indians historical interactions with Europeans began long before the establishment of the United States of American, and on the continent of North American, which Indians had occupied thousands of years before any European interruption, and was their homeland. Therefore, Stan Juneau maintains (2001) that the European project of colonialist education for Indians has been a work in progress over at least 400 years and has always been from an oppressive and paternalistic position. In referencing the work of Ward Churchill, George Tinker (2004) unflinchingly agrees and comments that, “Indian schools were consciously designed as part of the colonizers imperial project (p. xiii). Also, quoting T.B. Macaulay (1835) in his “*Minute on Education*,” and British efforts to colonize India and the goals of education and the “task of empire” was explicitly aimed at, “educating a class so they may be interpreters between us and the millions we govern” (p. xiii).

Under assault to change from the moment of contact with whites, the Indian American experience, has been at odds with that of European immigrants. The

struggle for educational outcomes, teacher instruction, and content, has been contested because Indians ways of educating their own children sought to promote the survival and livelihood of the collective, in contradistinction to the goals and aims of a Euro-American government seeking to determine rigid curriculum and uniform standards for learning. Wilcolmb E. Washburn (1975) relays very clearly the war for the destruction of the minds and ways of the Indian population in, *The Assault on Indian Tribalism: The General Allotment Dawes Act of 1877*,

Three principle themes emerged early on in the lake Mohonk conferences and were thereafter regularly deployed as rationales guiding the formulation of federal Indian policies: 1) the need for inculcation of individualism among native people 2) that to achieve this end Indians should be universally “educated to hold eurowestern beliefs and that 3) all Indians, duly educated and thus individualized, should be absorbed as citizens into the U.S. body politic (p. xvii).

Many of such ideas, while important aspects of European imperialism, also come from ignorance, misunderstanding, and undervaluing of Indian history and their cultural purpose and practice of education for their young. Raymond Cross (1999) therefore, rebukes the idea that Indians were unable to educate their own children. In fact, they did so amongst the diversity of many different tribes is an unsupported myth. They were able to cross many tribal barriers respectfully and still have educational interests that were indeed very specific to their own indigenous issues and ways of survival, but also which were in line with a general philosophical thought that, through the process of transmission of knowledge and communication, the ability to adapt to the surrounding environment and social system would benefit them, while still ensuring that its culture and tribe continued to exist and thrive. So after

contact with European immigrants, the natives didn't see co-existing with groups outside of their own immediate tribe or nation at odds with their current practice of living successfully with and amongst different natives as implausible.

Thomas Thompson (1978) goes on to elaborate that from the first contact with Europeans, there are two defining periods of conflict that highlighted the salient educational differences and priorities. The first, period was dominated by missionary intervention from the 16th to the 19th century, and the second was most characterized by “negotiations” through domination by the federal government from the late 19th century until the mid-20th century. For example, beginning in 1611, Europeans introduced the carceral institutional systems with distinct sets of disciplines in “educating” Native Americans and began to open up schools throughout the eastern coast, eventually spreading to the Midwest and southwest. They created mission schools and colleges with intentions to “Christianizing and civilizing” the “savage and unsaved” Indian population. This era was characterized as the beginning of institutionalized alienation directed against indigenous populations, which was ultimately supported by the federal government and its assimilation policies to “absorb” the Indian youth into the mainstream of American life, which resulted in a further loss of indigenous way of life and the destruction of Indian cultural identity.

Ward Churchill (2004) states,

The imposition of US citizenship, which is also covered in part by the Allotment Act, meant first and foremost that Indians would no longer be citizens of their own nations in any genuine sense (Indian Citizenship Act Ch. 233, 43 Stat. 25).

Susan Johnson (2000) reminds us that prior to the full enforcement and coercive nature of the assimilation process and policies, Indians interacted and negotiated with the European immigrants and eventually signed the agreement as sovereigns and independent nations with the United States to establish the “government to government” relations in the forms of nearly four hundred treaties. Eventually, this treaty-making period would end in 1871, the US congress, no longer the president, had the power to sign treaties with Indian nations, which was a tremendous setback in the relations of which the provision for the necessity to establish educational policies and progress were a part of. Indian tribes had become accustomed to education being included in treaties between Indian nations and the United States government. For example, “The 1896 treaty agreement between the Blackfeet tribe and the U.S., article 3 states, “it is agreed that in the employment of all agency and school employees, preference in all cases be given to Indians residing on the reservation, who are qualified for such positions” (p. 13).

Even though education had been a long-standing part of treaties, it was, however, usually determined to be part and parcel of the duty of American institutions and their duty to “civilize” Indians. The educational policies failed to take into considerations continuing past educational practices of the tribes which were seen as crucial to their survival as a sovereign and independent indigenous community. The Native American populations were also targeted by unscrupulous policy-making well-dressed in the form of providing them important “educational opportunity.” In 1874,

in order to “encourage” Indians to remain locked into the confined spaces of the reservations, a program was established that sought to “select” and place those most “disruptive” or recalcitrant segments of indigenous people in military styled schools which eventually led to the creation of the Federal Indian Boarding School system in the late 19th century. There was a devolution created in legislative directives that dissolved their unparalleled historic “sovereign” status compared with other colonized and enslaved populations, and ultimately left them as wards of the state. This was most apparent and began with the mass openings of boarding schools for indigenous children throughout the U.S. Juneau (2001) states that,

Education of young Indians began to come to the forefront in 1860 with the establishment of the first federal boarding school on the Yakima reservation in Washington. In 1879, the first off-reservation boarding school for Indians was established at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Chemawa Indian school in Oregon, Haskell institute in Kansas and Chilocco Indian School in Oklahoma were opened within the next five years” (p. 21).

It is important to note that although the federal government eventually took control of the task in dealing with establishing Indian educational policies after the missionary period, it eventually became a state issue, and, Cross (1999) states, “From the 1920s until the 1970s, federal laws and policies transferred control of Indian education from the federal government to the states and their public schools,” which caused even more differentiation and consternation amongst indigenous tribes, as there were many abusive ways in which states decided to approach managing their newly acquired “Indian problem” (p. 960-961).

Ward Churchill (2004) estimates that through torture, work, disease, weather and overall care at the residential schools that at minimum, thousands of children died.

And that doesn't scratch the surface with the damage done to the survivors. He contends with great passion that the atrocities are nothing short of genocidal in nature and scope citing the work of Dorothy K Clark (1954) in *Casualties as a Measure of Effectiveness of an Infantry Battalion*,

Taken, often by force, from their homes at ages as young as four, transported to facilities remote from their families and communities, confined there for a decade or more, relentlessly stripped of their cultural identities while being just as methodically indoctrinated to see their traditions and thus themselves through the eyes of their colonizers, chronically malnourished and overworked, drilled to regimental order and subjected to the harshest forms of corporal punishment, this was the lot of one in every two native youngsters in north American for five successive generations. Of those ushered into the steadily expanding system of residential schools, during its first forty years of more, about half did not survive the experience. In other words, roughly one-quarter of the American Indian population during the early twentieth century was physically destroyed by the process of schooling" (p. xviii).

It was believed that the states were themselves more in touch with the needs of its Indian population and could best serve their students' needs most effectively. In reality, most of the state efforts to "educate" its Indian students were disastrous to say the least and was highly influenced by the opportunity to benefit from federal funding. This in turn gave each individual state the control over all standards, policies, and methods utilized to educate Indian children and who was qualified to teach Indian students. The results were terrible schools conditions and neglect, which were explicitly present in the off-reservation boarding schools (Churchill, p. 21). In an attempt to capture the disregard for the wellbeing of Indian children, and those who were charged with "educating" them were not those who were most qualified,

interested necessarily in the project of colonialism nor empire building, yet these were the selection of those in charge of running such institutions, Churchill examines the work of Michel Foucault (1979) and Alice Miller (1983) to accentuate his point stating it is,

Worth noting too is the fact that for all their humanitarian veneer, the enlightened settler elite which advocated, implemented and maintained the system suffered no discernible qualms in hiring the very dregs of their society—sadists, pedophiles and the like to preside over the indigenous youngsters consigned to residential institutions (p. xviii). This awful reality, taken in combination with the normal techniques employed by school authorities to achieve the desired deculturation/reculturation of their charges, all but guaranteed that every student would suffer the effects of severe emotional trauma. Hence, the ubiquitous “residential school syndrome” creating self-nullification (p. xix). A sorrow shared in common by all who went through the residential schools. Either one knows the feeling or one does not. The reality we’ve thereby inherited is as it was meant by those who imposed it one of catastrophic dysfunction” (p. xxii).

From the time of contact, the initiative to break established tribal education traditions started as early as 1500s and lasted until at least 1871, which was signified by the ending of a treaty-making era between the United States government and Indian tribes. At that point, Indians were officially “involuntary minorities” and from that point on, faced the coercive nature of the government in its attempt to incorporate them into American society in a manner that the federal government saw appropriate. Churchill (2004) concludes that we must be honest about what was done and call it by its name in order to address the lingering effects of schooling for Indians from time served in residential schools and that it is impossible for those who implemented such a system of horror and torture to adequately also be in charge of fixing that which they broke and states,

For an offending government to sponsor which is to say control the very entity charged with investigating/chronicling/assessing the nature and extent of its misconduct constitutes so transparent a subterfuge as to be unworthy of further comment” (p. xxvi).

Historically oppressed groups that have suffered under the effects of colonial education must recognize this fact and be willing to do all in their power to not participate nor condone the reproduction of the unequal social relations in which these tragedies occurred, and continue to until this day.

African American Educational History

Educational institutions existence, purpose, and methods of operation often go unquestioned or critically interrogated beyond the academically accepted narratives, which at best frame them as simply one of many social institutions and are not considered as the primary mechanisms of imperial projects and weapons in efforts in support of enslavement, colonization and cultural genocide. Pamela Smith (1999) has laid bare what many have refused to acknowledge clearly and concisely, with regard to the history of education in American history with specific attention to its constitutional origins and beyond. Although her work has been significant in many ways, it still has not garnered the respect nor needed utilization in order to approach our current educational crisis. She goes on to state,

Few want to trace our current education problems to the past. Yet, the past holds us in its grips. Much of today can and should be explained with a clear view of the past in mind. Only by understanding and identifying these links with the past can we begin to understand that constitutionally supported slavery bred intractable racism, which bred de jure and de facto educational disenfranchisement of a people, which bred the modern subeducation of black children, and which has bred race/gender educational pedism (p.

2).

William H. Watkins, in *The White Architects of Black Education (2001)* examined the conditions in which formal Black education in America came to exist during a major transitional period for the country. As a result, new kinds of social arrangements were forming which were highly influenced by corporate philanthropists, who had an interest in how newly freed slaves would be incorporated into society (p.3). Derrick Bell (1987) contends that these conditions were also, and in my opinion, continue to be the essence of such negotiational conversations amongst whites in efforts to hold on to power and domination, “Consequently, the ability and willingness of American to sacrifice the rights of blacks has become a difficult to break pattern in the nation’s politics” (p. 32).

Therefore, the effort to educate blacks was much more than just teaching the basic elements of schooling to adults and children of color. Consequently, in the foundation of racialized education, the political framing of “appropriate” knowledge to be given to blacks through education played a major role in the process that would evolve to become the cornerstone of race relations for many years to come (Watkins, p. 6). In Watkins examination of the white architects of black education, he states despite the benevolent pledges of those whites in power who brokered what the educational path would look for newly freed peoples that ultimately, “They were political operatives as much as or more than educators and curricularists. Their

curriculum for accommodationist education evolved to be as much a primer for citizenship and obedience as for school subjects” (Watkins, p. 6).

Educational institutions have been one, if not the most important sites utilized in knowledge construction and organizing modern society, and were ideologically essential in obtaining mass consensus politically. Therefore, it is most important to understand the prevailing ideological goals of public schooling after the civil war, specifically when it came to the looming “Negro problem.” Smith (1999) makes a critical penetration into the accepted narrative of simply figuring out what to do with newly freed people. In actuality, freedom, and its unintended consequences actually forged a new sense of ownership that extended far beyond those who were actually slaveholders in the past and nationalized such feelings, and at the same time contributed to fueling a feeling of supremacy which was much more corrosive and states,

[After the Civil War], blacks in the mind of the nation were still slaves: non-persons to be treated with great disrespect, little recognitions, and great criminality. Only the master changed, becoming less individualized to being nationalized, that is whites as a group became the new enslaver under white supremacy (p. 11).

Blauner (1972) explained, that much like their European counterparts in their expansion period and efforts to address the immigrant influx, the U.S. government also had to plan for what to do about its minority populations, and “proper” education was the answer. Eventually, the concept of “morality,” which was inherently seen as a “white” trait, became a central theme associated with educating blacks and permeated

much of the literature used to indoctrinate blacks. Also Anderson, (1988) adds that, in an effort to maintain their subservient sociopolitical role after the slavery ended, much of the educational materials focused on topics such as “self-help,” because it was believed that blacks wouldn't, or were incapable to, do anything for themselves, unless prompted by whites, reinforcing long-held stereotypes about those of African descent, many which still are intact today.

After reconstruction, the effort of blacks to become more active participants in society was facilitated through the establishment of the Freedman's Bureau in 1868 (p. 19). From the very beginning, blacks have always received a separate and unequal education in America. Much of the early work to establish black education in the country was influenced by non-governmental agencies such as missionary societies and other civic-minded and philanthropic groups that had an investment in helping mold educational policy. Many of those organizations were well-funded and specifically promoted “race philanthropy and race curriculum,” which had an ideological impact on the framework for reform and policy-making, and are still present today. For example, Anderson (1988) states, “From the 1860s to 1915 certain (white philanthropic) groups were responsible for establishing more than 30 colleges that enrolled over 60% of the black students attending colleges” (19).

The opportunity to influence educational policy in America was ripe at the time for many of these philanthropic groups because of little, or in some cases, no

involvement by the local government in providing the most basic substantive assistance to the newly freed blacks. In a study conducted by Lindeman (1936), he found that between 1921 and 1930, “43% percent of all foundation gifts went to education, followed by 30% to health issues. Of the money earmarked for education, a significant amount went to higher education” (p. 21).

Many of the efforts by philanthropists were presented as assistance to ease the transition of newly emancipated blacks into a new social order. Nonetheless, their efforts were not designed to drastically change the racial foundation of the social hierarchy, meaning that blacks were still expected to remain in their designated place in society and act accordingly. These educational reforms were undoubtedly accommodationist at best in their orientation, in which any change in black social status was expected to be slow and gradual. These marginalized social positions forced them to become the source of cheap labor, ultimately benefiting corporate-industrialists, while at the same time, failing to disrupt the status quo in society. Bell (1992) reflects about the sincerity with which newly freed Blacks were granted and where truly lies the benefit for white society in doing so. In his eyes, Black freedom was the ultimate bargaining chip for those vying for the control of the future of the country and states,

As with the moral compromises in the Constitution, at the heart of the long-term liberty interests and civil rights of the enslaved, the newly freed enslaved, and the modern Black lies a condition. Blacks can only be free and equal if their rights are not bargained away. In essence, freedom, liberty and civil rights for Black people depends on whether they are cache for compromises and disputes between whites or whenever whites can obtain a benefit from the sacrifices of Blacks (p 158-94).

It has been well-documented that blacks had always embraced education through many long-standing efforts to self-educate. Troost (2006) states that,

Reports from the battlefields display this strong desire of freedman to become educated. Colored regiments continually requested spelling books and teachers to help them in their academic endeavors. In refugee camps, African Americans clamored for education and sought to read. Additionally literate blacks often aided in teaching others how to read and write, occasionally setting up makeshift schools. Freedman desired to read for political, economic, and spiritual reasons. Many army reports express an unbelievable enthusiasm for schooling on the part of the freedmen (p. 4).

However, the “benevolent” involvement of whites in the creation of an educational program was incomparable in committed resources from the government, which became central to formal policy creation, while the genuine interests of blacks and what they desired for themselves were heretofore excluded from the policy-oriented discussions. Again, although white investment in the formulation of black education was viewed then, and still today, as a strictly humanist endeavor, ultimately, it was part of political and economic projects to maintain the system of racial hierarchy and supremacy. This is exemplified by distinctly separate monetary funding, industrial management, and educational training that were committed to black education.

Black education in America has been central to the ways in which we have understood and approached the politics of the country's racial history. It also remains one of the most significant paths toward acceptable integration of blacks into society. It is important to properly situate the history of black education in America, if we are to make a serious and honest effort in resolving many of the socioeconomic

disparities that still linger, continue to plague, and perplex social scientists. The ruling “white” cultural values and knowledge formations that influenced early curriculum such as “conformity, obedience, sobriety, piety, and the values of enterprise” were fundamental to the accommodationist program, and was an extraordinary example of politically-constructed social engineering. If we are to move beyond these old ways of constructing educational policy for blacks, there must be an accurate accounting of its origins and missteps. In conclusion, Watkins (2001) states,

If we are to create new models of pedagogy and intellectual work and become architects of our own education, then we must not simply repair the structures that have been passed down to us. We need to dismantle the old architecture so that we might begin anew (xiii).

In *The Mis-Education of the Negro (1933)*, Dr. Carter G. Woodson examined the consequences of blacks being educated in the “white” American school system, and how such knowledge affected them psychologically and socially. Central to his thesis was the failure of the educational system to adequately represent and teach “negro” history. He found that most of the few historical references to blacks’ involvement and contributions globally, and in America, were relegated to slavery, and were derogatory in ways that cast blacks in a subordinate or sub-human light. As a result, Woodson contended that this state of affairs was tragically detrimental to the psyche of blacks, and that the direct outcome was “brain-washing” of young black children in ways that made them feel inadequate and inferior. Additionally, he

believed that this intentional neglect of African-American history distorted their heritage and deprived black children of a past, and ultimately a future.

Woodson was adamant in his concerns for the children of the black race and how they were affected by such an educational system and imposed curriculum. With great foresight, he posited that the conscious exclusion of African-American participation as builders of societies, and their history of resistance and opposition to end American would negatively impact the ways in which young black students would understand themselves historically and currently, contributing to the development of “deep-seated insecurities, intra-racial cleavages, and interracial antagonisms,” which would affect any liberatory efforts blacks would take up in the future. Smith (1999), still in agreement with Carter very accurately surmises that even with the advancements made from the struggles over time that,

The current miseducation of Black children cannot be properly understood unless one realizes that the past educational disenfranchisement continued unabated from slavery, through segregation, through desegregation and through all other attempts to equalize the education of Black children with that of white children. Indeed, we cannot properly discuss the myth of separate but equal education without realizing that educational equality was and is a myth (p. 13).

Part of his efforts to bring these concerns to light and fill the gaping void resulted in him founding the Association for the Study of the Negro Life and History, and establishment of the Journal of Negro History. Many of Woodson's contributions were taken up literally by students in the 1960s, and were the impetus for reforms that took place within many educational institutions, disciplines, and departmental

curricula which sought new knowledges as foundational for engendering self-determination and self-identification.

Woodson, like Dubois, believed that black youth needed a “special” education based on “different” foundations as a counter-measure to the negative racialized-indoctrination which he claimed they were subjected to, in the “white” educational system. He contended that this effort would serve the purpose of “nullifying,” or at least “diminish” the impact of a propagandized white version of black's involvement in history and knowledge creation, assisting in raising the black child's self-esteem and embolden their self-knowledge. Interestingly, in his study, Woodson came to the somewhat prophetic conclusion that the educational systems in both America and Europe were both inadequate and didn't do blacks or whites justice by way of providing an education grounded historically in truth and built on social justice. Woodson's efforts were paramount in an ongoing struggle to counter the long-held institutionalized belief that blacks were inferior and incapable of learning. His exploration of how blacks were being mis-educated in America provided a foundation upon which many progressive educational reformists and critical theorists interested in knowledges formations have continued to build. Despite such advancement in scholarship influenced by theoretical conceptions provided by Carter and others, Berry and Blassingame (1987) connects the legacy, and in many ways the failure of actions to break the prophetic cycle described by Carter remain destructive and underserve blacks and state,

While the educational disenfranchisement of Blacks is atrocious in and of itself, the failure of the public school system to provide Black children with basic reading skills is particularly harmful. And, it is the inability of Black children today to achieve a basic reading level by graduation from high school that links their futures with the reality of those who were enslaved in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. After all, in order to ensure that many slaves remained acquiescent to the institution of slavery, many were precluded from reading and learning how to read (p. 24).

Barbara Cottman Becnel (1993) adamantly demonstrates that the programs for training blacks still have a deleterious effect and place in the modern school system, “In addition to not attaining basic reading levels as children, pre-teens and high school seniors, Black children also do not achieve satisfactory levels in history, geography, and math” (p. 92-4).

Latino/a Educational History

When studying the history of education in the United States, it is generally agreed upon across disciplinary boundaries that its purpose was to serve several key goals: to create an informed citizenry, assimilation of immigrants both culturally and linguistically, and to many the most important, a development of a reliably educated workforce that would continue to be the engine of the American economy. Of particular importance, in congruence with the other goals of education in the US, immigration issues were, and have remained at the forefront, since the U.S. is a nation built on immigration. However, this component, while fashioned and historicized as a similar process for most minority groups in general, has also been complex and hidden in ways that produced many disparate histories and outcomes. For this section, I focus on “Latino” American's continuous fight for equitable schooling prior to and

after the establishment of the US as a nation, and how their inclusion and exclusion, despite the promise of equal treatment under the law, has always been based solely and sometimes in conjunction with land of origin, territory, language and skin color.

Scholarship which addresses educational history in the US differs on the time and context in which the educational interaction began between Latinos and Europeans, which is often confused with the many historical staggering waves of Latino subgroups that also makeup part of that history. Rachel Moran (1997), most succinctly explains the problematics of documentation of the history of the Latino/as struggle for social justice and educational equality,

Certainly, some of this gap in coverage can be attributed to the existing sociolegal frameworks, which do not fully account for the past and present experiences of Latinos/as, students or otherwise. For example, the civil rights paradigm, which focuses on eliminating the Black/White racial disparity and the legacy of slavery through the development or enforcement of legal rights, is one obvious choice for making sense of the experience of a non-White racial/ethnic group in the United States (p. 77-78).

Douglas Massey (1993), complicates this notion by stating,

Yet, this paradigm is an ill fit because Latinos/as' history and present experiences differ from African Americans' in several material ways - not only because of the importance of language to Latinos/as experiences of immigration, but also because race has a different meaning for many Latinos/as than it does for African Americans (453-54).

Cristina Rodriguez (2009), concludes that,

That said, perhaps the immigration/assimilation paradigm would be a better fit: it takes a long-term view of U.S. history and examines how various European immigrant

groups rose in status and wealth. However, this paradigm, too, is inadequate because a presumption of foreignness which often plagues Latinos/as does not attach to the White ethnic groups from Europe, which historically have constituted the bulk of the U.S. immigrant population. Thus, these existing paradigms are not a good fit for analyzing Latinos/as' experiences because, in the first instance, Latinos/as are not other Blacks, and in the second instance, they are not other Whites (p. 41, 43).

For sure, the contact with Europeans in the 16th century demarcates the beginning of such interaction and through various geopolitical forms of relations such as war, colonization and annexation. This is even often more conflated with the ethnic history of Latino/as which is complex as well. Officially, the group defined as Latinos has a mixed history which includes, but are not exclusive to, a mix of Europeans, indigenous populations and Africans which eventually coalesced into what now is considered definitively “Latino.”

From the beginning of contact, the establishment of mission schools by Europeans has always represented to many Latinos the primary conduit for goals of “cultural and linguistic genocide.” Much can also be said about the similarities between the histories of institutionalization of education for Native Americans as well. The dual efforts of the mission schools were “educating the savages” and “saving their souls,” and those rhetoric’s were openly synonymous with the colonial mission of schooling for the European conquerors to totally assimilate “savages” into civilization. Victoria-María MacDonald (1987) captures this sentiment best and states,

Consequently, education for this group was increasingly viewed negatively as reflected in the Spanish colonial dicho (saying), *mestizo educado*, *mestizo colorado* (an educated

mestizo is a red devil)” (p. 208).

Despite the lofty goals of schooling such as equity and imparting a democratic citizenship-based education, schools have always been sites of political struggles for Latinos, as both immigrants and colonized groups in engaging with the dominant majority population of whites or Europeans. In this continuing struggle for equity and humanity within educational institutions, Latinos have always utilized many options, communally, private educational options, and unbeknownst to many, numerous litigation efforts that have affected legislation with regard to equal education under the law, despite numerous nefarious non-litigated efforts by local, state, and federal-level interventions to defeat such victories. Williamson, Rhodes, and Dunson (2007), conclude often the histories are not simply due to inadequate records being kept, but instead that they were not being kept “officially” at all, despite the rich and varied historical efforts and state, “Records about Latinos/as’ struggles for equality and equity stretch back in time, but it is not until the early twentieth century that we have records of the formal discrimination against Latinos/as in public schools” (p. 199).

Like most groups that have struggled to come from under slavery and colonization, when Mexico won its independence from Spain, the disappearance of educational options, once the purveyance of the victors of war and their conquering efforts, also disappeared. Many of the educational reforms under newly independent regions struggled mightily and resulted in many ways being dependent in one form or another on the presence and willingness of the legacy of the many religious

institutions. These religious establishments previously played a much larger formal role in educational endeavors, especially the Catholic Church.

Eventually, the intertwined and complex history of the Catholic Church and the more secularized versions of education desired by Mexico emerged in the Southwest immediately after acquisition of Texas from Mexico following the Mexican American War and American annexation of Texas in 1845. The U.S. government considered that education by the newly independent Mexican state and its population was undervalued and ultimately had a negative impact on the ways in which the reform movement of the protestant church involved themselves with those of Mexican heritage during the mid-19th century in Texas.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 finally gave the U.S. government undisputed control of Texas and Southwestern territories, including California, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. Formally Mexican citizens were now subjected to newly imposed colonial educational policies and institutions. During the great depression, many campaigns of aggressive “Americanization” were waged to pressure already disliked and othered Mexican-Americans to repatriate due to what many described as culture clashes during the advent of the common school era, which Mexican-Americans understood to be a continuation of an assault on their heritage, and thereby should have been protected under the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This era of assault brought about more politically astute and matured challenges by Mexican-Americans as litigants in the state courts to contest the idea of public schools as the primary institutions for Americanization and religious

reformers, which ultimately Mexican-Americans lost after many decades of resistance and compromise. Many of the struggles and policies in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were differentiated based on the local viability of the Mexican population and their legacy in the area, especially in new states such as Texas and California, which had more experience with the rapid expansion and intolerance by newly arriving settlers to the west. In more rural areas and less “settled” by Europeans, those of Mexican heritage had more political and economic power and often educationally became bilingually and culturally more advanced over time. Fry and Gonzalez (2008) note that this historical geographically important trend continues to influence patterns of immigration, population and centers of educational struggle by noting,

The Latino/a population has been growing throughout the United States. In part, this growth has occurred in states with already large, established Latino/a populations: Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas. These nine "established" Latino/a states enroll roughly three-fourths of all Latino/a students in the United States (p. 15).

In light of the consistent efforts by its bilingual and cultural citizens to hold on to American and Mexican culture and language simultaneously, Texas, in 1856 and 1858, the Common School Law of 1854, legalized the following amendment, which stated that, “No school shall be entitled to the [monetary] benefits of this act unless the English language is principally taught therein” (p. 998-999).

This amendment wasn't singularly targeted at Mexican citizens, and was also an effort to quell the growing animus for the German population. However, it was

ultimately the Mexican citizens who would suffer most harshly, due to their desire to hold on to their heritage and also inability like the Germans to eventually benefit from the social and cultural accommodation and acculturation, and the benefits and opportunities afforded to them due to their applicability to the ideal of “whiteness” and all of its privileges (p 18).

Unlike the history of other “minority” groups, and also other ethnic Latino groups, and the way in which they were incorporated into American society and educational institutions, the development of a Mexican-American middle-class evolved in the southwest afforded them an amount of political and economic autonomy and power that provided opportunities unavailable to others, prior to what historians now call the era of civil rights. Between the years of 1920-1940, the development of social, legal, and civil organizations along with philanthropic efforts focused on educational rights of their children on issues such as language differences, had always been a primary issue within their overall political and cultural struggles, and segregation (p.42). Therefore, the issue of “special language needs” was always at the forefront of Mexican Americans’ colonial struggles and was an important local, regional, and national educational agenda in the Southwest (p. 43).

Latinos engaged in numerous lawsuits during the 1920s and 30s, which originated from local community efforts and while most were unsuccessful, demonstrated the savvy and more importantly, the priority which education was held within the Mexican-American culture. Education had always been a point of

contention as understood and reported historically by those studying educational history through the lens of their European counterparts in such matters. Additionally, many of their challenges to the prevailing law were situated constitutionally which were, and continue to be, a major part of the ongoing debate about education within the country, although often overlooked by scholarship exploring educational history of the United States and its varying ethnic groups. For example,

Victoria-María MacDonald (2004) states,

During the late 1800s until World War I, college participation in the US among all adults was a small (less than 5%) proportion of the entire population. Among the elite classes of Tejanos, Californios, and Hispanos in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the sons and daughters of the elite (but downwardly mobile) classes often attended private Catholic Colleges. These schools represented a smooth continuity with the Spanish language, culture (sex segregation, for example), and religion distinct from the public universities emerging during this era. Many of these Catholic colleges started first as academies to provide high school preparation before students reached collegiate status and accreditation. The most prominent include Santa Clara College in San Jose, California (1851); Saint Michael's College in Santa Fe, New Mexico (1859), chartered again in 1874 as the College of the Christian Brothers of New Mexico; Notre Dame College in San Jose, California (1868); and Our Lady of the Lake in San Antonio, Texas (1895) (p. 313).

During the era of legal segregation, there was a unique development within the context of schooling, which was the impetus for formalized teacher training. These schools used to be called junior colleges and now are community colleges, which educated many Mexican-Americans. The first in the Midwest in 1901 and eventually spread across the country because of the low cost, close proximity to home-worlds, and the strong desire to retain their historical and cultural heritage. Mexican Americans were mildly successful in their collaborative efforts and received strong support from the local Mexican American communities.

For the most part of Mexican and Mexican-American interactions with Europeans were the only Spanish speaking groups encountered. This would change after the Mexican-American war of 1845-1848, which would usher in the first “subgroup” of ethnic Latinos into the rubric of American life and politics. The acquisitions of Puerto Rico and Cuba by the U.S. government following the Spanish-American war in 1898 would forever change the ways in which Latinos were seen and accepted. Bowman (2010) states that,

This also is beginning to change due to recent immigration and migration patterns discussed above. While the geographic distance among national origin groups may be more obvious, the social distance among these groups is less visible, but at least as strong. Montoya and Valdes (2007), state that, “As the Latino/a population grows, the differences both between and within Latino/a subgroups become ever more apparent.” Wellman and Sigelman (2009), additionally confirm that while, “The largest Latino/a sub-groups - people with Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban heritages - often have little or no contact with one another (p. 8).

The new acquisition of the formally Spanish territories deeply influenced immigration policies in ways that were not characteristic of Mexican Americans history of negotiations, treaties, and political “cooperation.” Although, to this day, Puerto Rico continues to remain a commonwealth of the United States, Cuba did claim its independence after the Cuban Revolution in 1959. However, because of the ways in which educational policy has been constructed around the ideologies which pervaded immigration and colonization, “English-only” policies still remain the main focus of importance of colonial educational programs. And more perversely, because these immigrants and newly acquired “citizens” of Puerto Rico were darker-skinned, many of them were streamlined into historical black colleges such as Tuskegee and

Hampton, furthering isolation and cultural decimating practices. Even though Puerto Ricans were not seen and treated like the Mexican-American population, they still had the advantage through pseudo-citizenship to travel and work back and forth in their homeland unlike other groups whose lands were legally confiscated by the U.S. government. They enjoyed a minimal amount of cultural autonomy even while under the “colonial” rulership of the U.S. From the mainland.

The historical context in which Latino educational policy has been formed in the United States has always been, and continues to be complex. The relations, which founded these conditions, were under subjugation, colonization, and litigious maneuvering that allowed the segregation of Latino students for over a century, despite their efforts to remain connected to their heritage at all costs. Unfortunately, when addressing issues of education within the Latino community, it is often couched in language that is specifically “immigrant-based” even though the majority of today’s Latino population were born in the continental United States. Reardon, Yun, and Eitle (2000) propose that,

Although general demographic changes are not always reflected precisely in the public schools, understanding communities' demographic changes can help school districts, advocates, and parents develop a more nuanced understanding of the racial/ethnic isolation in particular school districts and work to address this isolation (p. 352-53).

Bowman (2010) surmises that,

Latinos/as' struggle for educational opportunity is multifaceted. The piece of this struggle perhaps most obvious to many non-Latinos/as in the United States is English

language instruction, and indeed it is a crucial part of any comprehensive discussion about Latino/a educational equity (p. 19).

The ways in which the history of Latino/as struggle has been framed continues to be more complicated by the quest for subgroups legitimization legally and culturally and therefore influencing the ensuing debates and legal action aimed at contesting the historical segregation based simply on language, which ultimately end up convoluted with proper pedagogical perspectives and practices that can be effectively implemented for the inevitable drastic change demographically which already is in motion. The demographic tsunami that is upon the country cannot ignore the forecast of need for drastic change in the ways in which we address the needs of the new population of students and continue to force unsubstantiated and unproven methods of “education” upon them. Bowman (2010) illustrates the importance of becoming prepared for the dramatic shift in the student population and reminds us that,

Today, Latinos/as constitute the largest group of non-White public school students in the United States. We cannot ignore the substantial educational challenges and substandard educational experiences which continue to plague so many of these students (p. 24). Under-education of the Latino/a population will only continue to become one of the most prescient issues that we as a country face.

Asian and Pacific Islander Educational History

The history of Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders' (APIs) education in the

United States presents an arduous task to say the least. Although there have been differences in the ways that each ethnically different group has been “incorporated” into American society, each is nuanced in ways that all have been exclusionary on both a global and local scale. Each experienced segregation from white students, and at times from schooling all together. Wilma Chan notes (1987),

Our early history in education was one of total exclusion. The first Asian immigrants were not even allowed to attend public schools. When the early Chinese protested, they were finally allowed to attend "separate but equal" schools just like the discriminatory treatment of Blacks in the South (<http://www.apimovement.com/book/export/html/535>).

Due to historical and legal complexities of different agendas within the immigrant population of Asians, it requires a nuancing which explores many groups and the ways in which policymakers have addressed educational efforts in relation to student and parental language differences, homeland tradition, political global standing, and entrancing economic and prior educational status. Yet and still, all of these together historically have typically only been addressed with such broad strokes that there still has yet to be a definitive and accurate accounting of Asian-American educational history. It is noteworthy in an attempt to adequately gauge the diversity of Asian Americans is that at one time or another, Asians were, depending on the place and time in their history in the united states have been designated as both black and white through a series of court cases. Nevertheless, they were still discriminated against in each instance.

Although the development of public education in America was part of the struggle for a democratic society and equality for all, Asian Americans were historically denied access to education due to them being restrained and confined to a relationship legally constructed and defined as a temporary immigrant labor pool. Therefore, many of their rights and access to education were convoluted with their status as temporary laborers. Asians from the very beginning of their time in North America faced discrimination as they were a critical aspect of developing the nations rail systems, national mining efforts, fishing, farming, and both on the mainland and in Hawaii as well. All the while being treated with disdain and forced to live in dehumanizing conditions. An example of the legal supported prejudice and racism she also speaks to the rigorous efforts by the government to continue to discriminate against Asians and finds,

In the legislative area alone, between 1880 and 1924, fourteen discriminatory laws were passed that kept Chinese and other Asian nationalities in a second class status. The restrictions imposed against Asian Americans as a people became a necessary part of superexploiting our labor. It is within this context that the first Asian immigrants fought for educational opportunities as one way to fight superexploitation and gain greater control over their lives (<http://www.apimovement.com/book/export/html/535>).

Educational inequity was always a part of the Asian immigration experience. And despite being in an environment which despised because of their language, culture, and enduring the stigma of drug users and purveyors (NEA, 2008), 1884 became a pivotal year for them and their foray into the legal system to acquire equal-protection under the law in *Tape v. Hurley* (NEA, 2008). Most astutely they brought a suit

against the San Francisco board of education in defiance of the legal right that an American born citizen, although of Asian immigrant parents, was denied the opportunity to attend a school in the district. J. Soo (2006) highlights that even though many children of immigrants were indeed born in the country many institutions in conflict with the law of land intentionally on the state and local levels undermined or ignored the letter and spirit of the law and proceeded with discriminatory practices,

Joseph and Mary Tape brought a legal action challenging the refusal of the Spring Valley Elementary School to admit their daughter, Mamie, born and raised in the United States. At the time, San Francisco Board of Education policy expressly prohibited ethnic Chinese children from attending the city's public schools. The California Constitution even went so far as to declare Chinese to be "dangerous to the well-being of the state (p. 1).

Eventually the lawsuit was won but instead of following the ruling of the court, the San Francisco board of education reopened a separate school for ethnic Chinese again, which they had previously outlawed as a way to circumvent the ruling and continue with discriminatory practices.

This was only the beginning of such legal challenges that Chinese immigrants fought. They continued, like many other minority groups to utilize the legal system as one, but as one of the most effective strategies of their struggle for equality in all aspects of their lives beyond simply education. Many immigrants saw America as their new, but adopted home and fought diligently to participate as such even though the laws were constructed as anti-Asian and against them gaining the full privileges of citizenship for the adults, but especially against their children.

Many of the historical struggles of the Chinese and Asian and Pacific islanders in general are often framed as many colonial histories are of oppressed groups, but specifically in their case as being passive victims. But their legal and social struggles, especially in the areas of citizenship and full access to education prove otherwise. They directly confronted the government through their efforts and set precedents which laid foundation for many other actions aimed at dismantling discrimination, prejudice and racism for citizens and non-citizens with immigrant status. Their concerns and contributions were wide-ranging.

From 1941-1945, a very dark and often ignored, overlooked and shameful time in American history, much of the literature on the history and efforts for equality of Asian Americans is, and remains to be silent on due to the WWII and instead, generally focuses on the illegal incarceration of Japanese Americans alone. However, after this period, much of the xenophobia exemplified in immigration laws were relaxed against Asians. Eileen H. Tamura (2001) notes,

In recognition of China as an ally of the United States during the war, Congress in 1943 repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act and allowed immigrant Chinese residents to apply for citizenship. This action was followed in 1952 with the McCarran-Walter Act partly influenced by the heroic efforts of Japanese American soldiers during the war which allowed Japanese and other Asians to apply for naturalization. During this period, immigration restrictions were loosened, and mainly Chinese and Japanese entered the United States (p. 60).

After the passing of the 1965 Immigration Act and global action or inaction by the United States faced with the remnants of colonialism and imperialism and its legacies of civil war, religious and political persecution, unimaginable poverty

created the conditions for which many consider the unforeseen influx of immigrants from Asia, Chinese, Korean, Asian Indians, Filipinos, Vietnamese, and southeast Asian groups searching for refuge and a better life for themselves and especially their children, migrated to the United States forever changing what had for so long only been a predominately Chinese and more recently Japanese presence. Due to the small population and ethnic representation of the diversity of Asians in the country, much of the history of immigration only focuses on Europeans and therefore creating a devastatingly vacuous gap in the experiences of the children of Asian immigrants and the diverse scope of their presence and experience was more than just labor and ultimately assimilation into American society. This linear approach is a critical hurdle when examining Asian-American educational history, you are overloaded with either the immigration narrative of the Chinese or the internment and resilience of the Japanese-Americans, the rest of the Asian immigrant and American-born population falls silent in the literature. This is in and of itself, a part of the colonizing nature of American educational institutions.

The analysis of the history and tradition of American immigration has typically concentrated solely on Europeans, who were also at times all considered to be the same, and at the same time excluded Asians. It is this omission that when focused on by scholars or taught in educational institutions that the term “immigrant” tends to be synonymous with European. Asian-Americans have lived in the United States for over 150 years with staggering influx and all with different challenges. This has been true Chinese and Asian-Indians since the 1850s, the Japanese since the late

19th century and Koreans and Filipinos since the early 20th century. However, Roger Daniels (1997) noted that,

Historians and other students of our immigrant past became used to writing off Asian immigration as an aberration. In addition, many, perhaps most, of the historians of immigration wrote about their own ethnic groups, and, even today, all but a handful of historians of immigration are Euro-Americans with a propensity to identify the immigrant past with Europe. Perhaps the literary scholar Lisa Lowe puts it best when she identifies a persistent motif in American culture, the notion that Asian Americans are "perpetual immigrants" or "foreigners within" (p. 14).

Total exclusion and segregation was the norm for Asian American students in the educational system until the 1950s. However, their eventual inclusion, also part of the efforts of overall integration movements in society also changed the nature and relationship of Asian Americans' education experiences. The access that they fought for exposed them to the ideology of racism as curriculum and the misrepresentation and in many cases omission of other minority groups as well as their own in the nation. Wilma Chan (1987) reminds us that,

During the same period, Chinese children were punished for speaking their native tongue, just like Chicano children in the Southwest were punished for speaking Spanish. Although we had a legacy of one hundred years in this country, our history had been written off as unimportant and our contributions were hidden to prevent a questioning of the racism and discrimination practiced against our people (<http://www.apimovement.com/book/export/html/535>).

It isn't until the 1960s the uprisings that followed that we find any sort of substantive accounting of Asian American educational history as a result of their activism to equal and specifically higher education as the generational shift allowed many children of immigrants the opportunity to go to college. This also coincided with the

efforts of civil rights movements with African Americans, Chicanos, and other minority groups challenging the very core of systemic racism which they endured, as well as, their experiences in educational institutions forced change in policies, and demanded a curriculum providing an education that was inclusive and respectful of minorities' histories. Chan (1987) goes further and states,

Particularly important was the demand for ethnic studies programs which, for the first time, taught Asian Americans and other minorities the truth about the contributions and struggles of our people as well as exposed the racism and oppression of the capitalist system. The awareness of Asian American history and culture and the forging of a positive national identity was an important step in bringing many young Asian Americans into the communities to learn firsthand the conditions of national oppression and to make the commitment to fight for social change (<http://www.apimovement.com/book/export/html/535>).

One of the most critical legal cases that still has an impact today for all immigrants and their children, no matter ethnic or racial designation is the case of Lau vs. Nicols 1974 which clarified the argument against separate and equal education for non-English speaking students and determined that bilingual education was necessary and legal. However, as many strides in the right direction to equitably educate all children, often systemic adjustments are made which take two steps backward as a result. An example of this is the backlash which took place in 1977 and sought to dismantle the gains of Affirmative Action in the Bakke decision and claims of "reverse discrimination" and worked to eliminate bilingual education and ethnic studies programs.

Much of their efforts focused on the inclusion of Asian American studies

along with the ethnic studies and multicultural movement. It is this demand for inclusion which then begins to characterize Asian American educational history and paves the way for the next two decades of the increased visibility and inclusion into curriculum and courses, but also in the development of departments. Directory of Asian American Studies Programs reveals that, “In 1999, at least forty-three colleges and universities in the United States had Asian American programs, and another twelve offered courses on Asian Americans (1999). These were some of the major accomplishments that came from efforts an implementation of Affirmative Action which provided access to both educational as well as occupational mobility and allowed many Asian Americans to gain admission into universities. Asian American enrollment rates in colleges and universities increased rapidly in the 1970s and 1980s thereby reflected a broader demographic growth. However there was even more backlash and unintended consequences according to Chan (1987),

The most insidious attack on the educational rights of Asian Americans, however, has been the Model Minority Myth which was used to cover over the continuing discrimination against Asian Americans, fan up increased racial hatred against our people, and divide us from Blacks, Chicanos and other minorities who are our best allies in fighting for our rights (<http://www.apimovement.com/book/export/html/535>).

This has led even the most empathetic scholarship to minimize the continuous struggles of other newly-arriving Asian immigrants such as the Vietnamese or Cambodians because other ethnic groups now have generational and educational history here in the United States perhaps the most commonly invoked accounts of Asian American success in the late 1960s were those that cast Asian Americans

collectively as a "model minority." This stereotype, which sought to divide people of color solidarity in collective struggle and invoke ideas about American individualism, meritocracy and exceptionalism and rooted in the protestant work ethic which promoted the idea that Asians are more hard working than other groups and has a history that dates back to the 1800s when the discussion was not about educational attainment, but labor and management of a group of people, therefore, they get what they deserve. Sharon S. Lee (2008) critically examining the history of such practices of division of labor and the history of immigration notes,

Reconstruction Journalists of that era praised Chinese immigrants in contrast to freed slaves in the South and Irish immigrants in the North. Such messages divided the labor force along racial lines and fueled anti-Chinese sentiment, particularly among Whites (p. 135).

The model minority image isn't new and only diminishes the struggles of other groups and ignores current prejudice and discrimination. One scholar deftly captures the continuance of inadequate scholarship devoted to the Asian American educational experience and the diverse ways in which they should be approached, while at the same time, calling the educational history, its effects, and goals for what they are and states,

Today we continue to unveil the catastrophes of differential and separate educational experiences through the history of Asian immigration in and host of under-research disparities. Many claim that a new era of global education due to past and current immigration has eased the pogroms executed through the legacy of separate and still unequal educational policies which covertly still promote whiteness through conformity equaling success. An ideology based on the mythology of meritocracy. An American education is still seen as "the" primary road to success by immigrants arriving today.

The majority of Asian Americans not a part of the model minority stereotype continue to suffer from being under-educated and daily face the stigma of immigration and the foreignness attached to it, while at the same time, villainized and pit against other minority groups for their proportional success in higher education which is not representative of the many groups and experiences which compose the racial category of API, more than 70% of Asian Americans are working class and still continue to have limited options despite the progress of some members of their groups succeeding. Today, just when Asian Americans are touted as the model minority, they are also along with other non-white immigrant groups, having educational rights rolled back by "English-only" laws and serves as a constant reminder to all newly arriving APIs that the United States still seeks to force accommodation through stripping away language from communities which serve as ties to their cultural heritage.

Chapter 5

Learning to Teach and Teaching to Learn

Teacher Education Programs

In order for significant and transformative change to occur and be lasting in our educational system, the role of teachers in that change must become more of a central focus and receive the necessary support that historically has not been given much attention, or has eluded most teachers who attempt to make such a change and have an impact through individual efforts. According to Nickse (1973), little attention

has been paid in the literature in analyzing the role of the teacher as an active agent of social change, and schools of education have avoided, and I would add, incapable of properly preparing teachers for any other role than an academic one. The traditional role of teachers in educational settings has been narrowly, and simultaneously loosely defined by prescribed functions and work-related tasks involved in a simple certification process in most states. Additionally, the social status of the teacher has historically remained at the bottom of the institutional hierarchy in the educational pecking order and continues to receive less critical attention and focus. Teachers would benefit greatly by developing their critical consciousness's to understand the origins of and how social institutions and systems such as schools operate within society in order to make lasting change while being a crucial participants within educational settings. Nevertheless, it is rather unlikely that traditionally trained teachers can develop their critical consciousness and function as change agents. They often see the social challenges that affect the learning environment within the schools they work as being beyond their control. Teachers have historically been excluded from the decision making process about their students and schools and most of the issues and concerns typically end up remaining the purview of researchers and politicians. According to Fullan (1993), how teachers are trained and the ways that schools are organized, there exist an educational hierarchy that maintains the status quo and continues to be adversely affected by political decisions that all contribute to the keeping in place an inequitable institutional system. One way out of this quandary is for teacher education programs to make explicit the goals and skills of change

agency and to provide teachers with the skills to be successful in such efforts. To make this change a reality there needs to be a new conception of teacher professionalism that integrates what some scholars have called a “moral purpose and change agency,” one that works simultaneously on individual and institutional development. Currently teacher education is not geared toward achieving either of these goals that have proved to be effective.

One of the most glaring omissions in teacher education programs is the inability or unwillingness of teacher educators to model the kinds of behaviors and actions that espouse and seek to instill in their students. In general, faculty members involved in teacher education programs have been teaching and advocating pedagogical praxis for teachers or schools that they themselves have not engaged in, in any meaningful and lasting way. Faculties of education programs also continue to be deficit in navigating and negotiating effectively institutional mechanisms for improving their own teaching praxis. There is a need to redesign programs in ways that develop beginning teachers’ knowledge-base for effective teaching and institutional improvement in ways that counter the conditions that have continued to adversely affect teacher candidates, despite some changes made in improving the moral status of teachers simply through exposure to literature (Fullan, 1993).

The need for a new paradigm for teacher professionalism should be able to synthesize the importance of moral purpose along with the ability to nurture and

develop the tools for effectively going forth with a commitment to change agency as a core component of teaching. Cochran-Smith (1991) has stated that in most pre-service programs, “the role of the teacher as an agent for change is not emphasized, and students are not deliberately socialized into assuming responsibility for school reform and renewal” (p.285). Instead, student teachers have a tendency to focus on technical rather than critical or epistemological aspects of teaching. Gay suggests (2010) that shifts in the ideological orientations and actions of most teacher education programs require strong commitments to cultural diversity that must exceed anything that has been accomplished before.

In order to change practice in significant and worthwhile ways, Smylie (1995) suggests that teachers must not only grow intellectually and learn new subject matter and pedagogical techniques, but they also must be more focused on tending to in their own culturally engrained beliefs and practice, that makes the theories they embrace action-oriented and transformative. More teacher education programs are including the subject of cultural diversity in their curricula (Banks & Banks, 2004; Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Grant et al., 2004; Sleeter, 2001; Trent et al., 2008). However, according to Gay (2010) the program for promoting cultural diversity has been not as successful in significant ways as expected. Teacher education programs have recognized and have attempted to address the growing challenge of preparing a predominately white, middle-class, and female teaching force to work with an increasingly diverse population of students. As a result, here has been an

acknowledgment of the necessity to engage white teachers in diversity programs, in which they must examine their experiences and critically assess how they are affected by issues of gender and power and how it affects their teaching practices (Darling-Hammond, 2002, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Sleeter, 2008). Some research according to Garmon (2004) contends that diversity courses have affected positively students' racial attitudes. However, there have been other reports with little or no change. It is important to note that even after "diversity-focused" coursework and fieldwork are incorporated into the teaching curriculum, some pre-service teachers may still be emotively unprepared to work with racial minority and low-income students (Sleeter, 2001).

In order for substantive changes to be made, teacher practice is of utmost importance, and not just what they do in the classroom, but also outside of the classroom, specifically, how they engage with issues that are most critical within the community that they teach in. Hagiwara and Wray (2009) suggests that students interested in urban teaching need to critically assess and deconstruct current institutional and personal practices in order to make more significant and well thought out connections with the realities of urban schooling. This includes the kinds of critical and reflective immersion of students into urban schooling experiences that connects their own coursework to the real-life challenges that they will inevitably be confronted with when attempting to teach, and more importantly reach, the students and communities they are to serve. Teacher education programs have attempted to

embrace the internship model, but often they failed to effectively develop an explicit “collective vision” that was congruent with the goals of the teachers who actually commit to teaching in urban settings. Within educational programs there continues to be a lack of clarity and vision about the meaning and practice of teaching to achieve social justice, and not succumbing to the disingenuous program of survival within an unequal system, rooted in historical accommodationist ideology. Teacher education programs nationwide must send a clear message that social justice is the foundational goal of a truthful and redemptive “American” education, and not an addendum to teacher’s pedagogical strategy or educational curriculum.

Besides training teachers to learn to become more culturally “aware” and diverse in their practices, teacher education programs themselves have long been behind the curve when practicing what they preach. According to Ladson-Billings (2005), there existed a gap in much of the literature on diversity, and teacher education remained silent on the pervasive nature of cultural homogeneity that was typical of teacher education faculty around the country. Teacher educators have been and continue to be predominantly white, and as a result, are often even more disconnected than the students they teach when it comes to the critical understanding of social reality surrounding the students, families and communities of color struggle for an equitable educational system, but more importantly, their struggle for justice in all aspects of their daily lives. Therefore, the same uncritical teaching environments and practices are being reproduced by white teacher educators and programs who

have been charged with preparing the new predominately white teacher population, who in turn are supposed to educate children of color (Grant & Gillette, 1987). The cyclical nature of reproducing uncritical teachers continues to subvert any strategies for achieving social justice in our educational institutions and beyond.

Thompson (2003), a white teacher educator noted, “We often write and talk as if racism and whiteness were problems we could solve through pedagogy” (p.10). Sleeter (2001) points out that teacher education programs have often been criticized for providing “disjointed multicultural content” that is more reflective of the intellectual and/or political interests of teacher educators themselves, rather than consciously and intentionally addressing the reality of the urban educational situation, and the dire circumstances that most schools and students of color find themselves in. Fullan goes on to state that “[T]eaching, at its core, is one of a moral profession...and teachers must combine the mantle of moral purpose with the skills of change agency” (p. 1 & 2). Murrell (2002), suggests that one way that some teacher education programs have attempted to address the disconnect between the expected instructional and pedagogical role of teachers and community needs are through programs of immersion for students who desire to teach in urban schools is to assist them in developing “a situated understanding of people and principles of cultural diversity” (p.17). The immersion program is focused on preparing teachers not only for the mechanics of developing the necessary skills in their occupation, but also the collaborative engagement of social praxis directly with the people they will serve.

In order to become effective agents of social change, teachers must be properly trained, consistently encouraged, and ultimately supported to commit to and remain career-long learners in developing cultural competencies and understandings of anti-racist pedagogy. This must inform their practice and their development of educational opportunities for students and their families, and communities at large. Pohan (1996) has found that potential teachers who have more cross-cultural experience are more likely to develop favorable personal and professional feelings about people with diverse backgrounds and life experiences. While this is a positive benefit, it is however not enough to develop favorable feelings personally and personally. A historically grounded commitment to justice is far more appropriate and necessary first and foremost.

There have been many efforts to effectively evaluate teachers before they enter into their respective schools to see if they are committed to urban education. One of the more “radical” but “rational” suggestions have been put forth by Levine-Rasky (2001), who suggest that “signposts” of a potentially good candidate to become a multicultural educator are those who explicitly demonstrate an “internalized desire for change” and desire to eradicate not only inequality within educational institutions but are committed to social injustice throughout society. Haberman and Post (1998) also argued that teachers who will engage in educating the burgeoning group of culturally diverse students should be intentionally selected on the basis of

their explicitly self-reported ideology and predisposition, suggesting that “training” to teach in urban schools is useful only for those with who display the proper predispositions. Instead of trying to change the views of potential teachers who have traditionally held negative views of students of color, according to Garmon (2004), there is a case to be made for enlisting a specific type of pre-screening that would base selection of teacher candidates on the kinds of life experiences that reflected a multicultural context and display a complimentary disposition to diversity and intend to work in schools of color.

Researchers have found that teachers' commitment early on has been the greatest indicator of where they end up teaching (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Quartz et al., 2003). Therefore, Frakenberg et al. (2010), suggests that principals and policymakers of urban districts should specifically focus on and take seriously commitment levels of new teacher candidates who make known their desire to teach in and remain in urban schools during the hiring process. While this may seem very radical to some, the point of creating a more diverse and “unconventional” teaching recruiting pool and a more diverse set of teacher-educators, is to ensure that all students, including white students, have the opportunity to experience a more accurate picture of the increasing inevitability of what it will be like to live and work in a multicultural and multiracial society.

There are many circumstances that facilitate how teachers end up contributing to reproducing the status quo within educational institutions. For instance, teachers who work in urban and other challenging school environments are most susceptible to succumbing to feelings of being the only ones in the fight, and experiencing alienation and/or apathy. For many teachers then, there is an almost unquestionable belief that they have and continue to do all they possibly can to help students and the communities with the circumstances that they find themselves teaching in. Additionally, they believe that they have been educated as much as they need be and are as qualified as we reasonably can expect and should be left to do as they see fit in their classrooms, regardless of their school performance. According to Thompson, Warren and Carter (2004), educators have historically absolved themselves from all blame, when students and schools fail.

It is this attitude combined with low expectations by teachers of students that often sustain, rather than change, student achievement differences. In short, LSES (Lower socioeconomic status) students and students of color are often not expected nor encouraged to catch up and learn the skills necessary to survive and succeed in the dominant culture. These expectations are both subtly and explicitly communicated to students daily through teacher-student interactions. While some teacher efforts, such as an institutional practice of “teaching down” to certain student populations, may actually stem from good intentions, the effect of such teaching practices can ultimately be damaging. The cumulative effect of such differential treatment on the

basis of race and class of students can result in long-term consequences for students' achievements (Delpit, 1995).

Research utilized in teacher education programs have for some time now acknowledged that students have many different learning styles, and despite such knowledge, many teachers openly admit that they failed to explore and implement additional teaching strategies to effectively address this issue. This inflexibility has at times been compounded by teachers acknowledging they did not receive adequate training to deal with the population of students they end up teaching. This corroborates the growing body of research that has revealed that many teachers are under-qualified to teach students from diverse backgrounds in urban schools (Thompson, Warren & Carter, 2004). Although research has consistently found that teachers are the most important agent in schools affecting the level of student achievement, teachers have historically and currently place the blame on the “deficit” of student abilities for their student’s failure (National Center for Education statistics, 1996).

In general, teachers are not fond of nor accepting of change, specifically reforms and the pace at which they are often expected to implement them at the behest of “disconnected” social researchers. According to Rousmaniere (1997) one of the principal reasons that curriculum reform, has been less than successful is that teachers and administrators have often been able to “ignore” them. The institutional

structure of schools is semi-autonomous in that they were able to incorporate certain reforms or aspects of the reforms as they saw fit until recently. Bushnell goes on to state, “These conditions may have fostered the attitude that some current teachers hold toward curricular, pedagogical, or other reforms with which they do not agree: if they waited long enough, the disputed particulars of the reform would eventually be replaced with something new and “better.” Even though teachers may have thought that they were doing what was best for their students by resisting these externally imposed programs, their actions failed to challenge the unequal power structure itself at its core. They focus on their students and do not disrupt the system,” believing that they are doing the best they can for their students within the existing institutional and pedagogical framework. Ultimately, Rousmaniere (1997) concludes that “teachers’ resistances are superficial,” and only allude to change without critically exploring the underlying power relationships. Teachers are masters of adaptation, but such skill does not have true substantive qualities necessary for fundamental change, and points to a passivity all too common within educational institutions. Instead of helping to address and change the education-gap, teachers often end up sustaining it through practices that they believe are resistive and transformative. Nonetheless, their efforts may actually end up contributing to the widening of the educational gap. How much power difference teachers actually have that makes an impact on the educational system in relation to the life of a student is difficult to ascertain from year to year, but, “it may be quite substantial if effects accumulate from kindergarten through high school (Bushnell, 2003).

Resistance and Recovery in Education

Theoretically, resistance as a concept is a valuable and necessary tool in examining the potentiality of socio-political change in educational institutions; however, there needs to be more a more concise framing of the concept, while maintaining openness about how it can be used as an effective theoretical and practical tool in exploring the liberating aspects of critical pedagogy.

“[R]esistance...depicts a mode of discourse that rejects traditional explanations of school failure and oppositional behavior and shifts the analysis of oppositional behavior from the theoretical terrains of functionalism and mainstream educational psychology to those of political science and sociology” (Giroux, 1983 p. 289). In this instance, the strategy of resistance and oppositional behavior must be detached from notions of deviance and it must be connected with a moral inclination to fight against hegemony (289). The central theoretical element in analyzing acts of resistance should focus on the degree to which it denotes an intention and to resist and fight against domination and submission. Its emancipatory value and its potential achievement should be measured by the degree of possibilities for stimulating collective political struggles among all members of the educational community.

The quest for educational equality for marginalized groups in the U.S. has been characterized by what Kituse and Specter (2001) conceptualized as a “natural history” of claims-making activities, which has ultimately been defined by the

dominant majority rather than the people whom it was to benefit. In their seminal work *Constructing Social Problems* their analysis focuses on the construction social problems and find that many times, traditional as well as alternative efforts for educational reform end up co-opted by the hegemonic force of institutional agendas. As a result, they find that the mode of incorporation of marginalized groups into society continues to be the predominate lens through which education has been framed, in that the dominant society views itself as indispensable “caregivers” and providers of “solutions” to those who make legal claims and problems, instead of those most in need and seek justice simply on moral grounds. This has been most prominently displayed by the litigious-nature of American society and its role in forging “societal adjustments,” through legislative means. There is no denial of the progress made through such efforts, however, it has complicated the ways in which not only social problems are defined, but ultimately resolved. Many recent efforts have been made by researchers and activist interested in understanding more intricately the actual ways in which social inequality permeates and works within school settings, have explored beyond the still oft used deficit models, which demean the home-life of children, schools, and communities. Instead, they have worked to rescue these sites from the previous negative ways in which they have been framed and utilize them as rich counter hegemonic resources that can aid in educational change that is socially justice-based and equitable.

Multicultural Education

One of the most widespread politically supported and educator-supported moves to make schools and the educational process more inclusive and address the ever-growing diversity within American schools has been the multicultural education movement. The history of multicultural education in the United States is a relatively recent development. Most scholars agree that it has its origins in the beginnings of the civil rights movement of the 1960s that encompassed many different groups of people of color who began to focus their struggles on desegregating many of the social institutions, including the educational establishment. As a result, their efforts provided the platform for demanding more inclusion into broader American-life and the need to consider both informal and out-of-school education and their relationships to formal school programs (Banks, 1989; Davidman & Davidman, 1997). In addition to the movements fomented by the aggregate of people of color, women rights movements also widened the discussion about inclusiveness in curricula and brought to the table issues such as sexism, equal pay, and gender equality which were often overshadowed by the domination of racial and ethnic issues (Banks, 1989). Eventually, these movements came to include much broader social groups, including gays and lesbians, those with disabilities, and the elderly, and finally began to address basic human rights issues.

As the racial and cultural landscape began to change, people of color were beginning to have more of a presence in educational institutions and multicultural scholarship that pushed for changes in teacher education that focused on cultural

competence and culturally relevant pedagogy grounded in a global framework that provided opportunities for all students, and not just those from traditionally white and middle-class backgrounds. Finally, multicultural educational scholarship specifically focused on educational practices that were based on a social-justice foundation that was culturally responsive and responsible, and widened its scope to challenge the existing capitalistic order (Ovando and McLaren, 2000). Multicultural education is wide-ranging in its goals and approaches and has put forth consistent efforts to transform everything from the individual to larger society.

Therefore, according to Gibson (1976), multicultural education is the process of developing competencies in multiple systems that allow for many different ways of seeing, understanding, knowing, and doing. Grant (2006) espoused, that from a multicultural perspective, there is no one correct way of experiencing the world that represents any dominant truth. Consequently, multicultural education is therefore naturally inclusive of multiple policy, practice, and structural approaches and alternative methods of educating. As a result, an authentic multicultural education acknowledges, celebrates and advocates for the histories and contributions of marginalized groups to be more of a part of the traditional curriculum. It is explicitly committed to challenging the previous omitted and distorted views of marginalized groups. It proposes that the point in history at which we've arrived require “alternative” explanations which are more representative of the accepted narrative of the dominant culture. Its proponent’s desires are to make known the ways in which

institutional and personal decision making both have been influenced by systemic legally constructed exclusionary practices, and therefore illuminate the destructive and adverse consequences which continue to prevail today.

Contrary to the assimilationist position, multicultural educators reject the notion that schools should function in a way to dissolve cultural differences or simply tolerate them. Instead, they state that multicultural education and the diversity it embraces is and has been a fact of life in American society contrary to the ahistorical narrative, and should be preserved and extended. Multicultural scholars have advocated for a “new narrative of US history, one that focuses on the historical moments in which different groups interacted over, been fought over, issues of justice, equality, and civil and political rights” (Grant, p. 13). Grant (2006) therefore surmises that multicultural education has evolved to bring historically marginalized groups to the forefront of public education and create spaces where discussions among diverse groups of people, can, through interaction generate new ideas and sensibilities about the world in which they live that otherwise my have not been discovered. It is through these attempts to critically talk about and analyze the inequalities within the educational system, that possible strategies for the continued inclusion of marginalized groups can be most fruitful.

Most generally, according to Banks (1993) multicultural education has been and remains to be about an education based on social justice that promotes

transformative knowledge to realistic action. Discussions about multicultural education have always been couched in the larger context of what kind of country do we want to have and the kinds of policies that can accomplish that goal. Consequently, most of multicultural education to date has found itself part of policy and programs that have more than often, either derived from the worldview of the dominant culture or eventually became a part of it.

Politically, multicultural education has always focused on the resistance to, and the displacement of, Euro-American cultural domination. It has made its agenda to integrate diverse content and perspectives from the experiences of non-dominant racial, ethnic and linguistic groups into curriculum. The goal was to enable students to specifically recognize how power operated in knowledge construction. Additionally, its intent has been to reorder educational institutions with culturally relevant pedagogy (Banks, 1993). However, implementation has been met with ideological forces that has at times both enhanced and/or limited the relative success of the task. (Olneck, 1990, 1993; Sleeter, 1996).

According to Gibson (1976), in order for multicultural education to be effective there needs to be a serious examination of informal knowledge and education in ways that engender connections to formal education in productive ways. This in turn will help to promote a multicultural education strategy that utilizes the multiple knowledges of people's histories. This effort is essential in recoding once

thought of deficiencies as distinct learning styles and strengths to build on. Also, it has the value of validating students' experiences as worthy of study and use in exploring the world. Additionally, King (2006) proposes that multicultural education should be guided by explicit instructions given to students by educators that link knowledge and the social commitment to action based on a transformative curriculum. Students should also be involved in knowledge creation themselves that allows for them to explore their own personal assumptions, positions and experiences.

Multiculturalism as Praxis

Although multiculturalism has “caught on” in some peripheral ways, it is not enough and needs to be more strident in its goals to challenge the institutional-hegemony that Kitsuse and Spector (1987) warns of when involved in “claims-making” activities. For this, citing critical research on multicultural education, Banks (1993), suggests that in order for multicultural education to be implemented successfully, institutional changes must be made that facilitate students in the task of understanding how traditional academic knowledge, as well as their own cultural-knowledges are created, and how the context in which they are created influences their validity. Since creating an empowering school culture for students of color and low-income students involves restructuring educational institutions, it is also imperative that the adults model the attitudes and behaviors they are trying to impart to students.

Understanding the relationship between knowledge and power provides the critical capabilities that can assist in imagining our futures as well as the barriers that lie in front of us, and can dramatically change the ways in which its holder experiences the world (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 50). Students are and have been in desperate need of such knowledge in order to meaningfully change the existing social structures and ideas that continue to oppress them. It is only when students are able to intentionally discern and understand the methods used in their oppression, can they act to change those social constructions that impede their quest for social justice. Ladson-Billings (1995) suggest that such a project would entail a culturally relevant pedagogy in which both students and teachers are engaged in critical counter-hegemonic dialogue and are explicitly and collectively working to disrupt the status quo for a truly democratic, just and humane world. Integral to this undertaking is the acknowledgment of all the differing involved “positionalities” or “situated knowledges” (Haraway, 1998). Maher and Tetreault (2001) state, “Position more than any other single factor influences the construction of knowledge, and that positional factors reflect relationships of power both within and outside the classroom itself” (p. 23).

Because of the hierarchical nature educational institutions and resistance by staff and faculty, much of the involvement of students in making “change” is patronizing at best through multicultural day events and so on. Villa, Thousand, and Stainback (1992), however, see student participation as the most significant piece of

the puzzle in their own education and governance if multicultural education is to be successful. However, this change ultimately hinges on the political clarity of the teachers as they must be able to articulate that students' school failure is inextricably linked to other forms, formal and informal, of social decay that they experience daily. Students' interpretations of the past and present about these issues should be utilized as ways to encourage their participation in a more realized democratic project that will close, the "created" educational gap and call it by name, so as to confront the many other connected social issues that students become aware of. The struggle of students and their resistance to domination is central to any endeavor seeking to change the conditions in urban schools as it directly speaks to their experience in larger society (D'Amato 1996). Their learning then, is deeply connected to their ability to work together with other students and teachers in the process of what King (2006) calls, "deciphering culture-centered knowledge" that leads to students embracing their own unique forms of "Diaspora literacy" (culturally informed knowledge) that is based on their "heritage knowledge" (group memory) all in the same setting.

Goals of Multiculturalism

All involved and committed to a transformative multicultural education are focused on the same goals, which are to create an educational system that honestly, effectively, and ethically deals with the history of diversity in this country that has long been denied existence and legitimacy (Gay, p. 39). Their hope is that by

incorporating all spheres of life as equal partners and participants into an educational experience, that students will acquire the skills necessary to work across longstanding cultural divides and in turn, improve relations with people from all walks of life in a quest for a more democratic society closer to the ideals established at the founding of the United States. Multicultural education's emancipatory goals must first start with the educational system in general, but specifically teachers, and students and communities they serve.

Transcommunal Multiculturalism

According to Childs (2003), we are facing a challenge in the twenty-first century where, from the global to the local, cultural identities are being “uprooted”. As a result, many of these social/cultural identities that inform the places from which many socially justice oriented movements derive from, are being undermined. This in turn, has caused many groups of people who have many of the same goals rooted in personal aspirations for social justice, to become increasingly fragmented, and their movements even more vulnerable (p.7). These sources of discontent that inevitably enter into the school system affect all participants in ways that keep divisiveness at the forefront of the conversation about what to do to change our schools. Many of the different racial, ethnic, gender, and language differences that are aspects of the diverse populations of urban schools have sought to seek their agendas separately. Consequently, the educators, legislators, and the policies that they put forth and execute, do the same. This approach to dealing with the problems we now face have,

and continue to draw negatively upon the struggles that many people face without putting forth a solution that honors these differences, but at the same time, fail to find ways that these different struggles are connected to the overall struggles that are being fought against every day in society. Sociologists for far too long only viewed the commonalities of such groups to be connected through their class positions. However, the reality of the current crisis of fragmentation that we face requires something new that can address the needs of many, while at the same time, embracing and respecting the particular needs of the few. How do we go about facing this challenge in a way that is not just revolutionary, but also realistic and can have implications for real changes in practice and policy?

Looking to expand the analysis beyond simply class struggles, Davies (1995) points to other theorists who have drawn on developments in feminism, literary theory, postmodernism and post-structuralism (McLaren 1989; Aronowitz and Giroux 1985, 1991, 1993; Wexler 1987; Giroux and McLaren 1989; Weis 1990). They explore how resistance, and social change, can be forged by new culturally diverse alliances, which have not been traditionally thought of as participants in the “revolutionary class”, which has generally been traditionally white, and male. These new potential agents of social change are, and should be, more diverse.

According to Wexler (1981) it is the diverse collective which will forge a new sense of personal or individual discontent with society in ways that exhibit a wide range of concerns, possibilities, and alternatives that may have been previously

marginalized due to the historically homogeneous ways of conceiving social change. For Childs (2003) then, Transcommunitarity, which is “the constructive developmental interaction occurring among distinct autonomy-oriented communities and organizations, each with its own particular history, outlook, and agenda. This interaction is developed through interpersonal relations of people engaged in common tasks, is producing working groups of activist whose roots are in communities and organizations, but who also form bridges among diverse peoples as they address substantial, albeit often varied corrosive dilemmas—from economic crises to environmental degradation, from indigenous land rights to the organizing of workers across national borders” (p.10 & 11) A Transcommunal education is most promising for true progressive, multicultural, and emancipatory-based movements for traditionally marginalized groups. Its strengths lie in the fact that it looks to enhance methods that many groups are already utilizing in their struggle against oppression, while at the same time, encouraging the development of “broad constellations” that embolden the “emplacements” from which these groups draw a sense of self and purpose (77). Heterogeneity is the source from which new movements will have the most success in defining what education is to be, and how we will go about attaining it.

Additionally, the organization of new collectives, will in turn, facilitate new ways of “being and seeing”. Wexler (1981) stated that post-Marxists looked to other “radical” groups that are already struggling to be more promising agents of social change. Part of this is because these other “radical” groups have already well-defined

and articulate positions, which serve as an interlocutor for other marginalized groups to connect with, while still being able to voice their own specific concerns. To further substantiate his claims, Wexler goes on to state that, “Reproduction is only one type of collective cultural process and that to appropriate the historical possibilities which they indicate, collective action can be explored as an alternative to the structuralist view of social dynamics, both generally and as applied to education (p. 261). What once was characteristic of union solidarity can now also be used to ferment culturally-based solidarity.

Finally Wexler(1981) states that it is post-Marxist rejection of positivism and embrace of interpretivism, which they see as a more productive way to excavate the hidden meanings of what is socially constructed knowledge, and a way to find useful connections between groups that would otherwise have no apparent connection to one another. Some of the key distinctions of post-Marxist approaches to education according to Davies (1995) are that they tend to utilize a more “gradualist” model of educational change, and embrace more formal resistance, in comparison with cultural Marxists focus on informal groups and “counterculture”. As a result, they are highly skeptical of the potential for change from individualized activism, and again look to more organized and politically savvy groups that are already engaging in radical discursive “resistance”. It is these kinds of “Transcommunal activists” that Child (2003)s sees as most effective in connecting seemingly disparate groups and ideas

because the nature of their work has been shaped by circumstances where this was not only needed, but necessary.

Transcommunality relies on concrete interpersonal ties growing out of...shared practical action from diverse participants. From such practical action flow increasing communication, mutual respect, and understanding (189).

The analysis of education in capitalist societies, particularly in the U.S. has attempted to examine the ways in which socio-economic inequities in society were being reproduced, resisted and ultimately transformed by working-class students as the agents of social change, but they have traditionally focused solely on the differences between groups without thoroughly examining the potentiality of the ways in which many of these movements have worked together at times.

According to Childs, the celebration of distinctions amongst groups as well as commonalities is essential, and can serve as a basis for forging action that is rooted in ones specifically community. If we employ John Dewey's definition of democracy, described as a "mode of associated living, of conjoint, communicative experience," Childs' conception of Transcommunality can be of great service to those interested in educational transformation. Transcommunality is unabashedly about hope, and looks to assist any and all, who desire a better future. A hope that often has been hidden by overtly politicized agendas and approaches, and in some instances, depoliticized theoretical and methodological approaches to social change. Transcommunality is also about practice, how do we work constructively toward social change, when the

idea of community has all been but destroyed, co-opted and distorted by the forces of globalization and capitalism? Transcommunality can be helpful when exploring educational change, because it looks for change in broad public consciousness, much like Marx, but instead it embraces a different theoretical map, where change would begin with individual students, teachers, the schools, and the communities they serve, instead of workers and the workplace. Transcommunality, while taking the useful parts of idealism and materialism, unite in a way that employs a pragmatic course of action, while still providing hope by remaining flexible and open to change as it is deemed necessary. Transcommunality echoes the adage that “you never step in the same river twice.” While it is helpful to look back at our footprints, and how we have dealt with educational reform in the past, it becomes ever more important to look ahead and see what the terrain before us requires.

Transcommunality as Pedagogy

Stanton-Salazar (1989), points to what he calls, a discursive “identity kit” which comes with “the appropriate costume and instructions of how to act, talk, and often write, so as to take on a particular role that others will recognize,” which can aid students coming from many different backgrounds and experiences to learn to *decode the system*, and perform the dominant discourse along with maintaining their own cultural ways of knowing, that allows for “accommodation without assimilation” (Ogbu, 50). This, combined with Childs' notion of “Transcommunal identity politics,” can help students navigate educational institutions while remaining

connected in concrete ways to their own communities and experiences. In Valenzuela's analysis, schools are deleterious and don't seek to build on what students already know and bring to schools in ways that "confirm the language, history and experiences of the cultural 'other.'" (Valenzuela, 512) Instead, they alienate those who have not mastered the dominant discourse that prevail within schools. If schools did work with students in ways that both honored what they brought to school with them, as well as explicitly taught them how to decode the system, the ideological biases based on the "myth of meritocracy" would be exposed, along with an agenda that has often rendered it invisible to students.

Transcommunality emphasizes a constant process of negotiational construction of organization among diverse participants, rather than an imposed monolithic system. Such negotiated action involves the recognition that dispute and difference, sometimes profound, must be accepted as a basic aspect of the human condition rather than being constrained through top-down, police-like controls (p.22).

The development of a critical pedagogy that embraces ethical concerns such as the "human condition" should begin with what Raymond Williams calls "the desire to make learning a part of the process of social change itself," and in turn becomes a practice that takes place across multiple sites and diverse experiences that actively and profoundly teaches. Transcommunally, this would entail cooperation that worked across typical "identity-lines" and instead puts forth a new and changed way of thinking (Delgado, 1994, 1). Conceptually and practically, Transcommunality is a practice that is about respect and mutual recognition of diverse, and even at times when necessary, divergent perspectives that can facilitate engagement with one another. Pedagogically, then, it is open to a narrative space that is ongoing and one

conducive to short and long term goals. “Transcommunality is a method that incorporates fusion and fission, structure and fluidity” (p.23). It allows for a high degree of diversity, autonomy, and coordination of its participants.” As a practice then, Transcommunality emphatically rejects any attempts to dismiss and sideline the inherent difficulties and/or struggles that are connected with the personal differences and institutional constraints experienced differently by groups and instead look to specifically address them as opportunities to learn with and from one another. Giroux, Torres, and Mitchell (1998) concur and state,

Similarly, the pedagogical as performative practice acknowledges the full range of multiple, shifting and overlapping sites of learning that, in part, produce, mediate, legitimate, and challenge those forces that are waging an assault on democratic public life in the United States. In this instance, the political becomes more pedagogical as diverse cultural workers recognize the need to work together to create/perform/construct those spaces in which desire, memory, knowledge, and the body reconfigure the possibility of speaking otherwise in order to act otherwise in diverse public cultures and terrains.” (Giroux, Torres, and Mitchell, 1998. (p.145).

Teaching Transcommunally is responsive to, and encourages, awareness of one another in ways that changes interaction between communities, in ways that enhance mindfulness of others, instead of being dismissive and exclusionary. This is helpful when engaging with students about their different ways of knowing and participating in the world and how these experiences are played out in a school setting. Often, marginalized groups enter into an exchange of one-upping each other when it comes to their oppressive experiences. Through consistent interaction with one another in respectful ways, those students who would have normally been

suspicious of differing perspectives can develop new and productive relationships based on a learned and earned trust through sharing. This can forge new possibilities that may have previously been excluded in the past.

A Transcommunal approach then, can bring together people who are willing to go through a process of self-transformation, as they engage with others from many different backgrounds on collective issues, even though some of their individual, and specific group concerns may be different (p. 44). This suggests then that there is a necessity to move beyond what Williams (1989) states as “traditional binarisms” such as margin/center, unity/difference, local/national, public/private, that continue to be a barrier to joint progression rooted in respect for others, and ultimately a demands a conscious “redefinition process” (p. 152).

Transcommunality as a pedagogical practice has the potential to properly address the issues that currently define our educational crisis. It is through its desire for our approach to change to be honest, sincere, and pragmatic. Educators, parents, students and policy-makers must learn to see the diversity in urban schools as not just the source of the crisis, but also as the solution. This practice must not only be limited to how teachers engage with students in the classroom, but it must be a practice that they also embrace in their own lives and are adequately trained in. This would require teacher educational programs to model the kinds of activity that utilizes Transcommunal practices in higher education. As a “radical” practice, a

Transcommunal education has the flexibility to encompass the major tenets of multiculturalism, while at the same time, moving beyond, and providing for new ways of interaction that re-situates ongoing collective political activism for social justice at the forefront of any effort to change the trajectory of our inadequate and inequitable educational institutions.

A true liberatory education cannot be effectively imagined or implemented without the explicit commitment and involvement of teachers who are willing and capable of embracing a critically-oriented social justice foundation that is focused on breaking down the stagnant and reproducing processes of traditional Euro-centered education and the hegemonic practices that sustain them in order for it to be a reality. While the strength of multiculturalism lies in its ability to acknowledge “others,” and the many ways in which all have contributed to society, the ways in which many educational institutions have implemented such programs have been co-opted and as a result, continue to marginalize and reproduce socially constructed historical inequalities. However, multiculturalism and its tenets have only taken us as far as it can in its current structure and use. There needs to be a re-orientation within the multicultural movement that also allows a space for acknowledgment of the real differences in people's life experiences while at the same time, making more explicit and political connections to the many differing forms of oppression that all marginalized groups' experience. These real differences require that we are not always in melting pot mode, all which deprive and negate real opportunities to critically understand others' positionality respectfully. “While we all are in the same

boat, some of us have different seats.” This being so, it is necessary that we employ an educational strategy that is able to encompass us all, but at the same time, give credence to the tangible differences that we have in a way as not to participate in re-marginalizing anyone or any experience.

While many theories and pedagogical practices explored have undoubtedly contributed to understanding and attempting to ameliorate the unequal ways in which schools have produced not only disparate, but truly devastatingly unequal experiences and outcomes for different groups within society, they all have ultimately fallen short in the effort to find significant concrete long-lasting strategies that can be implemented in teacher education programs and as a daily practice within and outside of educational institutions. It is imperative that students, teachers, and the communities that they serve are connected in a quest for social justice for all that make their stride toward real social justice and an equitable education, much more than a desire or simple policy adjustment.

As a practice, Transcommunality is about change, not only in our educational institutions, but throughout society at large, and it is most interested in changing the human condition through embracing a communicative way of interacting, that allows for critical engagement and disengagement between groups throughout society that are all struggling to bring about social justice. Developing and embracing Transcommunality as pedagogy has the potential to transform individuals,

communities, educational institutions, and ultimately society. This will, however, require that teachers themselves become committed to working in new and alternative ways that go far beyond their traditional training by being actively engaged in efforts to change society. These efforts should be aimed at transforming the diversity-crisis in educational institutions into an opportunity to affect broader social change. This effort, in addition to those found in poor and communities of color, can also be utilized in predominately white “middle-class” and “upper-class” schools and communities and encouraged and supported in the universities as much more than just an addendum to their education. This is imperative because the teaching workforce, has been, and continues to be predominately white, and female, and in order to make significant change; their efforts are central to any endeavor to transform the inequitable situation of our educational institutions. It is in this hope that new communities will emerge from those which were historically disconnected and move far beyond the scope of change previously imagined by emplacement-based groups and in turn, foster relationships in new and creative ways that acknowledge many new allies and solutions in the struggle that may have been previously disregarded because of cultural differences between marginalized groups.

Chapter 6 Results and Findings

Closing the Achievement Gap: Teacher Quality or Teaching Inequality? The Continuing Separate and Unequal Education of Students of Color

Many “explanations” are given for the difficulties teachers face while striving to raise test scores and overall achievement of their students and schools. However, substantial research has agreed that most obstacles can be overcome when teachers are properly certified with degrees in the specialization of their subject and go through more rigorous pedagogical training. Despite this knowledge, the current system of teacher certification has continued to contribute to adverse selection and placement of teachers, especially in schools that need quality teachers the most.

Goertz and Duffy (2003) state that while assessment has always been a part of the educational system, the focus on specific standards and who is to be held accountable when standards and the goals are not met has changed the importance and impact of tests in the lives of students, teachers and schools. The importance of test results to policy makers comes from the focus on data from large-scale statewide assessments to make certification decisions about students and to hold schools and school districts accountable for the performance and progress of their students (4). Many can argue about the flaws in the design of accountability systems, but high-stakes testing has now become a very critical aspect of U.S. education and will serve all students, teachers and schools better if efforts were to understand and utilize it as an educational evaluative tool in a way that works to mitigate inequities found within educational institutions.

The findings and results presented in this section provide the opportunity to contextualize the current, yet ongoing dismal state of education in an urban setting, specifically, in four schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District and Artesia

Bellflower, and Cerritos (ABC) School District, a suburb just south of the other three schools analyzed. The four schools were purposefully chosen because of their distinct racial and ethnic compositions, unique historical backgrounds, and different socio-economic communities that that teachers worked in under the NCLB when combined, embody many similar challenges and ideas about success and failure representative of student demographic change throughout the nation. Additionally, each school, with the exception of Gretchen Whitney High School also has had a history of pervasive struggles with academic performance and graduation rates which continue to plague them. Crenshaw Senior High School is 69 % African American, Los Angeles Senior High School is 75 % Hispanic American, Gretchen Whitney High School is 82.1 % Asian American, and Susan Miller Dorsey High School is racially mixed with 55.4 % African American and 43.7 % Hispanic American.

School Histories

The Crenshaw district area is diverse yet remains the center of Los Angeles County's African American community where both Crenshaw and Dorsey High School are located. Both schools serve many of the same neighborhoods and are often only separated by a street block. Although the Baldwin Hills, an area which is served by both schools population, is 78.5% African American and is among the wealthiest majority-black communities in the United States. However, the in-group income disparity within the area is vast. Many students from the upper socioeconomic classes attend public and/or private schools outside of the neighborhoods.

The Crenshaw District was established during the early 1920s onward was composed of different white ethnic immigrants and excluded African Americans and Asian Americans from owning property in the area. After the progress and success of the 1960s the opportunity to move to this area of town was seen as a move toward realizing the hopes of many minority groups besides just white immigrants. Within a decade of the inability to legally own real estate property in the area, it became a predominately African American area in the wake of white flight and still today remains the largest and last black majority populated area of all voting districts in Los Angeles County, and the nation. Although Dorsey opened its doors in 1937 and serves many of the same areas as Crenshaw, which opened in 1968, the history of each of these schools serving a primarily African American and eventually Latino/a population doesn't occur until after the 1970s.

Crenshaw was initially an experimental school and began with students from middle-class African American communities and was the result of the combined efforts of community activism and the LAUSD Board of Education. Dorsey also was created from the same activism although the time the population was due to white ethnic and immigrant group's growth in the area. Between 1980s-1990s there was a "black-flight" from the greater Los Angeles County but specifically from the areas which served the high schools. Many blacks sought to take advantage of one of the fastest growing areas in the country which were outside of the city and often were in much more rural and suburban areas, including the so called Inland Empire in Riverside-San Bernardino counties which began to serve as a shelter for the children

from the gang violence and devastation which many had survived through in Los Angeles. Also, it was an opportunity for parents to enroll their children in schools that had more resources, better teachers, and ultimately would give their kids a new start which had all but eluded most of the children in the former neighborhoods. Much of this trend has been attributed to the loss of job opportunities, and coinciding with the rise of the prison industrial complex, and the arrival of immigrants of Latino/a heritage and southeast Asian origins, which was directly connected to flight from areas engaged in social upheaval fueled directly and indirectly with policies created and supported by the United States government. Although the dramatic shift due to black flight, African Americans continue to remain the majority population in the area.

Los Angeles High School is the oldest public high school 1873 in the Southern California Region and in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Until the late 1970s much like Dorsey and Crenshaw, Los Angeles High experienced a shift in demographics due to access for minority groups to housing in the area, compounded the impact of immigration from refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala during the 1980s. From that point on, Los Angeles High School which had a history of serving only white middle-class students and white immigrants became characterized as primarily “urban” although it is only 5 minutes North of Dorsey and Crenshaw. The attendance boundary consists of a contrasting spectrum of economic diversity ranging from affluent to low-income, and the immigrant community of Korea-town. Many of the surrounding neighborhoods which were white and still to

this day remain to be did not continue to send their children to Los Angeles high. Today Los Angeles High School serves a majority Latino/a population, children of immigrants, representative of the shift in LAUSD demographics and the group now being the majority of students of school age.

Whitney High School was founded in 1976 and originally conceived of as a community academic learning center and intended to be primarily a vocational school. Eventually, the school refocused its goals and worked to recreate it as a prep school. Whitney is also the largest employer within the city and has over 70% white teachers, despite the population it serves is mostly Asian. Whitney is located in Cerritos and traditionally had served mostly families of dairy farming and became a part of Los Angeles County in 1956 due to its rapid urbanization. As a reaction to the passing of Proposition 13 in 1978, Cerritos, unlike other areas in this study, responded by creating as many commercial zones as possible and therefore not only relieved them of the challenges faced by other schools but propelled them to benefit tremendously from their tax base as they were one of the first cities to develop large retail zones. Between 1970 and 1972, Cerritos was the fastest growing city in California and the population doubled from 16,000 to 38,000. By the time the 1980s came Cerritos has attracted a large number of Filipino, Korean, Indian, and Chinese immigrant families due to the opportunities it offered for socioeconomic and educational advancement. The 2010 census has since reflected this flow of immigrants and the predominance of its API population. Cerritos has the third largest Asian community in Los Angeles County. Whitney High School, historically much

different from the other schools in this study, has consistently been one of California's and the nation's top achieving schools where 85% of their students go on to college.

Analysis of Schools

One area of focus was the importance of the concept of teacher quality and the goal of raising teacher quality under the NCLB. This was to be determined by several factors: including, the level of certification of teachers and their credentials; performance of their students on standardized tests; and graduation rates combined with college readiness. This section examines how each school performed under this regulation from 2003 to 2013, during which improvement was mandated by the law and were defined as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) by the federal government which measured through the following three factors.

- **Performance:** Each year the percent of students in each subgroup scoring "proficient" or above in English/language arts and mathematics on standardized tests must meet or exceed target percentages known as "**annual measurable objectives**" (AMOs).
- **Participation:** The percent of students in each subgroup taking the tests must meet or exceed 95%.
- **Additional indicators** for AYP include scoring at certain levels on the Academic Performance Index (API) and, for high schools, improving their graduation rates.

One effective method of examining the impact of the NCLB standards on schools was by collecting the number of fully credentialed teachers, university interns, district interns, pre-intern, emergency credentialed, and waived teachers at each school,

which reflected each schools' commitment to not only fulfilling the legal mandates, but also ensuring to their students to staff their schools with the best qualified teachers over a specified period of time. For this particular part of the discussion, data on teacher credentialing, average years teaching, and the first and second year teachers, were analyzed for the time period of 2003-2009. For 2010-2012 data was not made available for any schools on the websites of California Department of Education (CDE) and Ed.Data (an extraneous data collection agency), and data for 2013 had not been reported to date.

Table 6.1 Teacher Qualifications at Four High Schools in Los Angeles

Teachers	Crenshaw	Dorsey	LA	Whitney
Full	67.5 (14.2)*	65.9 (10.1)	88.0 (34.0)	96.3 (2.5)
Emergency	17.0 (6.2)	20.4 (5.9)	8.4 (6.3)	3.7 (2.5)
University Interns	10.6	13.1	5.7	3.0
District Interns	2.1	1.9	4.9	0
Pre-Interns	10.3	7.2	5.6	0
Waivers	1.75	2.5	8.8	2.3
Average Years Teaching	10.15 (.61)	10 (1.1)	11.3 (1.0)	17.4 (1.2)
First Year Teachers	13.1 (6.3)	17 (8.3)	14 (5.4)	.27 (.64)
Second Year Teachers	12.1 (7.2)	15 (9.0)	17.3 (7.5)	.36 (.80)

Los Angeles and Whitney were highest in their averages of fully credentialed teachers. However, when closely examining the standard deviation of the averages of Los Angeles, the difference becomes staggering and an example of extreme

instability. Whitney however remained steady in its retention of fully credentialed teachers with the least amount of deviation from their average. The number of emergency credentialed teachers at Los Angeles, while less than half of Crenshaw and Dorsey, has the highest deviation of its average amongst the three schools. Whitney retained the least amount of emergency credentialed teachers and its deviation was about one-third of the rest of the schools comparatively. Average years teaching at Los Angeles was comparable to Dorsey and Crenshaw. However, Whitney's average was two-thirds higher than the other schools and remained consistent over the time period examined. Although Los Angeles' numbers were in some instances better than other schools, the inability of the school to be consistent greatly diminishes its achievements. Conversely, Whitney was the model of consistency with of the combination of the highest number and stable acquisition of fully credentialed teachers, least reliance on emergency credentialed teachers, and most years of teaching experience of all schools examined combine to set them far apart when it comes to high quality teacher retention.

Academic Performance and Graduation

SAT scores for all schools were collected from 2005 to 2012 and are pending for the year of 2013.

Table 6.2 Academic Performances and Student Graduation

Academic Performance	Crenshaw	Dorsey	LA	Whitney
API	538 (26.1)*	555 (45.2)	583 (51.0)	987 (5.2)
SAT	1087 (155.7)	1092 (128.1)	1213 (149.2)	1985 (43.6)

Graduation Rate	63.3 (7.2)	56.7 (10.5)	54.1 (7.8)	100 (0)
UC/CSU Ready	39.3 (11.6)	41.1 (22.0)	24.8 (7.8)	93.1 (3.2)

*Figures in parentheses show standard deviations

For Crenshaw, the average SAT score over that time was 1097. For students who graduated and took the required course work to be considered by California state law to be University of California or California State University ready, data was collected from 2003 to 2012. These numbers are not reflective of the total graduation rate of the entire school, only those who took college prep courses. During this time period, the percentage of students who did graduate as college ready from Crenshaw was 43 %. There Academic Performance Index (API) average score was 532.25 from 2003-2012. Under the NCLB Act, API Growth was attained for 2 year, not attained for 6 years, with 2 years their scores were considered invalid and 1 year was not available. For Annual Measurable Objectives from 2003-2012, in the areas of English/language arts, objectives were met 2 out of 10 times, and for mathematics, objectives were met 1 out of 10 times.

For Dorsey, the average SAT score over that time was 1092. For students who graduated and took the required course work to be considered by California state law to be University of California or California State University ready, data was collected from 2003 to 2012. Again, this number is not reflective of the total graduation rate of the entire school, only those who took college prep courses. During this time period, the average percentage of students who did graduate from Dorsey and were “college ready” was 47.8 %. There Academic Performance Index (API) average score was 546

from 2003-2012. Under the NCLB Act API Growth was attained for 4 years, not attained for 5 years, 2 years their scores were not available. For Annual Measurable Objectives from 2003-2012, in the areas of English/language arts, objectives were met 1 out of 11 times, and for mathematics objectives were never met (i.e., 0 out of 11 times).

For Los Angeles, the average SAT score over that time was 1249.9. For students who graduated and took the required course work to be considered by California state law to be University of California or California State University ready data was collected from 2003-2012. During this time period, the average percentage of students who did graduate from Los Angeles High and were “college ready” was 26.5 %. There Academic Performance Index (API) average score was 566 from 2003-2012. Under the NCLB Act API Growth was attained for 3 years, not attained for 6 years, 2 years their scores were not available. For Annual Measurable Objectives from 2003-2012, in the areas of English/language arts, objectives were met 1 out of 11 times, and for mathematics objectives were met 2 out of 11 times.

For Gretchen Whitney, the average SAT score over that time was 1985. Students who graduated and took the required course work to be considered by California state law to be University of California or California State University ready, data was collected from 2003-2012. During this time period, the average percentage of students who did graduate from Gretchen Whitney and were “college ready” was 92.3 %. There Academic Performance Index (API) average score was 987 from 2003-2012, 2013 is still pending. Under the NCLB Act API Growth was

attained for all 11 years. For Annual Measurable Objectives from 2003-2012, 2013 not being available yet, in the areas of English/language arts, objectives were met every year (i.e., 11 out of 11 times), and for mathematics objectives were met every year (i.e., 11 out of 11 times).

Crenshaw, Dorsey, and Los Angeles all had similar API averages. However, the difference between the schools appeared most dramatic in the deviation from the averages. While Crenshaw had the lowest average, it also had the least amount of deviation from its average of the three schools. Therefore, Dorsey and Los Angeles, while having the higher averages were less consistent in their attainment of progress from year to year. Whitney's API average was highest by almost 400 points and attained progress every year for the time period examined.

Crenshaw and Dorsey had similar SAT averages. However, Crenshaw had the most dramatic deviation from the average of all schools and Dorsey was only second to Whitney in changes in scores from year to year. While Dorsey was the only school to have a lower SAT scores than Crenshaw, it remained the second most consistent in its performance. Los Angeles had the second highest average amongst the schools and was the second least consistent and displayed a dramatic deviation from year to year, similar to Crenshaw. Whitney's SAT average was highest by almost 700 points than any school in this study and had the most consistent average of test scores with the least amount of deviation over time.

Dorsey and Los Angeles had similar graduation rate averages both in the mid-fifties, 56.7 (sd=10.5) and 54.1 (sd=7.8) respectively. However, although Los Angeles had the slightly lower graduation rate, it was more consistent by almost 3 percentage points. Crenshaw, although outperformed in almost all categories, was only second to Whitney in graduation rate and in consistency from year to year in its outcome. Meaning that while Dorsey was only second to Crenshaw for graduation rates, it also remained the second most consistent when taking into account the variation of graduate rates over time. Whitney's graduation average was highest and perfect at 100 % for the time period examined, which compared to most schools nation-wide is an anomaly. Over the last ten years, 2012 was a record year for graduation nationally as well as being an all-time high at 80% (Gradnation.org 2014). However, this number is drastically skewed when examining low-income students whose graduation rate is below the national average in 41 states, and non-low income students whose graduation rate is above the national average in 40 states, which still points to a tremendous opportunity gap. Nevertheless, Whitney exceeds even the best all-time national average of graduation rates.

Crenshaw and Los Angeles had the two lowest UC/CSU ready graduates. However, although Los Angeles had the slightly lower average number of UC/CSU ready graduates, it was more consistent by almost 4 percentage points and was second only to Whitney in consistently producing the same number of UC/CSU ready graduates. Dorsey, outperformed in almost all categories, was only second to Whitney in UC/CSU ready graduates but last in consistency from year to year in its outcome.

Findings suggest that while Dorsey was only outperformed by Whitney, it also remained the most consistent in its production of UC/CSU ready graduates.

Whitney's has been consistently successful at producing the most UC/CSU ready graduates at 93.1 % for the time period examined, suggesting that almost all of their graduates qualified to attend a four year university.

Research shows that “the effect of the teacher far overshadows classroom variables, such as previous achievement level of students, class size, heterogeneity of students, and the ethnic and socioeconomic makeup of the classroom” (Magee, 27). The most significant predictor of whether or not a student does well in math and reading on standardized test is the proportion of well-qualified teachers in a state who are certified within the subject matter which they teach, fully credentialed or have a major in the field that they teach (Hannshek and Raymond 317; Smith and Desmond 226). This remains a controversial point of contention between teachers and educational researchers because it forces us all to think about what it means to be qualified to teach and the disparate impact of lack of proper certification and its place in trying to work on the most pressing issues in poorly performing schools. Although the requirements for being highly-qualified are now mandatory for anyone going into the teaching profession, many existing teachers, who also have to “prove” that they are highly-qualified, have been frustrated with what they believe was repetitive endeavor to teach them what they already had known, and been doing. For many, “reeducation” has been considered ultimately a waste of time. Many teachers feel that they have been teaching for years, and they should not have to participate in any

sort of continuing recertification programs.

Graduation Rates and Targets

This section examines the overall graduation rates and teacher and student racial/ethnic composition of each school and how its racial and ethnic dynamic may be related to student performance and graduation rate. Data collected for this analysis is from 2003-2013 except in the instance of teacher racial/ethnic demographics, of which 2013 was not yet available utilizing again two public data sets; (1) the California Department of Education (CDE) a state run site; and (2) Ed-Data, an extraneous data collection agency, which works to keep the public informed on all educational issues within the state of California in the attempt to fill in the gaps where they believe the CDE may have overlooked or omitted critical data.

Table 6.3 Graduation Rates and Target Goals

Graduation Percentages	Crenshaw	Dorsey	Los Angeles	Whitney
Graduation Rate	63.3 (7.2)	56.7 (10.5)	54.1 (7.8)	100 (0)
Graduation Target Attained	5 out of 11 years or 45.0	7 out of 11 years or 63.6	6 out of 11 years or 54.4	11 out of 11 years or 100.0
Highest Graduation Rate	77.5	72.2	64.8	100.0

Lowest Graduation Rate	41.0	44.4	43.9	100.0
------------------------------	------	------	------	-------

Graduation targets are based on making improvements from the prior year's numbers so if one year's graduation rate was really low, simply by exceeding the prior year's numbers, the following year would be considered a success and therefore would receive meeting target status. Crenshaw met their graduation target only 5 out of 11 times, or less than half of the time. From 2007-2009 their graduation rates were well below 60%

Dorsey met their graduation target 7 out of 11 times. However, out of the 11 years, five years in a row the graduation rate was in the 40 percent range between 2004 and 2008, well below average, therefore offsetting the seemingly successful numbers of reaching their graduation target a majority of the time.

Los Angeles met their graduation target 6 out of 11 times, or more than half of the time. However, out of the 11 years, four years in a row the graduation rate was in the 40 percent range between 2004 and 2007, well below average, therefore offsetting the seemingly successful numbers of reaching their graduation target a majority of the time.

Whitney high had the perfect graduation rate of 100 % from 2003-2013. This

exceedingly high and perfect graduation rate is an anomaly throughout the LAUSD, its sub-district of ABC (Artesia, Bellflower and Cerritos), school districts in the greater Los Angeles area, and California overall. Since graduation targets are based on making improvements from the prior year's numbers, sustaining this level of achievement, while incredible, also presented Whitney with the constant challenge to maintain such levels in order to reach their prior year's perfect graduation rate.

Teacher and Student Racial/Ethnic Demographics

Racial and ethnic data for teachers for all schools was collected from 2003-2012 and are pending for the year of 2013. However, for students, racial and ethnic data was collected for the years of 2003-2013. The categories utilized for classification were American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, Hispanic/Latino, African American, White, and Other/or those who declined to state. From the year 2008, which coincided with the change in the census classification with regard to multi-racial classifications, the numbers were statistically insignificant for teachers and students and were therefore collapsed into the other category when appropriate.

Table 6.4 Teacher and Student Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds by School and District

Teacher Race	Crenshaw	Dorsey	LA	Whitney	LAUSD	ABC
Percent White	24.0	32.7	46.5	75.1	44.6	57.4
Percent Black	59.0	45.5	18.1	1.2	12.2	3.7
Percent Latino/a	8.0	9.9	18.1	12.9	30.0	19.6

Percent Asian	3.9	7.5	10.6	10.8	8.68	15.2
---------------	-----	-----	------	------	------	------

The majority of Crenshaw’s and Dorsey’s teachers were African American and White while Asian and Hispanic/Latino made up the rest of the teacher population. The majority of students were African American similar to the teacher population. Although the second largest student population was Hispanic/Latino. White teachers in both instances are overrepresented when compared to the student populations they serve. This trend is consistent throughout LAUSD schools where students of color are the majority.

Whitney and Los Angeles both had the highest teacher representation for both White and API teachers respectively. API students at Whitney and Latino/a students at Los Angeles were the largest majority minority populations in this study. However, the predominance of White teachers at each school again raises serious questions about teacher recruitment, retention, and ultimately effectiveness except in the case of Whitney which is an anomaly for a school that is majority minority in LAUSD and under the NCLB Act.

The teachers’ racial and ethnic backgrounds for Crenshaw and Dorsey High are majority African American similar to the population demographics of the areas in which they are located, although Dorsey high has a larger population of Hispanic/Latino students. What is interesting is that both schools are fairly similar in performance, teacher quality and graduation rates. However, Los Angeles high, who serves a majority of Hispanic/Latino students and is located in the second most

diverse area only second to Whitney, has a majority population of white teachers at 46.5 %. Whitney who serves a majority population of Asian students has a majority population of white teachers at 75.1 %. Interestingly enough between these two schools there is a great disparity in performance, teacher quality and graduation rates. Additionally, each school also has the largest percentage of teachers who are Asian with Los Angeles having 10.6 % and Whitney at 10.8 %. While this notable in one instance for Los Angeles, Asian teachers are underrepresented at Whitney high school and not representative of the area it serves with a city population of that is 61.9 % Asian.

Since teaching is considered such an important occupation in our society, efforts to encourage and at times demand that teachers, and specifically white teachers who are the majority of teachers in LAUSD and urban schools in general to become better, has often been framed as an unwarranted condemnation of all teachers at all schools. However, I discovered that students continue to be underserved and undereducated in ways that gravely affect their life chances for social mobility. The continuing failure of teachers to alter the disparities in student achievement in the urban schools of color that I studied under the NCLB was consistent over ten years was facilitated by several factors. The unprecedented number of emergency credentialed teachers and uncertified interns, staggeringly below average overall graduation rates, college ready students, noncompetitive ACT and SAT scores, all together reveal that there are severely overlooked deficiencies in the teacher resource pool that is hired and retained at these schools excluding Whitney. There needs

further scrutiny and research in examining the influences or impact of White teachers and their use of an effective pedagogy which has facilitated a positive impact on students both in class and on standardized test at Whitney and whether the teachers their subscription to the model minority myth is a mitigating factor. Finally, while standardized test are not the most desired nor accurate way of evaluating student knowledge, effective test-taking skills is useful form of knowledge for social mobility and access to higher education for especially for students of color that come from LSES communities. Unfortunately, the continued failure to achieve is indicative by the lack of teacher investment of being properly trained and highly-qualified to teach students to think critically as well as the necessary test-taking skills, which at this time is not a part of teacher education in general

Discussion

This study continues to raise concerns about the historical impact of European colonization and enslavement on people of color in formal American educational institutions and how it affects their perspectives of themselves and their ability to succeed in society. My findings reveal that despite many efforts to close the achievement gap over time, policy interventions have often impacted teachers and students of color in unintended ways that contribute to reproduction of educational and social inequities in addition to those examined by other researchers. Although in theory educational institutions were lauded to be the primary institution for engendering democracy and active citizenship, the construction and implementation

of “Americanizing” policies ensured that these lofty goals would never be reached by the masses of people of color. The basis for what we now call the achievement gap has its roots in the separate and unequal educational history of the United States and was created by design. It is this legacy based on inequality and racism which still today deeply influences those who become teachers, how they are selected, certified, placed, and how they do their jobs.

By examining literature and conducting interviews with a teacher and students who attended four inner-city schools with majority minority populations, which I analyzed data from 2003-2013, several findings come out of this study. First, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and its efforts of reform requiring teachers to be highly qualified adversely affected teachers of color. In Los Angeles Unified School District under NCLB, African American teachers, already underrepresented, were unequally displaced by white teachers. Although there was a rise in the number of Latino/a teachers in the district, US Census reports that half of Hispanics/Latino/a identify as members of white.

Second, increased teacher accountability under NCLB was transferred to students and resulted in explanations of failure of other students of color framed as a narrative in which “victims were blaming victims” when students did not do well in school. At the same time, students primarily attributed their own success to their teachers. Third, when teachers explained NCLB and its impact on students, their comments were often characterized by utilizing socioeconomic factors when

reflecting upon student success or failure. Conversely, students often avoided racialized language framing the success or failure of their fellow students and themselves in concepts that reflect European educational terms of individualism, personal responsibility, and meritocracy. This language was institutional or school specific and did not apply in describing their lives outside of school or their own communities. Therefore, students' use of dominant narratives to understand and describe themselves and others facilitates the eradication of race and points to the embracement of a postmodern identity construction of being race free, and stigma free. Unfortunately this notion emboldens the idea that in order to be successful and maneuver the educational system, disavowal of racialized identities are a necessary tool, in what many have attributed to a post-Obama and post racial narrative. Nevertheless, this undermines collective movements, although in certain instances and contexts it may have proved useful for individual students who have succeeded and made it out of high school to higher education. Despite the specific efforts of NCLB to make sure that all students are taught and learn the same regardless of race, it has, through its eradication of race, heightened the racially significant differences amongst people of color and whites even more and ultimately reinforced negative stereotypes. Fourth, students in general did not know what the NCLB Act was about. Schools and teachers failed to properly inform students about how it could impact their life chances and put the disparities of school achievement in historical context. At best understanding of the NCLB Act was generally miscommunicated or very narrowly focused on whom it would affect. Both students and teachers tended to

explain the impact as mostly being unfair that teachers were being evaluated by students' scores on standardized tests and the goals were unrealistic. Finally, students and teachers both agreed that a critical pedagogy was necessary and important for succeeding in educational institutions. However, this particular point was articulated differently by each. Teachers acknowledged that a culturally relevant education was necessary and that it was especially important to have teachers of color who could relate and model such behaviors to students. Students in this instance were quite different in that they described the alternative or unique educational instruction that they received again in terms that were in general, devoid of racial and ethnic language and decontextualized. I would argue that the historical impact of educational institutions to obliterate retention and honoring of cultural and ethnic identity are still under assault and are only attributed to failure in school but not as a vital part of success.

“Troubling for the Future”

In Los Angeles Unified School District and nationwide, one of the main consequences of NCLB was that teachers lost jobs. In both instances African American teachers specifically, who are already underrepresented lost jobs while Latino/as and Asian American teachers saw rises in their numbers. While white teachers also lost jobs, they continued to represent a majority by a significant margin. In 2003 the National Center for Educational Statistics and LAUSD respectively reports that white teachers represented 86.1% and 47.7%, Blacks 6.5% and 14%,

Latino/as 5.1% and 27.2%, and Asian 1.3% and 8.1% of the teacher populations. By the end of 2012, the last year that data could be available each database reported that white teachers represented 83% and 39.2%, Blacks 6.2% and 10.6%, Latino/as 6.8% and 33.5%, and at Asians 2% and 8.5%, respectively. Overall the statistical change over time both nationally and district-wide present the same story, that Black teachers more than any other group suffered under NCLB, as they had historically under other efforts for educational policy reform. W.E.B. DuBois stated rather prophetically that, "If and when...[the Blacks are admitted to these [public] schools certain things will inevitably follow, Negro teachers will become rarer and in many cases will disappear" (Du Bois, 1960, p. 163).

History and research have shown that teachers of color have a harder time attaining credentials, being retained as teachers, and are the most adversely affected by policy changes. These factors have been known to creators of educational policy, educators, and politicians. Vanessa Siddle (1992) commenting on one of the unintended consequences of *Brown v Board* that, "By and large, this culture of black teaching died with *Brown*." Greg Toppo in USA TODAY reported that,

In 1954, about 82,000 black teachers were responsible for teaching 2 million black children. In the 11 years immediately following *Brown*, more than 38,000 black teachers and administrators in 17 Southern and border states lost their jobs. Educators say the effects are still with us: From 1975 to 1985, the number of black students majoring in education dropped by 66%. In 2000, 84% of teachers were white, while only 61% of students were white. Blacks make up about 17% of public school students but fewer than 8% of teachers; in 2000, 38% of public schools had not a single teacher of color.

These staggering inequalities are still pervasive today and has a devastating impact on who is going into and ends up educating children of color. S.B. Etheridge captures it

best when trying to address the unintended consequences of *Brown v Board* and states, “In a war there must be some casualties, and perhaps the Black teachers will be the casualties in the fight for equal education of Black students” (Etheridge, 1979, p. 220). The war I interpret him pointing to is the war for the minds of the youths of color which had always been at the center of European colonizing efforts to “educate” them.

This turn of events ultimately was a continuance of white teachers being in charge of teaching students of color and decimated teachers of color population forcing them into other occupations as they were unable to utilize the efforts of integration to teach at white schools. It was a one way affair. These changes took away role models and culturally capable teachers from minority students and reinforced stereotypes which emphasized the intellectual inferiority of teachers of color. Roberts and Andrews (2013) state that, “Throughout our nation’s history and even present day, a continual narrative of the limited presence of Black teachers in teaching has served as an abusive tactic to delude the American public into believing that the Black community is solely at fault for the country’s supposed disinterest in successfully recruiting and retaining Black educators into the teaching profession.” During an interview with an inner-city teacher from Los Angeles, when asked, “Do you think that there were unintended consequences that came from the NCLB that the public doesn’t know about?” A teacher who taught for over twenty years stated,

[The consequence is] the decrease in qualified applicants to become teachers. I think that’s one. But you know, I’m not going to say that I’m a conspiracy theorist, but I will say that I don’t believe certain things happen by accident

because the people who create this kind of legislation have, you know, they've been educational consultants, they've been educators, you know they've been in school, they've studied educational policy, they've studied politics, and all these types of things, ... I would say that I would think that they'd be to smart or to well researched to know, or to not know that that's gonna shrink the number of qualified applicants from certain communities. I mean they have to be aware of that, they have to be aware that they are making it harder and harder and harder for people to become teachers. For them to not know that I would be, ... I wouldn't believe that they didn't know that. And see the communities that need the teachers the most I think that, I can't say it was intentional, but I also can't say that it was unintentional. To make it that much more difficult to become teachers in the communities that need them the most. I think that a teacher can be a good teacher regardless of what color they are, but I think that Asian people do need some uh Asian teachers, and I think that African American people do need some African American teachers, I think that white people, they need white teachers, and Latino people may need Latino teachers. Well if it's really hard for the students in the African American and Latino communities, as based on the data, then to make it harder for an African American person to become a teacher is having a devastating effect on the community. But ... there should be standards for teachers, so I'm not saying there shouldn't be any standards, I just think to ... make the standards higher, like what, what part of what the legislation was to make sure that all students have highly qualified teachers, but where are you going to get the pool of teachers from? And this legislation has decimated the talent pool of African American teachers in particular. I'll tell you that, I know that for a fact, I see it every day.

In an examination of teacher disparities in American educational institutions, Erica Frankenberg (2006) finds that,

Despite expanding access to educational opportunity, there remains limited minority access to higher education, and as a result, teaching, like other careers, competes to attract a relatively small pool of minority college graduates. According to the 2005 American Community Survey, among Americans 25 or older, almost 50% of Asians and 30% of non-Hispanic whites had a bachelor's degree, which only 17% of African Americans and 12% of Hispanics (of any race) had a bachelor's degree (ACS, 2006). Within teacher education programs at universities, teaching candidates of color often lack emotional, financial, and personal support and feel marginalized in programs that often have a majority of white students and faculty (Miller and Endo, 2005; Branch, 2001). An additional barrier to a more diverse teaching force is the teacher credentialing process, which, in many states, includes requiring that teachers pass standardized tests. One study found that black candidates had disproportionately low passing rates on a commonly-used test that teaching candidates are required to pass for certification (Gitomer, Latham, and Ziomek, 1999).

Making the process and path to proper credentialing more stringent and bureaucratic was an intentional strategy after the Brown v Board ruling by the US Supreme Court employed by the southern region of the country's educational institutions to limit the number of teachers of color in wake of the decision. Her findings confirm that teachers of color still face many challenges when attempting to acquire credentials and has been a major factor in maintaining a majority white teacher population. When the teacher was asked has anyone suffered because of NCLB, the teacher in LA elaborated further and stated,

Ok, let's start off with the teachers. Those young professionals who want to go into education have suffered, because NCLB created a more stringent requirements for teachers that made it more difficult to become a teacher. For example, I might be a good student, and I might have good work habits and good study habits, and have a talent for connecting with kids, have a talent for you know presenting lessons, have a talent for you know, motivating students. You know, those intangibles that I just mentioned don't really matter because NCLB made it to where you had to have a 3.0 in your last 60 units of college. Ok, be all that as it may, I may not have a 3.0 average in my last 60 units but that doesn't mean that I don't have a lot of those other intangible factors that I just mentioned that would make me be an effective educator NCLB doesn't leave space for that. Some of the criteria that they had set up for the classification as highly qualified doesn't uh leave room for those intangible things like a person's natural ability to connect with students, their natural ability to motivate students, you know their love or passion for education, and there are a lot of people who are currently teaching who came along before NCLB and are very effective in the classroom that would not have had a chance to get hired if they had come along after this legislation was uh, you know uh enacted.

Since the legislation, and because of some of these more stringent requirements, its greatly reduced the number of qualified minority educators who are available or qualified to become teachers in the state of California and therefore that's really gonna hurt the students in the next generation because they don't have enough young minority African American teachers in particular coming through the pipeline to be able to become teachers. The legislation has greatly reduced, the pool of qualified applicants, people who were qualified underneath the framework of the NCLB legislation they made it much harder for people to become teachers. So the teachers, the schools suffer from that from not having people to fill teaching positions especially in minority

communities who can relate to the minority students and who have the heart and the passion to work with them. And you know the students suffer because they don't, you know, see someone they can relate with or they don't have people who are familiar to the dynamics of living in the inner-city or coming from the inner-city and, it's a real big void, and that void is apparent right now...on the campus I work at which is located in a predominately African American Latino neighborhood. I don't think there are any black male teachers under the age of 30. So that's very troubling for the future moving forward because the legislation made it so hard to become a teacher in addition to the grade point average there's other tests and other requirements that just made it really really difficult, the focus is being put on the teachers being quote end quote highly qualified as opposed to taking into consideration all the other variables that that have a large part of, a large factor in student.

This teacher's response, while addressing the inequitable ways in which potential teachers of color are undervalued and exacerbate the complex challenges in the process to become teachers, I contended that his response is indicative of the ways in which policy constructions are more in line with European-centered ways of valuing particular knowledges grounded in science and undervalue or discard other ways of knowing and doing as inferior or substandard.. Education, much like other social institutions, can be wielded to serve and support more than one purpose at a time, and usually are doing both, which can often cloud the historical snapshot and the ensuing patterns of interaction which become the legacy of them for contemporary purposes (Donato & Lazerson, 2000; Franke, 2000).

Educational institutions remain ideologically essential in obtaining mass consensus about all issues that we face in society. Kitsuse and Specter (1987) confirm that claims for justice historically have been co-opted by the dominant majority through legislative measures as "reforms" and result in solutions that benefit the goals and concerns of the dominant majority and reproduce the status quo and the

hegemonic force of institutional agendas. Dominant society continues to view itself, especially in educational institutions and who are teachers as deals with the “caregivers” which reflective of the colonial nature of the life of the institution. It is important for students to be able to have schools which hire, retain, and encourage teachers to model the kinds of behavior and active engagement that is productive to make changes in their life course and in society at large. Multiculturalism has attempted to address this and demands that new recruitment and educative efforts are socially-justice oriented along with those potential teachers that they seek out.

“Victims Blaming Victims”

The history of educational experiences of students of color in the United States is characterized by consistent efforts of deculturation and assimilation. The imposition and implementation of colonial goals on people of color was specifically designed to eliminate embracement of identification with cultural heritages and their impact on self-identity and collective self-determination and engender identification with, and reliance on, “Americanization” and its ideals of individualism and meritocracy for success. This agenda therefore has had a detrimental effect on communities of color but specifically students of color research has shown, and I have discovered from interviews, that students, when describing the success or failure of their peers embrace the notions that their peers don’t care and don’t work hard or are not interested in doing well. This language indicates that students, even if exposed to ideas of social justice, which some students did, still utilized characterizations of

other students' abilities, capabilities, and mental states that have their ideological roots in the whites have consistently described people of color and justified their "altruistic" and at the same time destructive efforts to "civilize."

The production and disbursement of the many "stock of knowledges" that originate from a society's different groups, classes, communities, and individual agents all bear the historical markers of political, cultural, and power differentials in a multiplicity of ways. The use of knowledge and information in educational institutions has been used consciously and strategically to plan, direct, and divert many social and political destinies of the less powerful and marginalized. Despite understanding ideologies totalizing efforts conflict with the way humans see and experience the world their usage has nevertheless proliferated. Over time, the academy and the public have become more cognizant of them and more skilled at identifying and critiquing ideological standpoints. However, it is exactly this exposure to them that has led to an even greater and more sophisticated exploitation of intentionally strategic ideological practices, which, even in today's society, reproduces the status quo espoused by such ideological positions. I contend that the effort of holding teachers accountable for the success or failure of their students have produced a climate in which students have counterproductively internalized the failure of the educational system as their own and unconsciously engage in blaming the victim. When asked "do you think standardized testing should be used to evaluate teachers' ability to teach?" A Latina responded,

No, I don't really think so, because I think it mostly has to do with the student. All of the students' scores shouldn't be used for teachers, especially in a school like LA High

where the students didn't really care. I remember they would tell me that only 1/10 freshmen would graduate. I remember like all of my classes, except my math classes, no one really paid attention, no one really did the work, and I know there were some teachers would try really hard to teach us and they would get really frustrated that no one wanted to learn. You shouldn't be rating these teachers on test scores.

While acknowledging that teachers held low expectations for students and their ability to make to graduation, the student blamed the students for not having the ability to succeed or care about it. Therefore she takes the position of the system being unfair to teachers but not to the students in her school and that they are unworthy. When a black male was asked his impression of teacher population at his school, he stated,

For the most part the teachers I had at Dorsey really cared about the students and really wanted to see students succeed. A lot of times they left that opportunity for the students to come forth and seek out. Some students took full advantage of all the opportunities the teachers were offering through their education some didn't. For the most part, teachers I had really cared about success of students.

Again, the student places the burden of success solely on the shoulders of the students and espouses notions of meritocracy and desire to succeed, because it is up to students who are compelled to go to school in the first place to seek out the opportunities as if they were some sort of treasure to be found by only a certain few.

Another Latina, when asked "Does what work for the magnet school can it work for the regular school?" responded,

I would wanna say that it would help them...but at the same time I feel like they wouldn't accept it...they'll kinda just like act up again...kinda just say this is too hard can't do it...I feel like that's just what happened a lot in the regular schools...that's like a mindset block, like in a lot of that population its, it's all individual really, but if you can't like get that mindset to change to be like yes, I can become something and somebody if you really work hard in school, then yeah, cause I feel like the magnet school is so special because only certain people want to be a part of it and only certain kind of people could apply to it. Everybody could apply to it but only certain people

wanted to apply to it.

This student who lauded the efforts of her teachers and the support they provided as crucial to her success at the same time devalues the ability of the other students in the “regular” school as being able to take advantage of such the assistance she was provided. Like the previous student, she embraces notions of individualism and goes further by reinforcing the self-selective nature of high-performing students in magnet programs which are essentially a gatekeeping mechanism which selects winners and losers.

“The Racelessness to Survive”

One of the unintended discoveries made while interviewing students was that they employed language to describe their experiences which included teachers, their peers, their neighborhoods, their schools and themselves that was devoid of specific racial or ethnic characteristics. It wasn’t until reviewing the tapes looking for instances where they would describe teachers who were supportive and may have utilized culturally relevant, alternative teaching methods, or some form of critical pedagogy or multiculturalism that I realized this. After which I went back and examined each tape again and noticed that this was the case for each student and in all instances except for one student. She mentioned a white and Latino teacher. This struck me as odd in schools which were predominately students of color and had different minority-majority populations. This led me to explore research that could address the concept of “Racelessness.”

Previous literature by John Ogbu suggests the ability, or inability, to transcend

cultural boundaries may have a direct influence on the development of a folk theory of school success (Ogbu, 1992: 85). A folk theory, as defined by John Ogbu, is part of the secondary culture and is based upon the “direct and indirect teachings of the schools themselves” (Ogbu, 1992: 85) and the historical experiences of minorities regarding their response to treatment by the dominant group (Ogbu, 1992: 86). In examining the impact of folk theory on school success, Ogbu makes a conceptual distinction between folk theories of “immigrant” and “caste-like minorities.” Immigrants, Ogbu defines, “are people who have moved more or less *voluntarily* to their host or new society for economic, social or political reasons” (Ogbu, 1992: 87). Conversely, caste-like minorities “are minorities that have become incorporated into a society more or less *involuntary* and *permanently* through slavery, conquest or colonization and then relegated into menial status” (Ogbu, 1992: 90). Many researchers and projects have since sought to explain and extend Ogbu’s provocative yet seemingly overly-deterministic approach to determining the success or failure of students of color.

However, Signithia Fordham (1988) examination of high-achieving black students sought to understand the complexity of identity-management and success and she discovered that although students feel trepidation about being successful and a minority, without acting white as posited by Ogbu that they instead embrace a form of “Racelessness” in order to survive and succeed in the educational system because they are aware of the stigma associated with their racial and cultural heritages despite the advances made in racial relations and its impact on social mobility. The author hypothesizes that this concept is also applicable to other historically subjugated groups

in the United States. In each interview, students who embraced racelessness were Black and Latino/a. Students may employ this strategy when describing their own experiences and quest for school success. However, research has shown that they are racially conscious when interacting with teachers of color. For example, Betty Achinstein and Julia Aguire (2008) examining the conception of cultural match found that teachers of color in urban schools are often targeted and challenged by students of color about their racial and cultural identification and authenticity. One of their teachers summarized teachers most succinctly and states,

Be prepared to have your race be called in question. Be prepared to have your identity be called into question. . . . Be prepared to be criticized for that background and admired for it. . . . I think that's the hardest part about being a teacher of color at [my school] because I went in, and I know who I am, and I formed my identity. But just because you know who you are doesn't mean the students are going to accept it. They're going to play with it. They're going to tweak it. (Achinstein and Aguire 1505).

The challenges of diversity are complicated and the way that they are played out in educational institutions are an important focus of study for understanding the ways in which dominant and Eurocentric narratives are reproduced and maintain the status quo of racial inferiority. Even in the era of advanced studies of multiculturalism, transformative models of racial and cultural centered education have been rearticulated and succumbed to hegemony in new and complex ways. The maintenance of dominant values and morals are Durkheimian (1961) in the strictest sense of functionalism and its focus on the classroom as a microcosm of society and its efforts to engender consensus from the masses. It is this focus which disregards the

varying ways in which students of color identity-construction and maintenance are impacted educational systems and the teachers. The interactions between peers, teachers and students, and teachers and administrators influence the students attitudes, achievements, aspirations, expectations, values and how their sense of “self.” The effect of teacher or school expectations of students from particular socioeconomic groups and how the students reacted to those expectations or lack thereof are explored by “Labeling Theory” and “Exchange Theory.” Labeling theory proposes that if a student is told something enough about themselves that they will embrace and incorporate that external label into their own “self-concept” and will act accordingly, whether positive, negative or even possibly some unforeseen rearticulation of the situation. Exchange theory, in turn, focuses on the cost and rewards that are involved in all interactions with others. This way of viewing interaction explores reciprocity and the potential for bringing participants together or breaking them apart and again, some unforeseen rearticulation of the situation in social situations. Within the theory of conflict orientations, cultural reproduction and resistance perspectives explore the ways in which those in power attempt to mold individuals through ideological control to serve their own purpose, in order to maintain the status quo. Morrow and Torres (1995), for example, have pointed to what is a hidden curriculum or educational program in schools and its latent impacts that ultimately contributes to the reproduction of their own social and class positions in schools and communities.

Not Knowing is Left Behind

According to Nickse (1973) little attention has been paid in the literature in

analyzing the role of the teacher as an active agent of social change, and schools of education have avoided properly preparing teachers for any other role than an academic one. The traditional role of teachers in educational settings has been narrowly and loosely defined by the prescribed functions and work-related tasks involved in a simple certification process in most states. Additionally, the social status of the teacher is often placed at the bottom of the institutional hierarchy in the educational pecking order and has traditionally received less critical attention and focus. Teachers have for some time now been excluded from making decisions about their students and their schools and most of these concerns end up remaining the purview of researchers and politicians. According to Fullan (1993), how teachers are trained and schools are organized, there exists an educational hierarchy that maintains the status quo and is adversely affected by political decisions that all contribute to the keeping in place an inequitable institutional system.

It would help teachers to develop their critical consciousness tremendously if they themselves understood how systems such as schools operate within the network of dynamic process and learned the skill of the proper problem-solving approach in order to make lasting change in the educational environment. Nevertheless, it is rather unlikely that traditionally trained teachers can develop their critical consciousness and function as change agents. They often see the challenges that they face as being something beyond their control. It is this attitude combined with low expectations by teachers of students that often sustain, rather than change, student achievement differences. In short, LSES (Lower socioeconomic status) students and students of

color who are often not expected nor encouraged to catch up and learn the skills necessary to survive in the dominant culture. Because teachers who were being held accountable for student achievement were very resistant to such evaluation, I wanted to know what they told students about it, and what students knew and how they understood the NCLB. When a Latina student was asked, “Did you know about the NCLB Act?” she stated,

I didn’t actually. I think like by my senior year I was like oh this is NCLB, but I heard of the term but never really knew what it meant.
“

What did you know about it?”

That there was like standards that our school had to meet and every student had to kinda like take those tests and the standardized tests. And the thing is about that was, I was in leadership so we had to do, we had to kinda like help promote it and let students know...to promote the standardized test, because if we didn’t make a certain goal, our school would gonna be shut down and we were gonna be like our degree wasn’t gonna mean anything. So that’s when we were like pushing it, because, cause it was we were so low that we kinda were just like a fingernail away from being shut down.

I know my counselor she would like talk about it and just say that, that we just needed to get like uh, like we just need to meet a certain level so that we can keep going the way that we are.

“Students talk about NCLB?”

Honestly I don’t think so. It was more of just like oh, we have to take these standardized tests it’s kinda stupid. None of us really saw the point of it we were just like we don’t understand, like why do we have to take this, it has nothing to do with what we are learning blah blah blah blah, but we never really specifically talked about nclb...we didn’t even know what they were meant for. What does even mean and why is this so important?

This student’s response points to the apathy and lack of understanding of the impact of educational policy for students of color. Even though this student was in leadership, it wasn’t until her senior year that she know about the ways in which her

future could be in jeopardy, and even with that information, she still wasn't provided with enough coherent and accurate summation of the NCLB. She exemplified what many students felt was that they would be responsible for their neighborhood school getting shut down. That is too much to bear and ask of students, who are still children to bear the weight of systemic disregard. When asked if students talk about NCLB?

Honestly I don't think so. It was more of just like oh, we have to take these standardized tests it's kinda stupid. None of us really saw the point of it we were just like we don't understand, like why do we have to take this, it has nothing to do with what we are learning blah blah blah, but we never really specifically talked about NCLB ...we didn't even know what they were meant for.

What does even mean and why is this so important?

Another LA Latina was asked, did you know about NCLB when you were a student?

What I learned about it just meant that they were supposed to pass you automatically so like you were in the grade you were supposed to be or something like that. I guess that's what they told me it meant. I heard it mostly from my mom and her friends because they were complaining about it and how no one was learning anything.

This might be the most egregious example of failure of schools and teachers to inform students about the important life changing aspects of educational policy and hope for equitable educational chances and instead this student is left with the impression that the policy was nothing more than social promotion. I asked a Black male did you know about NCLB when you were a student and he responded,

I knew about it in middle school. I heard about it from my teachers. I basically all I knew is that it was if someone didn't do really good, if their grades were bad they couldn't hold them back. They had to keep passing them along, but I didn't know if it stopped somewhere or not.

When asked if teachers or admin talk about NCLB?

No I don't really remember anyone mentioning it to us at all in a formal manner.

Assemblies, before standardized testing?

No, we had assemblies before standardized testing, but it was like “get good scores, get your scores up” so make sure you study for the standardized test and take practice tests but there was pretty much no like there’s NCLB so you have to do well, or any kind of incentive, there was no mention.

Although this student claimed to know about the NCLB since middle school, he again echoes the other student’s idea of social promotion even though he attended a totally different school. It causes one to pause and wonder if this was one of the ways that was utilized in schools of color to explain NCLB.

According to Rousmaniere (1997) one of the principal reasons that curriculum reform, have been less than successful is that teachers and administrators have often been able to ignore them. The institutional structure of schools is semi-autonomous in that they may be refined to incorporate certain reforms, but until recently, they’ve been able to do as they saw fit. Bushnell goes on to state, “These conditions may have fostered the attitude that some current teachers hold toward curricular, pedagogical, or other reforms with which they do not agree: if they waited long enough, the disputed reform likely will be supplanted by a new “latest idea” (p. 266). Even though teachers may have thought that they were doing what was best for their students by resisting these externally imposed programs, their actions failed challenge existing unequal power structures. More often than not, they likely reinforced current systems of power, as Foucault (1979, 1980) and McLaren (1989) suggested, “Instead of resisting, some teachers ignore the implications of surveillance and conduct their work with the prescribed limitations. They focus on their students and do not disrupt the system,” believing that they are doing the best they can for their students within

the existing institutional and pedagogical framework. Ultimately, Rousmaniere (1997) concludes that “teachers’ resistances are superficial,” and only allude to change without exploring the underlying power relationships. Teachers are masters of adaptation, but such skill does not have true substantive qualities but only points to passivity. Instead of helping to address and change the education-gap, teachers often end up sustaining it through practices that they believe are resistive and transformative. Nonetheless, their efforts may actually end up contributing to the widening of the educational gap. How much power difference they have is still uncertain but, “it may be quite substantial if effects accumulate from kindergarten through high school (Bushnell, 2003). Many critical theorists and educational researchers interested in the liberating potential of resistance by students and teachers within the school setting only focus on acts which seem obviously in opposition to the logic of schooling itself and are disruptive and intentional.

For Baudelot and Establet, contradictory consciousness is informed by both dominant and oppositional ideologies, and as a result, some students and even teachers in some instances may resist book learning or standardized testing in favor of behavior that is subversive and undermining to a fundamental school ideology, at the cost of developing forms of critical literacies that may be crucial to their own liberation of mobility in some cases (p. 78 *Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate Over ...* By Stanley Aronowitz, Henry A. Giroux).

Whereas colonial education was open and very specific about its goals specifically in the creation of legislation. Educational policy post *Brown v Board* and its intentions have often been coded in ways that purport to be working toward undoing the intentionally created disparities that came from an “Americanizing” education

dismiss notions of the historical structural impediments which still plague most people of color.

“Taught to Live, Survive, and Thrive”

There have been many attempts to capture the essence of what makes a good teacher and the ways in which that teachers actions impact the success of students.

There were several themes that emerged from my study which address this issue.

From the interview of one teacher and 7 students from inner-city schools, I found that the reasons most espoused by students were that they were pushed by teachers who cared and wanted them to go to college and taught them from a social justice perspective to understand the world so that they could accomplish that. However, in the instance of the teacher, he put forth a more simplistic notion that he was teaching the students for life after high school that didn't necessarily focus on higher academia, but one of citizenship and survival in the labor economy. When asked about teaching going on even if students weren't testing well, a LA teacher stated,

Let's say there is a student who may have a broken home, may live in a group home, uh transitional living, uh situations, and we have a large number of those students in our inner-city schools for whatever the reason may be. Mmkay, and let's say you come to a class where, let's just take an economics class for example, and let's say there's a lesson presented on finance and personal, you know, budgeting. Ok, so let's say you're taught you know how much, how much uh money per hour to be able to survive on your own ok. And let's say its presented to you uh, what types of training and what types of careers that you can go into to be able to make a living to uh to sustain yourself. Alright so let's say you're given that structure presented to you, you may or may not be the most academically inclined student, let's say that you get B's and C's on your report card, or even let's say C's and D's but you're not a bad person, um you're not a bad student, you're just not the best student. Ok, and taking this class has motivated you and inspired you, you know to start taking city exams and looking for employment in the service based sector or blue collar type skills and let's say you uh, you know research and find you a position opening somewhere like MTA, so you fill out

applications and you go through the training process and you get hired. And you know, now you're a bus driver and you're able to establish yourself you know with a basic career and a basic living you know as a bus driver. So that class, if you were to take the AP test in economics, or, see they don't give CST's in economics cause they don't test the 12th graders...you may or may not have scored high on that test, you might even got a C in the class, you might not have been an A or B student, but with that basic knowledge that you received, and the empowerment that you got, from you know the structure of being exposed to what it takes to go out into society and earn a living for yourself. That gave you some structure and direction that you may or may not have had before. So now you able to go make a living for yourself. See everybody's not going to be able to go up the corporate ladder per se, you know, but there are a lot of blue collar you know type skills and professions that are needed in today's economy and you know there are a lot of students who are eager to want to fulfill those types of positions if the information is presented to them in a way that's digestible or palatable for them. I might not be able to do trigonometry, or calculus or physics, but I might be really really good at basic math, and by being good at basic math you know I can figure things out and be able to have some structure you know for my life and my finances. Like that.

This teacher's response while embracing a perspective that can be considered simply as reproducing the status quo in ways that are reminiscent of theorists explanation that schooling is sorting mechanism for the division of labor and class-based, he also points to something more critical that has been ignored and that is, no social mobility and intellectual growth and civic action is possible of a student isn't capable of taking care of the basic necessities to live such as food, clothing, and shelter. Additionally, the sort of lessons that he shares is also a part of education that has been gutted by Reganism in the 1980s and the dismantling of vocational training which was good enough to help build the middle class, but once minorities were given the same access to such programs, they were eliminated all in the wake of advances that were made in the previous two decades which sought to even the socioeconomic playing field. However, when a Latina student was asked, so what is special about your school she

stated,

One group that was really awesome to me was students run LA, and that was because that teacher was a hardass...that one professor, I think he was the biggest hardass in the entire school...everyone knew him, everyone was like you don't want to take a class with Dr. R, like he's like the hardest teacher. I just remember like I did take his class, I took his class for biology he was so hard and he would make us, he like would assign like 6 chapters to read and we had to do homework after that and no one was going to do it, as a freshman in high school. So he made us like sit outside of the, of the classroom and like write down our homework and wouldn't let us go inside until we finished our homework. So it was funny to have him as a hard ass teacher, and then I had him for a student's run LA coach. And then, we were able to...then in time became, our friend our mentor, like somebody we looked up to, someone like who would push us because he knew we were capable of doing something. And I just think that was like an amazing experience because we were able to, like after or before class we would run like at 6 in the morning...unfortunately Crenshaw fired him, and he was the most, one of the most like amazing professors there...a lot of the students would complain about him and complain to the parents and the parents would come complain to the school and I think that had to do with stuff and I think just like budgets maybe. He definitely pushed them to go to college changed and he changed their perspectives in a lot of the ways that they thought about life. Cause a lot of them grew up in a really tough household. So being like able to have that figure and that person to like even though like he was a hardass and he was really mean to a lot of people, he cared about this one kid, that kid really felt special, and really felt like he was important, and was like able to do something with his life, even though he wasn't doing so well. Even like in his other classes and stuff, after senior year you could tell that he grew out of what he was going into, he was like going into the wrong path, but the influence of that one teacher kinda like made him wake up.

This student's response speaks to what many educational researchers have known and that is it is productive when teachers have high expectations and "teach up" along with having the connection with students in ways that they can and do accept your position as an authority figure, but at the same time develop the student-teacher relationship in ways that focus on mentoring for life. And along with the previous teacher interview which talked of students getting what they need from their time spent in school, whether it be a lesson of survival in the labor market, this teacher, while having expectations for his students to go to college, also recognized that a

student who wasn't necessarily a great student needed support which could assist the student in making a choice for life and not go down the wrong path. Both can be considered equally successful and good teachers are in tune with the needs of their students' community wide and also individually and should be trained to effectively deal with such issues. When asked about how much time they prepared for standardized test, a Latina student responded,

So for my magnet, no, I would say no, because we had like our different agenda where we'd read different books that didn't have anything to do with the test. Like when it actually came to the test, we would have time to like review things. We definitely had a different agenda, but like when it came close to it we definitely pushed to get ready for it.

Finally, this student talks about how it is possible for students to do well on standardized tests although in her classes they had a different "agenda" for what they wanted to learn and get accomplished. This can be done by teachers being specific and understanding and sharing with students that policy imposed standards and alternative socially-justice based educations don't have to be at odds, and cancel one another out, but instead work dialectically to provide students with an opportunity to do well in school and also enrich their lives in ways that are important to them communally as well. Another LA Latina when asked did you have any teachers that used any unique or alternative teaching methods while you were at LA High stated,

Yeah, I do think so because like nobody there was really that much into activities at the school and they would connect with students who couldn't really connect with their teachers and stuff like that. Lots of professors would talk about equality and social justice and stuff like that and try to connect with Hispanic and black children and they would have this like Mexican history professor who would try to connect with all the troubled kids who would not socialize much with other people.

So what life skills were they trying to teach?

The one time the professor tried teaching was like don't get in trouble with gangs, don't associate with gangs. That's like the one lesson I actually learned.

This student's response shows that students do pay attention and notice those who reach out to them even though they may not be the best students or are isolated because of their behavior. The addition of warnings to stay away from gangs is a lesson that many students know and have to deal with on a daily basis, but the effort of an educator to explain why and give students the information they need to understand the historical forces which may have created the conditions and context they live in now is an opportunity that most students are not afforded at that level in education. An education in the criminal justice system would serve students well as they watch many of their peers vanish away into the prison-industrial complex. A Black male student was asked, "do you think standardized tests should be used to evaluate teachers?" and he responds,

Definitely not because I'll go back to my history test, I don't think I learned anything that was on a standardized test, but I learned quite a bit. In some history classes you would just learn the regular stuff. But in this history class, every day we learned stuff, we learned that Christopher Columbus wasn't really this great person and he was responsible for a lot of deaths. WE learned about cointelpro and the black panthers and all of it. That was stuff I definitely would not have learned in another class and I definitely feel like he was an amazing teacher had it not been for that class I wouldn't have a thirst for knowing stuff like that. So I definitely feel like that definitely it not a good way to gauge how teachers teach, because they could be teaching something different and teaching it very well instead of teaching what's on the test.

This student's response is interesting in that while he doesn't believe that teachers should be evaluated by students' scores on standardized test, he simultaneously

acknowledge how alternative information that he was given encouraged his “thirst for knowledge.” Culturally relevant education can empower students in many ways that do not always result in creating an oppositional identity, oppose schooling or foster resistance in ways that prevent them from being successful in school.

As the racial and cultural landscape began to change, people of color were beginning to have more of a presence in educational institutions and multicultural scholarship that pushed for changes in teacher education that focused on cultural competence and culturally relevant pedagogy grounded in a global framework that provided opportunities for all students, and not just those from traditionally white and middle-class backgrounds. Grant (2006) therefore surmises that multicultural education has evolved to bring historically marginalized groups to the forefront of public education and create spaces where discussions among diverse groups of people, can, through interaction generate new ideas and sensibilities about the world in which they live that otherwise may have not been discovered. It is through these attempts to critically talk about and analyze the inequalities within the educational system, that possible strategies for the continued inclusion of marginalized groups can be most fruitful.

Therefore, according to Gibson (1976), multicultural education is the process of developing competencies in multiple systems that allow for many different ways of seeing, understanding, knowing, and doing. According to Grant (2006), from a multicultural perspective, there is no one correct way of experiencing the world that represents any dominant truth. Consequently, multicultural education is therefore

naturally inclusive of multiple policy, practice, and structural approaches and alternative methods of educating. As a result, an authentic multicultural education acknowledges, celebrates and advocates for the histories and contributions of marginalized groups to be more of a part of the traditional curriculum. It is explicitly committed to challenging the previous omitted and distorted views of marginalized groups. It proposes that the point in history at which we've arrived requires alternative explanations. Its proponents' desires are to make known the ways in which institutional and personal decision making have been influenced by exclusionary practices and illuminate the resulting consequences. Paulo Freire's (1970) attempt to extend and refine this thinking relied on people's ability to "read the word and the world" and critically understand the importance of the relationship of education and politics in this process.

Conclusion

Colonial education in America has had a decimating impact on people of color and whites as well. The attempt to "Americanize" people of color has been implemented in different ways over time and has always been geared to destruct the connection to cultural heritages and ways of knowing and living. This pattern has continued in the development of educational policy over time as the racial landscape changes and becomes more diverse in complex and subtle ways that have taken the job of communities of color of educating their youth for a world that sought to change them explicitly which relied on perpetuating inferiority, self-hate, low expectations and despair. The intentions of NCLB has taken a similar path in that it expects all

children to be taught the same thing and learn the same, despite the disparate historical conditions from which they have come from. Educational institutions are the only institutions in society where children are compelled to go and grow from a child to an adult in. this uniqueness is the new peculiar institution.

The most fundamental focus for social change has been human agency first and then structural change. However, this change which hinges on the political clarity of the teachers as they must be able to articulate that students' school failure is inextricably linked to other forms, formal and informal, of social decay that they experience daily. Students' interpretations of the past and present about these issues should be utilized as ways to encourage their participation in a more realized democratic project that will close the educational gap but also, confront the many other connected social issues that they will become aware of. The struggle of students and their resistance to domination is central to any endeavor seeking to change the conditions in urban schools as it directly speaks to their experience in larger society (D'Amato 1996). Their learning then is deeply connected to their ability to work together with other students and teachers in the process of what King (2006) "deciphering culture-centered knowledge" that leads to students embracing their own unique forms of "Diaspora literacy" (culturally informed knowledge) that is based on their "heritage knowledge" (group memory) all in the same setting.

Chapter 8: Historical Genealogy of Educational Policies and the Future of Decolonial Emancipatory Projects

The study set out to explore the ways in which Euro-centered constructions of knowledge, culture, and race have been used as the primary conceptions in the production of a colonial educational paradigm for people of color in North America. The implementation and enforcement of this paradigm has taken several forms for different groups over time but has always been the foundation for any formal and informal educational goals and outcomes, and have always been separate and unequal. It is through this historical lens that I sought to provide a genealogy of educational policy to its most current manifestation in the form of The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and its totalizing efforts make sure that all children receive the same education and are taught the same.

Examining the history of educational policy construction and implementation has served as a most useful endeavor in understanding the role of teacher education programs, white teachers' predominance in the educational field at the expense of teachers of color, and the detrimental impact on students of color life chances and their longstanding struggles with "achievement" in American society. The idea of what constitutes learning and teaching for historically subjugated groups, along with the purpose of educational institutions all require critical reevaluation and restructuring to shift the current trajectory of continuing destruction and division of communities of color. Making the process and path to proper credentialing more stringent and bureaucratic was an intentional strategy after the *Brown v Board* ruling by the US Supreme Court employed by the southern region of the country's educational institutions to limit the number of teachers of color in wake of the

decision.

Prior to being subjugated under a North American political regime that included subjection to Eurocentric modes of education, People of Color had generally educated their children from a culturally-centered knowledge that honored their way of life, and promoted seeing the world through a collective perspective as the basis for the survival as a group. Children and those that teach them remain the most integral relationship in any society or group. For people of color, colonial education intervened in this process in the most detrimental of ways in that it destroyed a relevant life-affirming education with one that both through violence and subtlety intentionally worked to eradicate this connection and replace it with cold notions of individualistic personal success and achievement. Two things particularly came from this shift. First, the knowledge, wisdom, and understanding of elders and ancestors who were the role models as teachers from communities of color was devalued and deemed irrelevant in navigating this new experience because they were being killed or forced into submission. Second, white teachers became surrogates of authority for authentic ways of living and created an educational industry based on this framework couched in language of altruistic caregivers. This industry is now reproduced and sustained in the academy and its teacher education programs. Despite the efforts over time to acknowledge and address the diversifying student population of America, teacher education programs at best have only scratched the surface and still through regulations and policy deny access of people of color to equally participate in the education of their youth.

The systemic culture of failure created in Euro-centered educational institutions that students of color have historically and continue to endure has always been attributed to their cultural backgrounds and them individually. Educators, politicians, researchers and society in general must be honest in our critique and efforts if we are truly to hold those accountable for inequities in schools. Teachers in general by nature of their jobs spend more time with children as they move from adolescence to adulthood than parents do. And because of legal and historically extralegal efforts to maintain white teachers as the predominant population of educators, then one can only look to them with questions at minimum about their own effectiveness, intentions, and the roles they have played in sustaining a system predicated on dominance and disparity. Teacher education programs attempt to make white teachers aware of their own privilege and subconscious attitudinal thinking about students of color and their potential to succeed have simply, not worked. Even the most radical pedagogical strategies presented in teacher education programs are devoid of examining and explaining why investments in students of color are not only necessary, but critical for future teachers and all students in a way that honor cultural heritages and their impact on self-identity and collective self-determination as we move forward to what has been posited by Ronald R. Sundstrom (2008) as “The Browning of America.” While the efforts of multiculturalism have been noble and have made contributions to intellectual and political advances in education, they have nevertheless been co-opted by conservatism and rearticulated into a melting pot perspective which has again contributed to the obliteration and dismissal of historical

culturally unique range of experiences of students and communities of color and has also advanced notions of racelessness. How do we as educators as primary decision-makers of implementing policy address the differences and the similarities in experiences of people of color in a way that is respectful, uplifting, and progressive?

The different modes of incorporation of Asian, African, Latino/a, and Native Americans into American society have indeed framed the different experiences, expectations, and attempts to resist colonial domination, exclusion, and exploitation. Therefore, it is necessary to employ a strategy to remedy the different ways in which each group has been adversely affected with an approach that is capable of ideological and pragmatic malleability. John Brown Childs (2003) has offered his analysis of a method of engaging with such issues through his conceptual excavation of what he has termed as Transcommunalism. For Childs, Transcommunalism is about a way of engaging personally and politically with others when there exist differences that impact strategies and agendas for advancement. This method of engagement is geared to address issues both socially and politically. Particularly, it is this mode of interaction that I suggest is ripe for examination within educational institutions and teacher programs as a pedagogy. The ability of Transcommunalism to forge new alliances and concurrently honor group autonomy is radical and pragmatic due to its fundamental reliance on a culturally cognizant heterogeneity and its disavowal of hierarchal relationships. As a society we have come to another critical point in our history and therefore must find new and approach that is forward thinking and mindful of our past. Transcommunalism is about transforming the human condition,

which is what a useful education should do as the foundation for social change and social justice. How do we change the human condition while being respectful of the diverse experiences and life-perspectives that communities bring to the table? A Transcommunal pedagogy and education provides the necessary skills to decode dominant discourse and understand the many ways in which people of color have been dominated and oppressed, in addition to the ability to navigate through educational institutions, retain their culture, and identify the cultural assault on their ways of knowing and seeing the world promulgated through the myth of meritocracy. All people of color have been affected in different ways by the internal colonizing force of educational systems. However, a Transcommunal approach can facilitate acknowledging these differences in ways that create ideological guideposts for all groups as they resist reproducing efforts of schooling, instead of comparing experiences for future of justice claims and victim status becomes the fight in and of itself. Unity-based efforts and movements have often suffered or were rendered ineffective because of this phenomena. Transcommunality as a pedagogical practice requires redefining the socioeconomic status of people of color no longer in terms of deficits, but instead as additive and as an abundant source for solutions to approach remedying educational the crisis. This is necessary both in formal educational institutions by teachers, students, and the communities they serve in order to implement truly transformative activism and practices in all aspects of society.

APPENDICES

Dear Crenshaw High School Alumni,

My name is Derrick Jones, I am a graduate student and PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Currently, I am writing my dissertation on the No Child Left Behind Act focusing on the experiences of students who attended Crenshaw High School in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and who are now attending UC Santa Cruz. Crenshaw has a rich history in the Los Angeles area and I am interested in interviewing you about your time in attendance and your understanding of the focus on standardized testing as part of the NCLB Act. Many educators often felt as if they had to “teach to the test” under the NCLB. Therefore, I am also interested in if you as students felt you had to “learn for the test”, and whether or not you think progress was made under such conditions.

Your participation will be greatly appreciated and is very critical in examining and extending research on educational policy and reform, and its impact on equal education for all. If interested in participating please contact me immediately. If you are curious and would like more information that may help with your decision to participate, and may have not been covered in this in this initial letter, please feel free to contact me: Derrick Jones, Sociology Department Room 128, UC Santa Cruz, deljones@ucsc.edu. I will respond to all inquiries.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH.

Best,
Derrick Jones

Dear Dorsey High School Alumni,

My name is Derrick Jones, I am a graduate student and PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Currently, I am writing my dissertation on the No Child Left Behind Act focusing on the experiences of students who attended Dorsey High School in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and who are now attending UC Santa Cruz. Dorsey has a rich history in the Los Angeles area and I am interested in interviewing you about your time in attendance and your understanding of the focus on standardized testing as part of the NCLB Act. Many educators often felt as if they had to “teach to the test” under the NCLB. Therefore, I am also interested in if you as students felt you had to “learn for the test”, and whether or not you think progress was made under such conditions. Your participation will be greatly appreciated and is very critical in examining and extending research on educational policy and reform, and its impact on equal education for all.

If interested in participating please contact me immediately. If you are curious and would like more information that may help with your decision to participate, and may have not been covered in this in this initial letter, please feel free to contact me:

Derrick Jones, Sociology Department Room 128, UC Santa Cruz,
deljones@ucsc.edu. I will respond to all inquiries.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH.

Best,
Derrick Jones

Dear Los Angeles High School Alumni,

My name is Derrick Jones, I am a graduate student and PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Currently, I am writing my dissertation on the No Child Left Behind Act focusing on the experiences of students who attended Los Angeles High School in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and who are now attending UC Santa Cruz. Los Angeles High has a rich history in the Los Angeles area and I am interested in interviewing you about your time in attendance and your understanding of the focus on standardized testing as part of the NCLB Act. Many educators often felt as if they had to “teach to the test” under the NCLB. Therefore, I am also interested in if you as students felt you had to “learn for the test”, and whether or not you think progress was made under such conditions. Your participation will be greatly appreciated and is very critical in examining and extending research on educational policy and reform, and its impact on equal education for all.

If interested in participating please contact me immediately. If you are curious and would like more information that may help with your decision to participate, and may have not been covered in this in this initial letter, please feel free to contact me:

Derrick Jones, Sociology Department Room 128, UC Santa Cruz,
deljones@ucsc.edu. I will respond to all inquiries.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH.

Best,
Derrick Jones

Dear Whitney High School Alumni,

My name is Derrick Jones, I am a graduate student and PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Currently, I am writing my dissertation on the No Child Left Behind Act focusing on the experiences of students who attended Whitney High School, and who are now attending UC Santa Cruz. Whitney High has a rich history in the Los Angeles area and a very distinguished reputation, and I am interested in interviewing you about your time in attendance and your understanding of the focus on standardized testing as part of the NCLB Act. Many educators often felt as if they had to “teach to the test” under the NCLB. Therefore, I am also interested in if you as students felt you had to “learn for the test”, and whether or not you think progress was made under such conditions. Your participation will be greatly appreciated and is very critical in examining and extending research on educational policy and reform, and its impact on equal education for all.

If interested in participating please contact me immediately. If you are curious and would like more information that may help with your decision to participate, and may have not been covered in this in this initial letter, please feel free to contact me:

Derrick Jones, Sociology Department Room 128, UC Santa Cruz,
deljones@ucsc.edu. I will respond to all inquiries.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH.

Best,
Derrick Jones



Name: Derrick Jones
Department of: Sociology
Address: 1156 High St, Santa Cruz, CA 95064
Title of Research Project: No Child Left Behind: *Compliance, Consent, and Beyond*

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Introductory section: You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Derrick Jones from the department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Before you decide whether or not to participate in the study, you should read this form and ask questions if there is anything that you do not understand.

Description of the project: The purpose of the study is to examine the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which gave the nation's schools until 2013 to raise student's academic achievement. Since the enactment of the law, many schools have been under extreme pressure to meet mandatory progress marks over the years, thereby making educators often feel as if they had to "teach to the test". We have now made it to 2013 and this project examines teachers' opinions and attitudes about the NCLB Act, standardized testing, and whether or not progress has been made. Finally, it seeks to explore other issues relevant to NCLBA.

What you will do in the study: If you decide to take part in this study, here is what will happen: You will take a survey which will ask you to answer multiple choice questions and some questions which require a brief explanation. Additionally, if you are interested in elaborating on any issues that arise and require more time to explain, participate in an interview which would be recorded, based on your availability. You will be asked questions about both academic and social experiences that effect how you go about your daily work and allotted time to talk about any other issues that you think are relevant to your experiences.

Time required: Participation will take approximately 15-30 minutes to complete the survey.

Benefits of this study: Although there will be no direct benefit to you for taking part in this study, the researcher may learn more about what the conditions were like for teachers and give them voice to aid in understanding what it was like to work under the NCLB Act which will greatly aid in research on educational policy reform and its

impact on equal education for all students.

Compensation (N/A)

Confidentiality, Risks or discomfort:

Despite my best efforts to keep all identifiable information kept secure and safe, there is however a potentially minimal risk that your identity or responses could be unintentionally disclosed. Interviews will be audio recorded. In each instance, I will be the only researcher with access to the original copies. There will be no other copies made. However, transcripts, both hard copy and digital will be the only information that will be available to those assisting with data entry. Although the audio recordings themselves will be coded, the transcripts themselves will not follow the same coding system. For example, the transcripts will be organized thematically and will incorporate information shared by participants by purposeful sampling according to themes that I, the primary researcher deem necessary and important for developing narratives based on themes that emerge from the data.

All hard copies of data collected will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my office for the duration of my project, and until graduation. After that, all hard copies will be destroyed and only digital copies will exist. All master and complete digital files from my research will be kept on a password protected external hard drive that will be locked away at my residence in a file cabinet for which only I will have the key.

Student assistants will be informed and trained in the ethical and legal procedures for handling data when human subjects are involved. Additionally, each student permitted to work on data entry will be chosen based on their outstanding work from both current or past sociology statistic courses and their aptitude for grasping the sensitive nature of research when working with human subjects. Although students will be working with interview transcripts and survey data entry, they will be working with numerical codes for only I will have the master key. They will be assigned random batches of data to enter so as not to be able to identify school, teacher, or patterns in the data provided. Finally, no students working on data entry will be from any of the schools from which students have attended or from where they may have any social relationships which may jeopardize the anonymity of any research participant.

Additionally, the nature of this research and your shared opinion about the subject matter, No Child Left Behind, and your own personal experiences is highly unlikely to have any detrimental consequences to your personal, professional, academic or political endeavors.

I like would your permission to keep your data for use in future research studies that

may explore issues and topics that were not able to be sufficiently explored for the purposes and intents of this current project. If you agree, the data will then only be accessible to me for further research endeavors.

In case there is any injury to the subject: (N/A)

Decision to quit at any time: The decision to take part in this study is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate. Even if you decide at first to take part, you are free to change your mind at any time and quit the study. Whatever you decide will in no way affect your job, private life or result in loss of benefits or services to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

Rights and Complaints: If you have questions about this research, please contact {Derrick Jones PhD Candidate, 1156 High Street Santa Cruz CA 95062, 831-332-0799, deljones@ucsc.edu. You may also contact the faculty member supervising this work: Hiroshi Fukurai, Professor of Sociology, 1156 High Street, 831-459-2971, hfukurai@ucsc.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Compliance Administration at the University of California at Santa Cruz at 831-459-1473 or orca@ucsc.edu.

Signature:

Signing this document means that you understand the information given to you in this form and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the research described above.

___ I agree to be surveyed.

___ I agree to be interviewed.

___ I agree to have my interview recorded.

___ I give my permission for my data to be retained and used in future studies described above.

Signature of Participant

Date

Typed/printed Name

Please sign both consent forms, keeping one for yourself.



Name: Derrick Jones
Department of: Sociology
Address: 1156 High St, Santa Cruz, CA 95064
Title of Research Project: No Child Left Behind: *Compliance, Consent, and Beyond*

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Introductory section: You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Derrick Jones from the department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Before you decide whether or not to participate in the study, you should read this form and ask questions if there is anything that you do not understand.

Description of the project: The purpose of the study is to examine the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which gave the nation's schools until 2013 to raise student's academic achievement. Since the enactment of the law, many schools have been under extreme pressure to meet mandatory progress marks over the years, thereby making educators often feel as if they had to "teach to the test" and students to "learn for the test". We have now made it to 2013 and these interview will examine students' opinions and attitudes about the NCLB Act, standardized testing, and whether or not progress has been made. Finally, it seeks to explore other issues relevant to NCLBA.

What you will do in the study: If you decide to take part in this study, here is what will happen: You will be interviewed and asked your opinion on a range of questions and a brief explanation and elaboration on any issues that arise and which would require more time to explain. The interview will be audio tape recorded, and interviews will based on your availability. You will be asked questions about both academic and social experiences at your former high school with time allotted for any other issues that you think are relevant to your current experiences as a student.

Time required: Participation will take approximately 30 minutes to one hour for per interview.

Benefits of this study: Although there will be no direct benefit to you for taking part in this study, the researcher may learn more about what the conditions were like for students and give them voice to aid in understanding your experiences of what it was like to learn and achieve under the NCLB Act which will greatly aid in research on

educational policy reform and its impact on equal education for all students.

Compensation (N/A)

Confidentiality, Risks or Discomfort:

Despite my best efforts to keep all identifiable information kept secure and safe, there are however a potentially minimal risk that your identity or responses could be unintentionally disclosed. Interviews will be audio recorded. In each instance, I will be the only researcher with access to the original copies. There will be no other copies made. However, transcripts, both hard copy and digital will be the only information that will be available to those assisting with data entry. Although the audio recordings themselves will be coded, the transcripts themselves will not follow the same coding system. For example, the transcripts will be organized thematically and will incorporate information shared by participants by purposeful sampling according to themes that I, the primary researcher deem necessary and important for developing narratives based on themes that emerge from the data.

All hard copies of data collected will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my office for the duration of my project, and until graduation. After that, all hard copies will be destroyed and only digital copies will exist. All master and complete digital files from my research will be kept on a password protected external hard drive that will be locked away at my residence in a file cabinet for which only I will have the key.

Student assistants will be informed and trained in the ethical and legal procedures for handling data when human subjects are involved. Additionally, each student permitted to work on data entry will be chosen based on their outstanding work from both current or past sociology statistic courses and their aptitude for grasping the sensitive nature of research when working with human subjects. Although students will be working with interview transcripts and survey data entry, they will be working with numerical codes for only I will have the master key. They will be assigned random batches of data to enter so as not to be able to identify school, teacher, or student patterns in the data provided. Finally, no students working on data entry will be from any of the schools from which students have attended or from where they may have any social relationships which may jeopardize the anonymity of any research participant.

Additionally, the nature of this research and your shared opinion about the subject matter, No Child Left Behind, and your own personal experiences is highly unlikely to have any detrimental consequences to your personal, professional, academic or political endeavors.

In case there is any injury to the subject: (N/A)

Decision to quit at any time: The decision to take part in this study is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate. Even if you decide at first to take part, you are free to change your mind at any time and quit the study. Whatever you decide will in no way affect your current standing as a student, grades, private life or result in loss of benefits or services to which the subject is otherwise entitled as a university student.

Rights and Complaints: If you have questions about this research, please contact {Derrick Jones PhD Candidate, 1156 High Street Santa Cruz CA 95062, 831-332-0799, deljones@ucsc.edu. You may also contact the faculty member supervising this work: Hiroshi Fukurai, Professor of Sociology, 1156 High Street, 831-459-2971, hfukurai@ucsc.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Compliance Administration at the University of California at Santa Cruz at 831-459-1473 or orca@ucsc.edu.

Signature:

Signing this document means that you understand the information given to you in this form and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the research described above.

___ I agree to be interviewed.

___ I agree to have my interview recorded.

___ I give my permission for my data to be retained and used in future studies described above.

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____

Typed/printed Name _____

Please sign both consent forms, keeping one for yourself.

Teacher Interview Schedule

1. In general, how do teachers feel about the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001?
2. Has the NCLB Act made any improvement in the quality of education for students?
3. Can federally mandated educational policy deal with the issues that teachers face on a daily basis?
4. Has anyone suffered because of the NCLB Act? If so, how?
5. What do you think about the idea of requiring teachers to be highly-qualified under the NCLB Act?
6. What do student need that the NCLB Act has not addressed?
7. What are your views on standardized testing as a way to evaluate students?
8. What are your views on using standardized testing to evaluate teacher effectiveness?
9. What other methods, if any, should be utilized in evaluating students and/or teachers?
10. Do you think that the NCLB unfairly targeted particular schools? Why?
11. Do you think the NCLB making school data on students and teachers public fair?
12. Are there any unintended consequences from the NCLB that you think the public doesn't know about?
13. What would you say the climate of the school is now since the date of NCLB requirement for compliance has come and gone?

14. What kinds of training efforts do you think to improve teacher quality would work better than the NCLB Act?
15. What do you think the overall impact of the NCLB Act has been on your school?
16. Anything you want to add to this interview?

Interview Schedule for UCSC Students

1. What is special about your former high school?
2. What was like being a student at (Crenshaw, Dorsey, Los Angeles, or Whitney) High?
 - a. When and how long did you attend?
 - b. Impression of students, teachers, administrators, neighborhoods?
 - c. Any special school activities were you involved?
3. What were some of the benefits (or problems?) of attending (Crenshaw, Dorsey, Los Angeles, or Whitney) High?
4. Did you know about the No Child Left Behind Act when you were a student?
If so, what?
5. Did teachers or administrators talk about NCLB? If so, what did they say?
6. Did students talk about NCLB amongst themselves? What sort of things were said?
7. Was standardized testing a significant topic of discussion at your school? Who talked about it the most?
8. How do you feel about standardized testing? How well did you do?
9. Do you feel academic programs were more designed toward taking the test?
Why?
10. Do you feel you were adequately prepared for taking standardized tests? If so, (no or yes) why or why not?

11. Should standardized test be used to evaluate teachers' ability to teach?
12. Should standardized test be used to evaluate what students have learned?
13. Did teachers use unique or alternative methods to teach?
14. Are there better ways to prepare students for college? Life?
15. Were you part of any academic or social clubs that enriched your experience as a student?
16. How much of role did the administrators at your school play in student life in your opinion? Were they helpful in assisting students, or teachers?
17. Was learning to think critically as a student a promoted and supported during your educational experience? What about for the school overall?
18. Which teachers do you remember best and why?
19. What teachers had the most lasting impact upon you?
20. How did any of these teachers influence your trajectory in higher education?
21. Are you still in contact with any of your secondary school teachers?
22. Would you recommend any of these teachers to high school age friends, family or acquaintances?
23. Is there anything not covered that you would like to share about your experience at (Crenshaw, Dorsey, Los Angeles, or Whitney) High?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATION

SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064 TEL:(831)459---1473
orca@ucsc.edu

RE: No Child Left Behind: Compliance,
Consent, and Beyond UCSC IRB Protocol #
2148

UCSC Principal

Investigator: Jones, Derrick

Exempt Determination

Date:

Dear Investigator:

The Office of Research Compliance Administration has reviewed the proposed use of human subjects in the project referenced above and has determined that the project is exempt from further IRB review.

Please note that you should consult with the Office of Research Compliance Administration if you have any plans to make changes to your study. Additionally, if an adverse event or unanticipated problem occurs during the research, it is your responsibility to notify the IRB immediately.

The UCSC IRB operates under a Federalwide Assurance approved by the DHHS Office for Human Research Protections, FWA00002797. Our DHHS IRB Registration Number is IRB00000266.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alice Kindheart".

Alice Kindheart
Office of Research
Compliance Administration
(831) 459-1473
orca@ucsc.edu

References

- Akbar, N. (1984). Afrocentric social sciences for human liberation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 14(4), 395-414.
- Alabama Schools. In Helen Ladd (Ed.), *Holding Schools Accountable*. Washington,
- Alarcon, N. (1991). "The Theoretical Subject(s) of This Bridge Called My back and Anglo-American Feminism." *From Criticism in the Borderlands. Studies in Chicano Literature, Culture and Ideology*. Edited by Hector Calderon and Jose Davod Saldivar. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs*, vol. 13, no 3, pp. 405-436.
- Alkebulan, A. A. (2007). Defending the paradigm. *Journal of Black Studies*, vol. 37, 410-427.
- Althusser, L. (1971) *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Education, Structure & Society*. (Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays*. Translated from the French by Ben Brewster. London N.L.B.
- Anderson, B. R. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London; New York: Verso.
- Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *American Educational Research Association*, 28(5), pp. 12-21+40.
- Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, c1988.
- Apple, Michael W. (1979) *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, Michael W. (1985) *Education and Power*. Boston: Ark.
- Aronowitz, Stanley and Giroux, Henry, A., 1991. *Postmodern Education: Politics, Culture, and Social Criticism*. Minneapolis, MN : University of Minnesota Press.
- Asante, M. (2003) *Afrocentricity: The Theory of Social Change*. African American Images/Africa World Press.

- Atwater, M. M. (1996). Social constructivism: infusion into the multicultural science education research agenda. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33(8), pp. 821-837.
- Balari, R. S. (1997). *Epistemology from an Afrocentric Perspective: Enhancing Black Students' Consciousness through an Afrocentric Way of knowing. Different Perspectives on Majority Rules.*
- Baldwin, S. C., Buchanan, A. M., & Rudisill, M. E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), pp. 315-327.
- Ballantine, J. H. (2001). *The sociology of education : a systematic analysis.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Banks, J. (1981). *Education in the 80s: Multi-ethnic education.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Banks, J. (1989). Multicultural education: characteristics and goals. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. (1993). The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction, and Multicultural Education. *Educational Researcher*, June, vol. 22 no.5, pp. 4-14.
- Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural education: historical development, dimensions, and practice. *Review of Research in Education*, 19, pp. 3-39.
- Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A.M. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* New York : Irvington Publishers.
- Berman, M. (1992). "Why Modernism Still Matters". In Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman, eds., *Modernity and Identity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Berman, M. (1992). "Why Modernism Still Matters". In Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman, eds., *Modernity and Identity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bernal, D., D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol 8, pp. 105-126.
- Blauner, R. (1972). *Racial oppression in America.* New York, Harper & Row.

- Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude. (1977). Translated from the French by Richard Nice; with a Foreward by Tom Bottomore. London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage in association with *Theory, Culture & Society*. Dept. of Administrative and Social Studies, Teesside Polytechnic 1990.
- Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert, 1977. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boyle-Baise, M. & Sleeter, C. E. (1998). *Community service learning for multicultural teacher education*. Washington, DC: Education Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 429925).
- Brown, E. (2004). The significance of race and social class for self-study and the professional knowledge base of teacher education. In J.J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V.K. LeBoskey, & T.L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 517-574). Boston: Klumer Academics.
- Bushnell, M. (2003). Teachers in the schoolhouse panopticon: Complicity and resistance. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(3), 251-272.
- Calhoun, C. (1991). Imagined Communities and Indirect Relationships: Large Scale Social Integration and the Transformation of Everyday Life. In P. Bourdieu & J. S. Coleman (Eds.), *Social Theory for a Changing Society* (pp. 95-120). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chan, Wilma (1987). Asian Americans And the Fight for Educational Rights posted 9/9/07 from East Wind Vol. 6 No. 1 Spring/Summer 1987 Focus on Educational Rights
- Chang, Mitchell, J. (1999). "Expansion and Its Discontents: The Formation of Asian American Studies Programs in the 1990s," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 2:2. pp. 181-206.
- Childs, J. B. (2003) *Transcommunalilty : from the politics of conversion to the ethics of respect* / [edited by] John Brown Childs. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 51 (3), 279-310.

- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J.A. Banks & C.A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931-975) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooper, J. E. (2007). Strengthening the case for community-based learning in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(3), 245-255.
- Cornell, S. (1988). *The return of the native: American Indian political resurgence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of English only*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- D'Amato, J. (1996). Resistance and compliance in minority classrooms. In E. Jacob & C. Jordan (Eds.), *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives*, pp. 181-208. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Daniels, Roger. (1997). No Lamps Were Lit for Them: Angel Island and the Historiography of Asian American Immigration. *Journal of American Ethnic History* Vol. 17, No. 1. pp. 3-18: University of Illinois Press
- Darder, A., & Torres, R. D. (2004). *After race: Racism after multiculturalism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Learning to teach for social justice. In L. Darling-Hammond, J. French, & S. P. Garcia-Lopez (Eds.), *Learning to teach for social justice*, pp. 1-7. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davidman, L., & Davidman, P. (1997). *Teaching with a multicultural perspective: a practical guide*. New York: Longman.
- Davies, Scott (1995) "Leaps of Faith: *Shifting Currents in Critical Sociology of Education*," *The American Journal of Sociology*, 100(6), pp. 1448-1478.
- De Carvalho, M. E. P. (2001). *Rethinking family-school relations: a critique of parental involvement in schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Delgado, G. P. (2003). *Transcommunalism: Beyond Tolerance, for Understanding*. In

Transcommunalism: from the politics of conversion to the ethics of respect.
Edited by John

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: New York Press.

Demanding their Rights: The Latino Struggle for Educational Access and Equity

Dewey, J. (1961). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Macmillan.

Dirlik, A. (2003). Places and Transcommunalism: A Comment on John Brown Childs's Idea of the Transcommunal. In *Transcommunalism: from the politics of conversion to the ethics of respect.* Edited by John Brown Childs. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Doyle, E. (1996). *Knowledge as culture: The new sociology of knowledge.* London; New York: Routledge.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Bantam Classic.

Dubois, W.E.B. (1975). *Dusk of dawn.* New introduction by Herbert Aptheker, Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus-Thomson Organization.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1975). The Education of Black People. *Ten Critiques, 1906 – 1960 New Edition.* (Edited by Herbert Aptheker)

During (Ed.), *The cultural studies reader,* pp. 31-41. New York: Routledge.

Durkheim, Emile. (1977) *The Evolution of Educational Thought: Lectures on the Formation and Development of Secondary Education in France:* translated by Peter Collins. Imprint London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Durkheim, Emile. 1961, *Moral education; a study in the theory and application of the sociology of education.* New York Free Press of Glencoe.

Dutro, E., Kazemi, E., Balf, R., Lin, Y. (2008). "What are you and where are you from?" Race, Identity, and the Vicissitudes of Cultural Relevance. *Urban Education,* vol. 43 no 3, May 2008, pp. 269-300.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction.* London; New York: Verso.

Foucault, M (1988) *Technologies of the self.* In L H Martin, H Gutman and P H

- Hutton (Eds) *Technologies of the self*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things; An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Knowledge/power: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Madness and civilization. A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Politics, philosophy, culture: interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.
- Frankenberg, E., Lee, C.I., & Orfield, G. (2003). *A multicultural society with segregated schools: Are we losing the dream?* Retrieved February 10, 2007, from <http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu>.
- Frankenberg, E., Taylor, A., & Merseth, K. (2009). Walking the walk: teacher candidates' professed commitment to urban teaching and their subsequent career decisions. *Urban Education*, 45(3), pp. 312-346.
- Friere, Paulo, 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos; with an introduction by Donald Macedo. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership* 50(6), 12-17.
- Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2010). Aggressive and tender navigations: teacher educators confront whiteness in their practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), pp. 225-236.
- Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity: What are the critical factors? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(3), 201-213.

- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2003). *Becoming multicultural educators: personal journey toward professional agency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gay, G. (2004). The Paradoxical Aftermath of Brown. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 6(4), pp. 12.
- Gay, G. (2009). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), pp. 143-152.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, 42, (3), 181-187.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures; selected essays*. New York, Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self : dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.
- Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 7, 7-18.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new Sociology of education: a critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53(3), pp. 257-93.
- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, (213-238).
- Giroux, Henry (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education: Pedagogy for the Opposition*. London: South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, Henry and McLaren, Peter, (1986). Teacher Education as Cultural Politics. *New Education*, 8(1), pp. 1-10.

- Gitlin, A., & Margonis, F. (1995). The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense. *American Journal of Education*, 103(4), pp. 337-405.
- Gonzales, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms/* edited by Norma Gonzales, Luis C. Moll & Cathy Amanti. Mahwah, N.J. : L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Gonzalez, G. G. (1990). *Chicano education in the era of segregation*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.
- Gordon, A. F. (1997). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gordon, B. (1994). "African American cultural knowledge and liberatory education: dilemmas, problems and potentials in a postmodern American society." In *Too Much Schooling, too little education. A Paradox of Black life in White societies*. Mwalimu Shujaa, editor. Trenton: African World Press, 57-78.
- Graham, B., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (eds) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Grant, C. A. (2006). *The evolution of multicultural education in the United States: a journey for human rights & social justice*.
- Grant, C.A., & Gillette, M. (1987). The Holmes Report and minorities in education. *Social Education*, 51, 517-521.
- Grant, C.A., Elsbree, A. R., & Fondrie, S. (2004). A decade of research on the changing terrain in multicultural education research. In J.A. Banks & C.A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 184-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gurvitch, G., & Moore, W. E. (1945). *Twentieth century sociology*; edited by Georges Gurvitch and Wilbert E. Moore. Imprint New York Philosophical Library.
- Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J.

- Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1998). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory into Practice*, 17(2), 96-104.
- Hagiwara, S. & Wray, S. (2009). Transformation in reverse: Naïve assumptions of an urban Educator. *Education and Urban Society*, 41(3), 338-363).
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). "*On collective memory*". Edited, translated, with an Introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hall, S. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: some problematics and problems." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*. London: Hutchinson, 1980. 15-47, 278-88.
- Hall, S. (1988). "*Minimal Selves.*" *Identity: the Real Me*. London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, pp. 44-46.
- Hall, S. (1992). "*Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies*". In *Cultural Studies*. Edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula Treichler. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1993). What is this "black" in black popular culture. *Social Justice*. Spring-summer. Vol. 20 1-2 p. 104 (11).
- Hall, S. (1996). "*Who needs identity*". *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Ed. Hall and Paul Du Gay. London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1998). Notes on deconstructing the popular. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 442-453). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Hallinan, Maureen, T., 2006. *Handbook of the Sociology of Education*. New York, NY : Springer.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspectives", in *Feminist Studies*, pp. 575–599.
- Haraway, D. (1989). *Primate visions: gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*. New York: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Harris, D. B. (2005). Postmodernist Diversions in African American Thought. *Journal of Black Studies* November 2005 vol. 36 no. 2 209-228 .
- Hill-Collins, P. (1998). *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Hill-Collins, P., & Anderson, M. (1992). *Race, class and gender: An anthology*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Holub, R. (2003). Transcommunitarity in a Global World. In *Transcommunitarity: from the politics of conversion to the ethics of respect*. Edited by John Brown Childs. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ingram, H. L., & Walters, T. S. (2007). A critical reflection model to teach diversity and social justice. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 2(1), pp. 23-41.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40, 581-617.
- Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (1976). The new sociology of education. *Theory and Society*, 3(4), pp. 529-552.
- King, J. E. (2006) *Literacy, Heritage Knowledge, and the Praxis of Critical Studyin' for Human Freedom*. Ball: 337-360.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32,(30), pp. 465-492.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. In A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds.) *Review of research in education*, 24, (pp. 211-247). Washington, DC: *American Educational Research Association*.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). New directions in multicultural education. Chapter 3 in *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). Edited by James A. Banks & Cherry A. McGee Banks. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56, (3), 229-234.
- Lane, S., Lacefield-Parachini, N., & Isken, J. (2003). Developing novice teachers as change agents: student teacher placements “against the grain”. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(2), pp. 55-68.

- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leland, C. H., & Harste, J.C. 2005. Doing what we want to become: Preparing New Urban Teachers. *Urban Education*, 40 (1), 60-77.
- Lemert, C. (1991). The end of ideology, really. *Sociological Theory* 9 (2):164-172.
- Levine-Rasky, C. (2001). Identifying the prospective multicultural educator: Three signposts, three portraits. *Urban Review*, 33, 291-319.
- Lieberman, L. (1968). The Debate over Race: A study in the sociology of knowledge. *Phylon*, vol. 29, No. 2 (2nd Qtr.), pp. 127-141.
- Lindeman, E. C. (1936). *Wealth & culture: a study of one hundred foundation and community trusts and their operations during the decade 1921-1930*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.
- Lipsitz, G. (1998). *Possessive investment in Whiteness: How White people benefit from identity politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Longino, Helen, E. (1990). *Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Louis Althusser (1971)--'*Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* Monthly Review Press.
- Lynn, M. (2004). Inserting the “race” into critical pedagogy: an analysis of 'race-based epistemologies. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), pp. 153-165.
- Maher, F.A., & Tetreault, M.K.T. (2001). *The feminist classroom: Dynamics of gender, race, and privilege* (2nd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mannheim, K. (1924, 1952) ‘*Historicism.*’ In P. Kecskerneti, ed., *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Mannheim, K. (1936). *Ideology and utopia: An introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. Translated from the German by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Margaret Goertz Mark Duffy Mapping the Landscape of High-Stakes Testing and Accountability Programs. *Theory Into Practice*, Volume 42, Number 1, Winter 2003, pp. 4-11. Published by Ohio State University College of Education
- Martin, R. J., & Van Gunten, D. M. (2002). Reflected identities: applying positionality and multicultural social reconstructionism in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 53(1), pp. 44-55.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. 1998, *The German Ideology: including Theses on Feuerbach and introduction to The Critique of Political Economy*. Amherst, N.Y. : Prometheus Books.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich. 2002, *The Communist Manifesto; with an introduction and notes by Gareth Stedman Jones*. London ; New York : Penguin Books.
- Marx, Karl. 1977, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Introduced by Ernest Mandel; translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Vintage Books.
- McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York: Routledge.
- McCarthy, E. D. (1996). *Knowledge as culture: The new sociology of knowledge*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Mclaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Mehan, Hugh, (1992). Understanding Inequality in Schools: The Contribution of Interpretive Studies. *The Sociology of Education*, 65 (1): pp. 1-20.
- Menchaca, M. & Valencia, R. R. (1990). Anglo-Saxon ideologies and their impact on the segregation of Mexican students in California, the 1920s-1930s. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 21, 222-249.
- Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(1), pp. 72-77.
- Morrow, Raymond, Allan and Torres, Carlos, Alberto, (1995). *Social Theory and Education: A Critique of Theories of Social and Cultural Reproduction*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Moses, W. J. (1991). Eurocentrism, Afrocentrism, and William Ferris's *The African Abroad*, 1911. *Journal of Education* 173(1): 76-90.

- Murrell, P.C. Jr. (2002, April). *Community teachers: Promoting teaching in culturally, linguistically, and racially diverse urban schools and communities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Mwonga, C. (2005). *Multicultural education: new path toward democracy. Re-visioning education and democracy*.
<http://www.macalester.edu/educationreform/publicintellecualessay/CarolineM.pdf>.
- Nasir, N. S., & Hand, V. M. (2006). Exploring sociocultural perspectives on race, culture, and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), pp. 449-475.
- National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP (1996) *Mathematics report card for the nation and the states*, Table 2.3, pp. 30.
- Nickse, Ruth. (1973). *How to change schools from the inside: Teachers as change agents*. U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare National Institute of Education.
- Nieto, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Why we teach*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., Rogers, J. & Lipton, M. (2006). *Learning power: organizing for education and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ogbu, J. (2008). *Minority status, oppositional culture, and schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Olneck, M. (2000). Can multicultural education change what counts as cultural capital. *American Educational Journal*, 37(2), pp. 317-348.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.
- Outlaw, L. (1983). *Philosophy, hermeneutics, social-political theory: Critical thought in the interests of African-Americans*. In L. Harris (Ed.), *Philosophy born of struggle—Anthology of Afro- American philosophy from 1917* (pp. 60-87). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Ovando, C., & McLaren, P. (2000). Cultural recognition and civil discourse in a

- democracy. In Ovando & McLaren (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education: Students and teachers caught in the cross fire*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Pohan, C. A. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity: Uncovering factors leading to multicultural responsiveness. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 29(3), 62-69.
- Remmling, G. (1973). *Towards the sociology of knowledge: Origin and development of a sociological thought style*; edited by Gunter W. Remmling. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ricoeur, P. (1986). *Lectures on ideology and utopia*. Edited by George H. Taylor. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rousmaniere, K. (1997). *City teachers: Teaching and school reform in historical perspective*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sahlins, M. D. (1976). *Culture and practical reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- San Miguel, G. (1987). *Let all of them take heed: Mexican Americans and the campaign for educational equality in Texas, 1910-1981*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Scheler, M. (1980). *Problems of a sociology of knowledge*. Translated by Manfred S. Frings. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Scott, J. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, vol 17, no. 4, 773-797.
- Shilling, C. (1992). Reconceptualising structure and agency in the sociology of education: structuration theory and schooling. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 13(1), pp. 69-87.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1992). Restructuring schools for multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2), pp. 141-148.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2000). Strengthening multicultural education with community-based service learning. In C. R. O'Graddy (Ed.), *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities* (pp. 263-276). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.

- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 94-106). New York: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1991). Mapping terrains of power: Students cultural knowledge versus classroom knowledge. In C. E. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education* (pp. 49-68). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Soo, J. "Back to School for Integration: The Catch-22 of Excellence and Diversity Without Race," Asian Week, August 18, 2006.
- Spalding, E., Klecka, C. L., Lin, E. Odell, S. J., & Wang, J. Social justice and teacher education: a hammer, a bell, and a song. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), pp. 191-196.
- Spector, M. & Kitsuse, J. I. (2001). *Constructing social problems*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (1989). A Social Capital Framework for Understanding the Socialization of Racial Minority Children and Youths. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(1), pp. 1-41.
- Tamura, Eileen, H. (2001) Asian Americans in the History of Education: An Historiographical Essay. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 1. pp. 58-71.
- Taussig, M. (1987). *Shamanism, colonialism, and the wild man: a study in terror and healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16, 7-29.
- Thompson, G. L., Warren, S., Carter, L. (2004). It's not my fault: Predicting high school teachers who blame parents and students for student's low achievement. *The High School Journal*, 87(3), 5-14
- Torres, C. A., & Mitchell, A. R. (1998) *Sociology of education: emerging perspectives* / edited by Carlos Alberto Torres and Theodore R. Mitchell Imprint Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Toure, S. (1969). *A dialectical approach to culture*. *The Black Scholar*, 1(1), 11-26.

Trent, S. C., Kea, C. D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice educators for cultural diversity: How far have we come? *Exceptional Children*, 74(3), 328-350.

MacDonald, Victoria-María http://www.nps.gov/latino/latinothemestudy/pdfs/Education_final_web.pdf

Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865-1954*; foreword by Robin D. G. Kelley. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weber, Max. 1925, "The Distribution of Power within the Political Community: Class, Status, and Party." Found in *The Essential Weber: A Reader*, edited by Sam Whimster. London; New York: Routledge, 2004.

Wexler, Phillip (1981). Body and Soul: Sources of Social Change and Strategies of Education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2(3), pp. 247-263.

Williams, R. (1995). *The sociology of culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Williams, R. (1998). The analysis of culture. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 48-56). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Walker (eds.), *Race, class, and education*. London: Taylor & Francis, pp.107-138.

Willmont, R. (1999). Structure, agency and the sociology of education: rescuing analytical dualism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(1), pp. 5-21.

Woodson, C. G. (2000) *The mis-education of the Negro* / by Carter G. Woodson; [profile, introduction & study questions by Jawanza Kunjufu] Chicago, Ill.: African-American Images.

Zerubavel, E. (1992). *Terra cognita: The mental discovery of America*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

