Pre-Service Teachers' Perspectives on Methods, Pedagogy and Self-Efficacy Related to Gender and Sexuality as a Part of Their Multicultural Teacher Education

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Cathy A.R. Brant, M.Ed.

Graduate Program in Education: Teaching and Learning

The Ohio State University

2014

Dissertation Committee:

Cynthia A. Tyson, Ph.D. Chair

Mollie V. Blackburn, Ph.D.

Diana B. Erchick, Ph.D.

Abstract

This study is an investigation into issues surrounding pre-service teacher multicultural

education. Using survey data, interview data and a syllabi analysis, this study explores

pre-service teachers' (n=69) understanding of multicultural education, particularly issues

involving lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer/questioning topics. Specifically,

the study examines the ways in which pre-service teachers understand various

multicultural concepts and the self-efficacy of these pre-service teachers to work with

LGBTQ students and families, to teach LGBTQ content, and to identify biases against

LGBTQ people in school contexts and classroom materials. The study supports the

previously suggested notion that issues of gender identity and sexual orientation are not

often addressed in teacher education programs. Because of this, pre-service teachers

demonstrate a broad range of understanding about key terms associated with

multicultural education, gender identity and sexual orientation. The study participants

identified effective and non-effective methodologies and pedagogies used by their teacher

educators that impacted the way they view and subsequently plan to address these topics

in their own future classrooms. The study also reveals what while pre-service teachers

report a strong sense of self-efficacy in working with LGBTQ students and families, they

have lesser sense of self-efficacy in teaching LGBTQ content and identifying LGBTQ

biases in schools and curriculum materials. The further implications of this study are

impact an examination of student self efficacy can have on the development of

multicultural/social justice components of teacher education programs, addressing issues

of sexual orientation and gender expression.

Dedication

Dedicated to all of the teachers, past, present, and future who are committed to making

schools safe and equitable for all students, especially those who identify as LGBTQ.

Acknowledgments

My doctoral studies journey actually began in 2001 when I was working on my M.Ed. at Rutgers University. I was sitting in my Teacher as a Researcher course, excited about my future career as a teacher. After completing a project on student motivation, my professor, Dr. Jeffrey K. Smith, told me that I would not be a classroom teacher forever. His statement appalled me because I thought that I would be teaching in an elementary grade classroom until retirement. But then, a few years later, Jeff gave me the opportunity to adjunct for the first time. It was then that I realized that teaching teachers about issues of equity and diversity was my calling. Without Jeff, I would not be where I am today. Thank you so much for seeing that potential in me so early in my career.

Words cannot express my gratitude for my exam and dissertation committee members. Dr. Jeane Copenhaver-Johnson was the first faculty member I had contact with when I was exploring graduate schools. Once I had decided to attend The Ohio State University, Jeane became my advisor, modeling for me the type of advisor I want to be when I have my own graduate students. She was warm, supportive, responsive, and worked to provide me with a number of opportunities that I would not have been able to have otherwise.

I am also especially grateful to my dissertation chair, Dr. Cynthia Tyson. She, too, has served as a role model for the type of advisor and mentor I would like to be. While I was working on the bulk of this dissertation, Dr. Tyson was on sabbatical, but despite

being on leave, she spent hours with me as I went through each phase of the process. She has gone above and beyond the call of duty, and has helped me grow as a student, a scholar, and an advocate of equity and social justice. Dr. Tyson is herself the embodiment of social justice, truly practicing what she preaches, and I consider myself very lucky to have had her by my side and in my corner as I navigated the dissertation process. Her confidence in me was unwavering, and I would constantly lean on that when times got tough.

It is in part because of the coursework that I took with Dr. Mollie Blackburn that I realized that my commitments to equity and social justice went beyond broad ideas of multicultural education and were focused on serving the needs of LGBTQ youth and youth that come from LGBTQ families. I would like to thank her for supporting me in my role as an ally in doing this type of work and asking the hard questions. I would also like to thank Dr. Diana Erchick for joining my committee near the end of the dissertation process, and helping me master making tables.

My writing partners, Candace, Amy, and Josh have been critical in my successful completion of this written dissertation. It was wonderful knowing that I had friends who I could talk to about the process, as well as more specifically about my content, as I wrestled with my data. I would also like to acknowledge my other academic friends and family who have helped me through various stages of this project.

I would be remiss if I did not thank my best friend, Jennifer Ellis. During the six years I have lived in Columbus, I have spoken to Jennifer nearly every day. She has

helped me work through all sorts of issues, both academic and personal. Jennifer has also helped me laugh at myself a little every day, which is good for my soul.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. From day one, my parents were supportive of my decision to quit my teaching job and pursue this degree. Throughout the entire process, they were there for me both emotionally and financially. My brother, Chip, his wife, Sydney, and their children, Harrison and Noa, have also been a tremendous support to me throughout the process, and nothing has motivated me to finish this degree more than Skyping with Harrison. I would also like to thank my in-laws, Chuck, Nancy, Julie, Greg and Sami. Although they came into my life near the end of this process, I know that I am able to rely on them for anything that I may need.

Words cannot express what my beloved partner, David, means to me. He truly is my better half and partner-in-crime. David has lugged my books while moving— twice— allowed me to talk through all the academic ideas spinning around in my head, and kept me well nourished through the entire process. David also created the database that allowed me to print out the various data reports that needed to be analyzed. I am proud that it is his last name that is on this dissertation.

I am sure there are people that I have forgotten to mention, but know that in my heart, you are there. Thank you everyone for all the support you have all provided me that has helped me get to where I am today.

Vita

1997	Shawnee High School
2001	B.A. Sociology, Rutgers University
2002	M.Ed., Rutgers University
2002-2008	Elementary School Teacher, Crim Primary School
2008-2012	University Supervisor, The Ohio State University
2012-2013	Adjunct Instructor, The Ohio State University-Newark
2013	Adjunct Instructor, Ashland University
2013-2014	Graduate Teaching Assistant, The Ohio State University

Fields of Study

Major Field: Teaching and Learning

Multicultural and Equity Studies in Education

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Purpose of the Study
Background

The majority of the teaching force is White, exclusively English speaking, middle or upper-middle class, and female, and yet the student population is becoming more diverse every day. There are more students of color, more students from the poor or working class, and more students who are speaking English as a second or third language (Feistritzer, Griffin, & Linnajarvi, 2011; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). These shifting demographics toward greater ethnic, class, and linguistic diversity require teacher education programs to teach future teachers how to be effective with learners from many different backgrounds (Baldwin, Buchanan & Rudisill, 2007; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Teachers in urban, rural, and suburban classrooms are all working with students who come from backgrounds that greatly differ from their own.

The cultural disconnect between teachers and their students has been termed the *demographic imperative*. The demographic imperative is "the recognition that bridging the chasm between the school and life experiences of those with and without social, cultural, racial, and economic advantages requires fundamental changes in the way teachers are educated" (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p. 7). Based on these teacher and student demographic trends, it is evident that teachers and teacher educators need to change the way that they teach in order to adequately meet the needs of the diverse learners in the

1

classroom, otherwise "the racial divide between teachers and their students will continue to increase" (Johnson, 2002, p. 153). Although work on racial, cultural, and socioeconomic differences between students and their teachers is important, it is also critical to address other forms of diversity that may exist in the classroom, such as gender non-conformity and sexual orientation.

Out of the 235 million adults (United States Census Bureau, 2012) in the United States, it is estimated that those who identify as gay or lesbian number, at a minimum, 8,000,000, or approximately 3.5% of the total population (Gates, 2011). There are approximately 600,000 same-sex couple households in the United States, out of which 84% percent have children (Lofquist, 2011). While the precise number of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth in the United States is difficult to determine, several studies measuring same-sex attraction, same-sex behavior, or both, produce an estimate of between 1% and 9%, and, most likely, between 5% and 6% of the total population (Human Rights Watch, 2001). The numbers of youth who identify as transgender or who have non-normative gender expressions are even more difficult to estimate. Regardless of the exact number of students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning (LGBTQ), at some time in their teaching career, every teacher will undoubtedly work with LGBTQ students or students who come from families with LGBTQ members.

In their teacher education programs, many pre-service teachers are exposed to multicultural teacher education coursework, either through a course dedicated exclusively to multicultural education, or as something addressed in courses focused on specific

2

subject content, pedagogy, or classroom management. These courses are meant to help pre-service teachers learn how to teach about and to teach for various marginalized populations. Just as teachers are being prepared to work with students and families of other demographics different from their own (race, class, religion, etc.), they also need to be prepared to work with those who are LGBTQ. This study sought to examine several elements of multicultural education and LGBTQ issues in education. First, I examine pre-service teachers' understandings of various terms associated with multicultural education and LGBTQ issues in education. Secondly, I examine the degree to which pre-service teachers feel prepared by their experiences in their teacher education programs to work with LGBTQ students and their families. Additionally, I look at their preparedness to advocate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and gender non-conforming people by addressing bullying, teaching LGBTQ content as a part of the formal curriculum in schools, and being aware of and addressing bias against LGBTQ individuals in school contexts.

Statement of Problem

There is no shortage of literature on the demographic imperative and the need for changes about how pre-service and in-service teachers are taught to work with diverse populations. The theoretical and empirical work done in this area has led teacher education programs to include some elements of diversity and/or multicultural education as a part of the coursework, but the ways in which pre-service teachers understand that instruction still need further study. Additionally, the ways in which specific diversity topics, such as gender expression, gender identity, and sexual orientation are often not addressed in the teacher preparation program, though arguably, they should be.

3

Every two years, the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) surveys over 7,000 middle and high school students who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, a sexual orientation other than heterosexual (e.g., queer, questioning), and those who self-identify as transgender or as having a gender identity other than male, female, or transgender (e.g., genderqueer) in an attempt to document and gain greater insight into these students' experiences in U.S. schools. The most recent GLSEN study (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, and Bartkiewicz, 2010) provides some startling information about the prevalence of homophobia, the discrimination of gay, lesbian and bisexual people, and transphobia, the discrimination of gender-nonconforming individuals, in schools.

Sixty-one percent of students surveyed felt unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation, and nearly 40% felt unsafe because of how they expressed their gender. Eighty-five percent of students were verbally harassed (e.g., called names, threatened) at school because of their sexual orientation, and 64% were verbally harassed because of their gender expression. Forty percent of the students surveyed were physically harassed (e.g., pushed, shoved) at school in the past year because of their sexual orientation, and 27% were because of their gender expression. Nineteen percent of students reporting being physically assaulted (e.g., punched, kicked, injured with a weapon) because of their sexual orientation, and 14% were physically assaulted because of their gender expression.

More recently, GLSEN, in conjunction with Harris Interactive (2012), conducted a similar study reporting on the climate for LGBTQ youth in elementary schools. In this study, 1,065 elementary school students in Grades 3–6 and 1,099 elementary school

teachers of Grades K–6 in schools across the country participated in an online survey. Forty-five percent of the students reported that they hear comments like "that's so gay" or "you're so gay" from other kids at school sometimes, often or all of the time. Nearly half of teachers (49%) said that they heard students in their school use the word "gay" in a negative way sometimes, often, or very often. More than a quarter of the students (26%) and teachers (26%) reported hearing other students make comments like "fag" or "lesbo" at least sometimes. Almost one in ten elementary school students (8%) report that they do not conform to traditional gender norms (i.e., boys who others sometimes think, act, or look like girls, or girls who others sometimes think, act, or look like boys). Students who do not conform to traditional gender norms are less likely than other students to feel very safe at school (42% and 61% respectively) and are more likely than others to agree that they sometimes do not want to go to school because they feel unsafe or afraid there (35% and 15%, respectively).

The statistics regarding the number of LGBTQ students in schools and the persecution they face from their peers (and potentially teachers) make it clear that this is a population that teachers need to be prepared to work with. Although many teachers receive some preparation in how to work with students from other oppressed groups (African American, the poor or working class, etc.), they may not be adequately prepared to work with LGBTQ students and families. When LGBTQ preparation occurs in the teacher education program, it is not clear what sense of self-efficacy pre-service teachers have to advocate, enact pedagogies and integrate LGBTQ in the curriculum. This study

attempts to address this problem by examining the ways pre-service teachers are prepared to work with LGBTQ students and their families.

Research Questions

In this study, I examine the multicultural education experiences of pre-service teachers and the effect of those experiences on their sense of self-efficacy. The research questions for this study are as follows:

- How do pre-service teachers conceptualize multicultural education?

- Given these conceptualizations, how do pre-service teachers report that teacher educators in their teacher education programs addressed:

  o multicultural content;

  o issues of gender and gender non-conformity;

  o issues of sexuality.

- What sense of self-efficacy do pre-service teachers report related to:

  o working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning students and their families

  o teaching and discussing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning content and issues; and

  o identifying bias against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer/questioning people in school related materials and contexts?

Overview of Research Methods

To answer these research questions, I employed multiple data sources. Seventy-five students, from four different cohorts of teacher preparation students, were contacted

about participation in the survey portion of this study. Out of those 75 students, 69 pre-service teachers were surveyed through open-ended, short-response questions about their conceptualizations of multicultural education and their familiarity with terms associated with sexual orientation and gender non-conformity. They were also asked about specific methodological practices used to address LGBTQ issues in their teacher education program. Finally, using a Likert-type scale, they were asked to assess their sense of effectiveness in working with LGBTQ students and parents, and their ability to identify bias about LGBTQ people in the curriculum and school contexts. Four pre-service teachers participated in a one-time, semi-structured interview. Finally, the data set included a document analysis of six-syllabi submitted by instructors who self-identified as instructors who integrate multicultural content into their instruction. These various data sources were then analyzed and triangulated. A complete discussion of the research methodology employed in this study can be found in Chapter 3. The results and data analysis can be found in Chapter 4.

Significance of the Study

This study builds upon previous work examining pre-service teachers and multicultural education, with a specific lens on issues of sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression. Students who self-identify as being LGBTQ, or those students who might be perceived to be LGBTQ by their peers, face significant difficulties in schools that can lead to tragic consequences. Changes need to be made to the way in which teachers are educated so that they can be prepared to teach about and for LGBTQ students and those that come from LGBTQ families. There are some studies that have

addressed the ways in which LGBTQ content is covered in teacher preparation classrooms, and these studies will be discussed in later sections of this document. This study builds upon previous work in the field in that it extends those studies that examine pre-service teachers' perceptions of their sense of self-efficacy teaching about and teaching for LGBTQ people. The goal of this study is to examine and to help inform the multicultural/social justice component of teacher education programs, addressing issues of sexual orientation and gender expression.

Terms in the Study

It is important to understand that language has different meanings for different people in different contexts. Due to this, I feel that it is necessary to define a few key terms that will be recurring throughout the study.

- *Pre-service teachers* are prospective teachers that are enrolled in a teacher preparation program with the intention getting a job in a school setting. The term pre-service teachers will be used throughout this dissertation to differentiate those who are students in K–12 contexts and those who are students enrolled in a teacher preparation program.

- *Teacher educators* are higher education faculty and staff who teach pre-service teachers as a part of the teacher preparation program. The term teacher educators is used to differentiate between those who teach or are preparing to teach in K–12 contexts and those who prepare teachers to work in those contexts.

- *Multicultural education* can be defined as "an approach to teaching and learning that is based upon the democratic values and beliefs and that affirms cultural

8

pluralism within culturally diverse societies in an interdependent world." It has

the goal of fostering "the intellectual, social, and personal develop of *all* (author's

emphasis) students to their highest potential" (Bennett, 2003, p. 14).

- The acronym LGBTQ stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender,

  queer/questioning individuals. Throughout the literature, this acronym can take

  many forms. For example, it can include an "I" to represent those who are

  intersex. The letters can also appear in different orders. Scholars like Meyer, for

  example (2010), choose to put the letters in alphabetical order BGLQT as to not

  privilege one identity over another. Lesbians have often chosen to put the L first

  to work against patriarchy. For this document, I have chosen to use LGBTQ, as it

  is most commonly used throughout the literature and is most familiar to the

  readers. I want to acknowledge, however, the ways in which the order of the

  letters may privilege some identities of others. The acronym LGBTQ will be used

  throughout the duration of this document unless referring to a specific group or

  set of groups.

- *Queer* is a term that signifies "those who have been defined or who have chosen

  to define themselves as sexual outsiders" (Sears, 1999, p. 4). Queer can also

  include those who exist outside society's traditional gender norms. Like

  McCready (2004), and Mayo (2013), I acknowledge that all who identify as

  lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender do not necessarily also identify as queer and

  vice versa.

- Throughout this document, I discuss *gender non-conformity,* or alternative gender expressions. Traditional gender norms posit that females are supposed to act a certain way and males are supposed to act another way. For example, girls are supposed to wear pink and play with dolls, and boys are supposed to like blue and play with cars. Gender non-conformity refers to individuals who think, act, or dress outside of the societal prescribed norms of a specific gender. People who identify as transgender, people who choose to cross dress, boys who are more feminine, or girls who are more masculine can all be considered gender non-conforming.

- *Transgender* individuals are those who have a gender identity that does not match their biological sex. A person who identifies as transgender may choose to change their anatomy to match their feelings, but do not need to do so in order to be considered transgender. Additionally, gender identity is different from sexual orientation. Someone who identifies as transgender may be straight, gay, bisexual or asexual.

Organization of the Dissertation

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore pre-service teachers' understanding of multicultural education, investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of their multicultural teacher education, and to assess pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy in addressing LGBTQ issues in the classroom and school. Chapter 1 identifies the research problem and question, and introduces the purpose and significance of the study. It also defines the key terms that occur throughout the research. In Chapter 2, I review the

10

literature relevant to the study. The literature review focuses on four major areas: multicultural education, multicultural teacher education, LGBTQ issues in education, and self-efficacy.

Chapter 3 covers three main areas. First, I discuss describe the research participants and the methods used to recruit them. Secondly, I describe data collection methods and describe the data sources in detail. Finally, I describe the analyses methods and theoretical frameworks used in analyzing the data sources. Chapter 4 discusses the ways in which the various data sources address each of the research questions. In this chapter, through the triangulation of the data sources, I specifically look across the data sources in order to find common themes. In addition to these themes, I highlight questions that are raised from these data. The themes found in Chapter 4 will help inform ideas around the future practices of teacher educators and educational researchers, which will be discussed in Chapter 5, the final chapter of this dissertation.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature
Introduction

This study spans the fields of multicultural education, multicultural teacher education, and LGBTQ issues in education. I begin this section with an overview of the scholarship of multicultural education, including its historical development and its current theories. From there, I discuss the literature surrounding the ways in which teachers are being prepared to work with diverse populations, a practice called multicultural teacher education (MCTE). In the third section of this chapter, I discuss the current practices in teacher education programs that address issues of sexual orientation and gender expression. Finally, I conclude with a review of the literature on teacher self-efficacy, focusing specifically on the literature on multicultural education self-efficacy in teachers.

Multicultural Education

Across the literature, there are a number of definitions for multicultural education. For example, Bennett (2003) defines multicultural education as "an approach to teaching and learning that is based upon democratic values and beliefs and that affirms cultural pluralism within culturally diverse societies in an interdependent world" (p. 14). Bennett's conceptualization of multicultural education contains four interactive elements: equity pedagogy, curriculum reform, multicultural competence, and teaching toward social justice. Nieto and Bode (2008) state that multicultural education "challenges and

rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralisms (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities and teachers reflect" (p. 44). For J. A. Banks (1991, 1992, 2004), the goal of multicultural education is to help reform schools so that all students, regardless of gender, cultural group, race, or social class can experience equality in schools and have the opportunity to experience educational mobility. While each of these definitions attempt to produce an all-inclusive definition of multicultural education, they are problematic. For example, Bennett's (2003) definition focuses on culture and is not inclusive of diversity issues such as social class, gender and sexuality. Both Nieto and Bode (2008) and J. A. Banks (1991, 1992, 2004) make an attempt to be more inclusive by listing more specific groups that should be included, but they also leave out issues of sexual orientation. Thus it is unclear whether or not these definitions are inclusive of issues of gender as specifically related to discrimination of males or females, or of non-traditional gender identities such as gender non-conformity and transgender.

Despite these varied and somewhat flawed definitions, there are some commonalities and important points that need to be raised. The authors all argue that there needs to be changes made to what and how students are taught in order to prepare them to be a part of a diverse, democratic society. "To support democracy, educators must seek to eliminate disparities in educational opportunities among all students, especially those students who have been poorly served by our current system" (J. A. Banks et al., 2005, p. 233). This includes students from diverse cultures, racial, and

ethnic origins, students with home languages other than English, students from rural and urban poor economic backgrounds, students who are transgender or gender non-conforming, students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or queer, and students who experience learning challenges associated with exceptionalities. These students all face a myriad of difficulties in schools. They are often in classrooms with teachers who do not understand them, in schools with sub-par materials and technology, and do not see themselves positively represented in the curriculum. "A major goal of multicultural education is to reform the schools and other educational institutions so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality" (J. A. Banks, 2004, p. 3). The current multicultural education movement has grown out of a long history of scholars advocating for equal education for students.

History of Multicultural Education Theory

The multicultural education movement has developed from its predecessors: the ethnic studies movement and the intergroup education movement. In the late 1800's and early 1900's, scholars of color, such as W.E.B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, and Anna Julia Cooper, began to write about the inequities African American students were experiencing in schools when compared to their white counterparts (Alridge, 2008; J. A. Banks, 1996, 2004). These scholars and advocates were dissatisfied with the quality of the education children of color were receiving, but they also wanted to change the ways that the institution of schools, and arguably society at large, viewed students of color. The goal of these scholars was to "construct accurate knowledge about African Americans so as to invalidate misconceptions and stereotypes, and create more accurate

14

versions of American history and life" (J. A. Banks, 1996, p. 37). The work of these early scholars led to what is called the early ethnic studies movement.

DuBois was one of the first scholars to argue that the problems African American children were having in school were not a result of their lack of ability, but rather a result of the social problems facing the Black community. "To help reduce high illiteracy rates among African Americas, DuBois believed that black public and private schools needed more teachers, better wages, longer school terms, more efficient supervision, and renewed interest in teacher training" (Alridge, 2008, p. 47). Similarly, Woodson had several concerns about the content students of color were being taught. Woodson felt that African American history was mostly ignored in the curriculum, and when it was represented, the stories and images were rarely positive ones. He argued that this omission was harmful to the self-esteem and self-image of African American youth (J. A. Banks, 2004). It was his belief that the integration of African American content to the curriculum was just one step toward improving the education of African American students.

The second movement that has led to current multicultural education theory is the intergroup education movement. The intergroup education movement took place in the 1940s and 1950s in response to the rising number of racial conflicts that occurred during this time period (J. A. Banks, 1996). Intergroup education, as the name implies, focused on the education to groups about other groups (C. A. M. Banks, 1996, 2004; J. A. Banks, 2004). "Intergroup educators, most of whom were liberal White academics who worked in mainstream American institutions, placed more emphasis on a shared American

15

identity " (J. A. Banks, 1996, p. 37). Intergroup education "involved curriculum innovation, teacher training, program development, and other forms of school improvement" (C. A. M. Banks, 2004, p. 756), but was not limited only to the classroom. Intergroup education focused on specific educational practices for meeting the needs of youth of color, but also on educational research (C. A. M. Banks, 2004) that emphasized the fact that training teachers is an effective tool when working with youth of color. Although intergroup education focuses on education about the other, it does not address more systematic issues like institutional racism and the effects it has on people of color (J. A. Banks, 2004). The work of the scholars during the intergroup and early ethnic studies movements led to the second wave the of the ethnic studies movement.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the second wave of the ethnic studies movement, sometimes termed the intercultural education movement, built upon the initial work of the African American scholars of the earlier ethnic studies movement. However, by this time, other groups had begun to speak up for their need for equitable education as well (J. A. Banks, 2004). The leaders of this movement pushed for the reexamination of scholarly works written during the first ethnic studies movement. Second wave ethnic studies scholars addressed the common negative experiences other groups, such as Jews, Native Americans, and women, have also faced as a result of American institutions like education.

Scholars (e.g., J. A. Banks, 2004; Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004) argue that major ideological and structural changes need to be made to schools. These changes include the reevaluation of the materials and curricula being used to teach students;

16

teacher training to help teachers gain a greater understanding of learning styles and

adaptations of teaching styles to meet these learning styles; shifting teacher and

administration thinking to understand the ways in which students' cultural and social

background impacts the ways in which they interact with schools; and a reevaluation of

the goals, norms and culture of the school to help combat the severe disparities in the

American educational system. Teachers need to be aware of— and be prepared to

influence— the structural conditions that determine the allocation of educational

opportunity within a school: the kinds of courses, curriculum, and teaching that are

offered to different students, the kinds of student groupings that are created, and

expectations that govern their treatment and the treatment of their families (J. A. Banks et

al., 2005, p. 233).

Schools need to be restructured to take into consideration the cultural differences

of different groups of students. Those who work with students, teachers and

administrators need to reconsider how they think about diverse groups of students, and

the best ways to meet their educational needs. This involves moving from traditional

ways of thinking to more inclusive ways.

Current Multicultural Education

Based on the ideologies and practices set forth by Cooper, Woodson, the ethnic

studies movements and the intercultural movement, the current framework of

multicultural education has developed. J. A. Banks (1991, 1992, 2004) lays out a

framework for multicultural education that involves five different dimensions: content

integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and

empowering school culture. Teachers, administrators and school systems engaging in multicultural education may engage in some, but not all, of these various dimensions.

The content integration dimension deals with the extent to which and the ways in which teachers include multicultural content into their content area instruction. Banks argues that all content area teachers are responsible for enacting multicultural pedagogies in their classrooms. The knowledge construction dimension involves teaching students about the ways in which knowledge is created and maintained. Students need to understand that certain groups have a greater investment in the maintenance and reproduction of certain types of knowledge, and the ways in which those groups can continue to generate that reproduction.

When teachers enact the prejudice reduction dimension in their classrooms, they seek to reduce the stereotypes and biases of their students in an attempt to create a more democratic classroom and society. "An equity pedagogy exists when teachers use techniques and methods that facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups" (J. A. Banks, 2004, p. 5). The final dimension, empowering school culture, involves a restructuring of the institution of education so that all students have access to an equitable education. A variety of school practices, such as the ways students are grouped, the tracking of students, and the interaction between students and teachers, are all aspects of education that Banks suggests should be examined. Further, in most cases, he posits that these practices should be restructured to provide everyone with an equal opportunity for success.

18

Similarly, Grant and Sleeter (2007a, 2007b) present their own framework regarding the types of multicultural education strategies being employed by teachers in K–12 classrooms. When K–12 teachers include multicultural education in their instruction, they typically use one or several of these categories. The first category of multicultural education is the business as usual approach. This approach is really not an approach; those who enact this approach ignore the structural inequalities for marginalized children and, therefore, continue to further their marginalization. The second category, teaching the exceptional and culturally different, involves instruction with the main goal of helping those exceptional and culturally different students fit into the existing structure of American schools and society. The third category, the human relations approach to multicultural education, is designed for all students with the goal of "promoting feelings of unity, tolerance, and acceptance within existing social structure" (2007a, p. 78). The fourth category is the single group studies approach. In this approach, the teacher teaches about the culture and oppression of marginalized groups from that group's perspective.

The goal of the multicultural education approach, the fifth category, is to "promote equal opportunity in the schools, cultural pluralism and alternative lifestyles, respect for diverse people, and support for power equity among groups" (Grant and Sleeter, 2007b, p.182). It should be noted here, however, that the term "alternative lifestyles" can be offensive for some people, as it implies that the way the person is living is a either a choice, something temporary, or something abnormal. The term is most often applied to those who identify as LGBTQ or as gender nonconforming, yet sexual

orientation and gender identity are not choices, but rather simply who people are. The final category, Grant and Sleeter's (2007a, 2007b) multicultural social justice education approach is one in which students are prepared to examine and critique societal structures and make changes to society.

Multicultural Teacher Education

Just as pre-service teachers need to be taught to use both specific pedagogical strategies for teaching subject content and a variety of classroom management practices, they also need specific training in multicultural education. This includes both enacting shifts within pre-service teachers' ideas about equity and diversity, as well as providing them with specific strategies and methods for them to employ in their future classrooms. In this section, I present the literature regarding why pre-service teachers need to have multicultural teacher education addressed in the teacher preparation program, and how this multicultural teacher education content can and should be addressed by teacher educators.

Teacher's Attitudes About Diversity

Milner (2010) names five conceptual repertoires of diversity that pre-service teachers may come to the classroom with. He argues that it is the teacher education program's responsibility to be aware of these repertories and to be prepared to address the ones that actually do a disservice to students from marginalized backgrounds. Many pre-service teachers adopt a color-blind perspective in which they fail to recognize the ways in which race, culture, and background can influence their students'— and arguably their own— perceptions and interactions in the world. Pre-service teachers can experience

cultural conflicts when they teach primarily or exclusively from their own cultural

frameworks, particularly when the cultural experiences of their students do not match

their own. This cultural conflict creates a gap between teachers and their students, a gap

which can be challenging to cross. Pre-service teachers often accept the myth of

meritocracy, a belief that successes in life are solely a result of hard work, with no

acknowledgement of the institutionalized privileges that may have been gained based on

race, gender, or socioeconomic background. The problem with teachers holding this

belief is that they then assume that all people can "pull themselves up by their

bootstraps," without recognizing the institutionalized barriers that may be preventing

them from actually doing so.

Pre-service teachers may often hold deficit perceptions of their students. In these

situations, teachers believe that students of color, students from poverty, and those who

do not speak English as a first language do not, and cannot, gain the skills needed to be

successful in schools. This perspective does not recognize the gaps, presented by

Ladson-Billings (2006), and discussed by Milner (2010), that exist between these

students and their White, suburban counterparts.

> These gaps include: the teacher quality gap, the teacher training gap, the
>
> challenging curriculum gap, the school funding gap, the digital divide gap,
>
> the wealth and income gap, the employment opportunity gap, the affording
>
> housing gap, the health care gap, the nutrition gap, the school integration
>
> gap, and the quality child care gap (Milner, 2010, p. 124).

The final concept Milner discusses is closely linked to the deficit perspective: when teachers hold a deficit perspective about their students, they often have low academic expectations for them. In these situations, students are often limited to rote learning rather than the creative learning experiences students in other contexts are given. The challenge with pre-service teachers possessing conceptual repertoires about multicultural education is that they ignore the fact that all of these gaps exist, and therefore undermine the effect these gaps have on students. In order to address these issues, teacher education programs need to make multicultural teacher education a priority.

Theories of Multicultural Teacher Education

Grant and Gibson (2011) suggest that across the multicultural teacher education (MCTE) literature there are four enduring questions: "Who should teach different groups of children, and what are the implications of these demographic (mis)matches?" (p. 19); is content knowledge alone enough qualification to teach?; what and how should students be taught?; and what role should schools play in social reconstruction? They argue that those teacher education programs that are committed to preparing teacher candidates to work in settings with diverse student populations must consider these questions, as the ways that teacher educators answer these questions will impact the type of multicultural teacher education instruction they provide their students.

Throughout the literature, there are a variety of ideological frameworks regarding how teacher education programs should conceptualize and address these questions. For example, Nieto (2000) argues that there are three ways in which equity can be placed

front and center in teacher education programs. The first is for the teacher education programs to take a stand on social justice and diversity. Colleges of education often have commitments to social justice and diversity written in their mission statements, but for Nieto, this is not enough. Schools of education need to focus on putting these statements into practice and giving teacher education students the tools they need to enact these commitments in their classrooms. The second way of bringing equity to the center of the teacher education program is by making social justice ubiquitous in teacher education. "When social justice is a major lens with which we view the education of all students of all backgrounds, then diversity gains a place of prominence in the teacher education curriculum" (p. 183). The final suggestion for teacher education programs is to promote teaching as a life-long journey of transformation. This concept is considerably more complex than the others. It involves teacher education students understanding their own identities; learning about and affirming the identities of their students; developing meaningful relationships with their students; breaking out of their monocultural selves and becoming multilingual and multicultural; fighting against biases and racism; and engaging in relationships with other communities that also do critical work. When teacher education programs put equity at the center of their programs— in ideology and in practice— teacher education students can begin to not only see the importance of these practices, but the realistic possibilities of engaging in this type of work in their classrooms.

Cochran-Smith (2003b; 2004) presents a framework for examining multicultural issues in teacher education. In this framework, Cochran-Smith argues that any research,

practice or policy in multicultural education can be answered by one of the following eight questions: the diversity question, the ideology question, the knowledge question, the teacher learning question, the practice question, the outcomes question, the selection and recruitment question, and the coherence question. The diversity question asks how educators are conceptualizing diverse students, whether or not students from diverse backgrounds are being viewed as "problems," and the ways in which educators think about how to work with these students. The ideology question asks, "What is the purpose of schooling, what is the role of public education in a democratic society, and what historically has been the role of schooling in maintaining or changing the economic and social structure of society" (Cochran-Smith, 2003b, p. 11)? The knowledge question asks what specific knowledge teachers require in order to teach diverse populations, particularly in regard to the knowledge and beliefs surrounding culture and social identity and their roles in schooling. The teacher learning question is especially relevant to MCTE. This question asks how teachers acquire the knowledge necessary to teach diverse populations, and what the best pedagogies are to provide them with that knowledge. The practice question asks, "What are the competencies and pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse populations effectively" (Cochran-Smith, 2003b, p. 13)? The outcomes question goes back to teacher education. This question asks precisely what teacher education programs should teach and how that knowledge should be assessed. The recruitment and selection question involves the process by which teacher education candidates are selected, specifically how teacher education programs are recruiting diverse teacher candidates to diversify the teaching force. The final question,

the coherence question, encompasses all of the other seven questions and asks, "To what degree are the answers to the first seven questions connected to and coherent with one another in particular policies or programs and how are diversity issues positioned in relation to other issues" (Cochran-Smith, 2003b, p. 15)?

Similarly, Villegas & Lucas (2002) have identified characteristics of a culturally responsive teacher. "Culturally responsive teaching is defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively " (Gay, 2002, p. 106). These characteristics of a culturally relevant teacher can be instilled and nurtured through the teacher education program. Having a sociocultural consciousness means that teachers understand that the way people think, act, and behave are all influenced by their race, class, and culture. Once teachers understand the role that culture plays in students' lives, teachers can then begin to develop affirming attitudes toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds. Rather than seeing a student's culture or race as a deficit that needs to be assimilated to White, middle-class culture, a culturally responsive teacher sees all the positive aspects of the student's particular culture and how it can be used in the classroom.

Additionally, teacher education programs, in an attempt to create culturally responsive teachers, can help teachers to develop a commitment to these issues and to acquire the skills necessary to act as agents of change. "Teachers need to believe that schools can be sites for social transformation even as they recognize that schools have typically served to maintain social inequalities" (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 24). Within their framework of attitudes and dispositions of culturally relevant teachers, Villegas and

25

Lucas base their work on constructivist views of learning. A constructivist view of learning is one that suggests that students are active participants in the construction of knowledge rather than merely receptacles into which teachers dump knowledge. The authors believe that teachers need to learn about their students, not only about their cultures, but also about what preexisting academic knowledge they already possess. With this knowledge, teachers are better able to help students progress in their understanding of new material. Finally, Villegas and Lucas argue that teacher educators need to ensure that the pre-service teachers they work with understand culturally relevant teaching practices. These practices need to be presented to teacher education students not only from a theoretical perspective, but also through practice.

The theoretical frameworks presented here are only three of many ways that teacher education programs across the country conceptualize multicultural teacher education. These three help frame the enduring questions faced by multicultural education (Grant and Gibson, 2011), as well as present ways in which multicultural teacher education can be addressed in both the schools of education and the teacher education classroom. As Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue, these ideologies must be woven throughout the teacher education experience. They should not only be a component of the mission of an education department, but infused in both the coursework and the fieldwork. Where there is a commitment to school equity across all dimensions of the teacher education program, the pre-service teachers enrolled in that program are more likely to adopt these principles and apply them in their own classrooms. The next section of this document will discuss several multicultural teacher education pedagogical

strategies presented in the literature that are being employed in teacher education programs.

Multicultural Teacher Education Practices

Just as there are many ways that teachers address multicultural education in K–12 classrooms, there are also a variety of ways in which teacher educators address it with pre-service teachers as a part of the teacher preparation process. In his analysis of over 45 multicultural teacher education syllabi, Gorski (2009, 2010) identified five different ideological approaches to MCTE being employed by teacher educators. Some courses focus on what Gorski terms Teaching the Other. When teacher educators took up this ideology in their classrooms, they focused on teaching broad generalizations of non-majority group members(Gorski, 2009) with the goal of preparing teachers to assimilate the other into the current educational system (Gorski, 2010). Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance has three main characteristics: "(1) a tendency to frame multicultural education as respecting diversity; (2) a focus on sensitivity and self-reflection; and (3) a failure to connect either of these to educational inequalities" (Gorski, 2009, p. 314). The third approach, which Gorski has termed Teaching with Multicultural Competence, is one in which the course objectives revolve around preparing teachers to have the skills necessary to implement a multicultural education curriculum in their classrooms that meets the needs of all students. This approach, he notes, fails to focus on the systematic educational inequalities that prevent students from marginalized backgrounds to be successful in classrooms. When teacher educators approach MCTE from a Teaching in Sociopolitical Context approach, they encourage teacher candidates to

use critical theories to examine the larger sociopolitical context, and critique the institution of schools and larger societal institutions. Gorski's final approach to MCTE is that of Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice. This approach is a step beyond the critical approach presented in Teaching in Sociopolitical Context, and prepares teachers to become social activists, not only to enact change in the school systems in which they will be employed, but in the greater community as well.

Teacher educators use several specific pedagogical strategies in their classrooms. It is important to remember that MCTE can take place in a number of contexts. It can be addressed in specific courses created to address multicultural issues. It can also be addressed through content area instruction. Finally, it can be addressed through the students' field experiences. The literature suggests that addressing multicultural education in just one of these contexts is insufficient; instead, it must be infused throughout the entire teacher education process.

Young adult and children's literature. Many teacher educators choose to use multicultural children's and young adult literature in their classrooms (Jetton & Savage-Davis, 2005; Wake & Modla, 2008) as a way to address multicultural education in the teacher preparation classroom. "The vehicle of quality, multicultural literature provides a substantial starting point for exploring issues of culture and education via critical literacy and reader-response approaches" (Wake & Modla, 2008, p. 182). The use of quality multicultural literature helps teacher educators and their students discuss topics that the pre-service teachers may find uncomfortable, as they challenge their ideas about their White privileged perspectives (Beach, 1997). The literature gives both the pre-service

28

teachers and the teacher educators a place to begin discussing these topics, which many of the pre-service teachers in particular have never considered before in their lifetimes.

Wake and Modla (2008) assert, "Professors must help pre-service teachers unpack their knowledge, beliefs and evaluations of student cultural diversity" (p. 195). In order for pre-service teachers to begin this process, they need to recognize the ways in which they are privileged and "begin to 'see' the hidden curriculum [so they can] conduct critical self reflection and take an active role in the ensuring that schools become the democratic institutions that all children deserve" (McNair, 2003, p. 46). This discussion and recognition of privilege and inequity often makes pre-service teachers uncomfortable. Often, they are resistant to these ideas, as they go against many of the epistemologies they have been socialized to accept, like the idea that we exist in a society where color does not matter. The use of multicultural literature in the teacher education process helps make pre-service teachers aware of oppression, marginalization, and the struggles of other groups, particularly the groups of students that they may be teaching (Jetton & Savage-Davis, 2005) in their future classrooms.

In addition, teachers need to be prepared for the resistance they may face from their students, parents, colleagues, and administration when using multicultural literature in their own classrooms. Some people believe that various topics under the umbrella of multicultural literature are "taboo," should not be addressed in schools, and are best left for parents to address at home. This concern can be addressed in the teacher education classroom as well. Pre-service teachers need to be prepared to defend their practices in the classroom, and explain how the literature can help children discuss issues they

witness both in the media and in their daily lives, like racism, homophobia, classism, ableism, and sexism. This is why the selection of high quality children's literature is critical. The literature chosen by both teacher educators and practicing teachers must accurately represent, in the text and the illustrations alike, the group or social issue being addressed.

Critical literacy. Critical literacy is another pedagogical strategy being employed by teacher educators to address multicultural education in the teacher preparation classroom. Critical literacy has its roots in the liberatory education work of Freire (1970/2000). Critical literacy goes beyond more traditional literacy instruction, such as decoding, fluency, and comprehension (Marshall & Klein, 2009). With the help of their teachers, students actively engage with texts (Marshall and Klein, 2009) to identify political elements, first through reading and then by writing about politically or socially charged events. Teachers use the print to attend to the politics of language and its implications for defining and redefining power structures (Van Sluys, Larna, Legan & Lewison, 2005), not only with the ultimate goal of empowering marginalized populations, but also to empower members of dominant groups to make changes (McLean, Boling & Rowsell, 2009; Minami & Ovando, 2004). Dozier, Johnston, and Rogers (2006) state simply that critical literacy "requires understanding literacy as a tool for social action and understanding the ways in which that tool works" (p. 19). This perspective is quite different than more traditional definitions of literacy.

Through engaging with texts through a critical lens, students, whether K–12 or pre-service teachers, can begin to deconstruct and reconstruct their ideas about difference

and inequalities (Bruna, 2007; Hadijoannou & Fu, 2007). Critical literacy pedagogies

give students the tools to look closely at societal structures by stepping outside of one's

own lived experiences (Dozier et al., 2006). This is especially important for students who

come from dominant groups. Once students are able to step outside of their own

experiences, they can begin to see the world through the lived experiences of others,

particularly those that have been marginalized because of their race, class, gender,

sexuality, ability level, religion or ethnicity. Critical literacy can give students an

opportunity to learn what oppression means and how to work against it (Marshall &

Klein, 2009). It provides them with the tools and the language they need to not only

reflect on the social norms that shape their own lives and the lives of others, but to

examine the oppressive beliefs, values and ideologies of the classroom itself

(Hadijoannou & Fu, 2007; McLean et al., 2009). In short, critical literacy involves

problematising the world and text.

> Problematising means questioning the things that we take for granted, the
>
> things that we accept as simply being "the way things are." We begin to
>
> ask: Why are things the way they are? Whose interests are served when
>
> things are organized (written/shown) in this way? Who is disadvantaged
>
> by the ways things are organized (written/shown) (Comber, 1998, p. 9)?

Other questions that can be asked during a critical literacy lesson include "Whose story is

this?" and "Whose voices are not being heard?" (Leland, Harste & Huber, 2005). Critical

literacy involves asking questions that students, or teachers, may not be comfortable

asking because they may conflict with their assumptions, stereotypes or ways of

31

knowing. This strategy should be used throughout the teacher education program, regardless of course being taught.

Cultural autobiographies. Teacher educators have also employed the use of cultural autobiographies and cultural narrative assignments in their teacher preparation classrooms. Cultural autobiographies and narratives give teacher candidates an opportunity to think about their own cultural backgrounds (Davis, Ramhalo, Beyerbach & London, 2008; Johnson, 2002). Through writing, and rewriting, these autobiographies, teacher candidates are given the opportunities to revisit their personal experiences (Johnson, 2002), and to examine and critique their own experiences. Further, Davis et al. (2008) argue that cultural autobiography assignments allow teacher educators to gain greater insight into their students' cultural backgrounds. As previously mentioned, an element of culturally relevant pedagogy is getting know one's students; assignments such as these give teacher educators a way to model this pedagogy to teacher candidates. They can show the candidates how the information gleaned from autobiographies and narratives can be used to inform their instruction.

Field experiences. As a part of nearly every teacher preparation program, students participate in some type of field placement. The field placement is another place in the teacher education process where pre-service teachers can be further prepared to work with diverse students (Burant & Kirby, 2002; Noordhoff & Kleinfeld, 1993; Olmedo, 1997; Seidl & Friend, 2002; Sleeter, 2008; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). As previously stated, there is no uniform teacher education curriculum. While this can be viewed as a negative aspect to teacher education, there are benefits to it as well, the

greatest one being that teacher education programs can set up coursework and field experiences that best meet the needs of their students.

Often, teacher education programs are located in parts of the country with specific diversity issues (Noordhoof & Kleinfeld, 1993; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). Teacher education programs can create field experiences to best meet the needs of the students in those areas. For example, Noordhoof and Kleinfeld's (1993) study discusses a scenario in which pre-service teachers have cross-cultural field placements in both small Alaskan villages as well as in larger city contexts. Similar projects have taken place in the context of American Indian populations (Smolkin & Suina, 1999; Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). Any pre-service teacher field placement can be considered a cultural immersion project, such as those discussed above, since all schools exist within a context of a community with a culture (Stachowski & Mahan, 1998). Experiences such as these can help pre-service teachers learn not only about the students they are being prepared to teach but also about themselves.

Community-based service learning "offers opportunities to make cross-group connections and to gain cultural understandings. Furthermore, it offers opportunity to meet real community needs and provides guidance for reflection on the service experiences" (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000, p. 37). Several scholars (e.g., Burant & Kirby, 2002; Seidl & Friend, 2002) engaged in research about these community-based field experiences. Seidl and Friend (2002) established mutually beneficial community based learning experiences through a local church. The pre-service teachers had the opportunity to gain some cross-cultural experience and competence by working with

members of the community. In return, members of the church community had the pre-service teachers' assistance in various church and community projects. In Burant and Kirby's (2002) study, pre-service teachers were required to not only have in-classroom field experiences, but community based field experiences as well. The combination of these experiences helped many of the pre-service teachers begin to deconstruct the deficit perspectives they held for many of their students. They began to see children in a different light, developing more positive attitudes toward working with them in the classroom. Sleeter (2001) argues that, often, White pre-service teachers find these field placement experiences even more important than the methods classes they take in their program, because they are able to learn so much about their students and the communities that they come from.

Difficulties Facing the Multicultural Teacher Education

There are several difficulties facing multicultural teacher educators. Currently, there are two agendas having a push and pull effect on teacher education: (1) the professionalization of teaching and teacher education; and (2) the dismantling of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2003a, Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Sleeter, 2008; Zeichner, 2003). The goal of the professionalization agenda is to make teaching similar to other professions such as medicine and law. The main argument of the professionalization agenda is that the inequities in U. S. public education can be fixed by "raising standards for teaching and teacher education and by greater investment in teaching and schooling" (Zeichner, 2003, p. 499). Additionally, proponents of this movement argue for a standardization of teacher education. Although there are many benefits to this agenda,

Zeichner suggests that it has the potential to focus mainly on content-based instruction, thus removing the MCTE from teacher education altogether. The second downside is that raising the standards for teacher recruitment makes recruiting more diverse teaching populations even more challenging than it is already. It seems logical that one way to meet the needs of diverse students would be to recruit more teachers of color. (For a more detailed discussion about the difficulties in recruiting teachers of color into teacher education programs see Sleeter and Milner, 2011). The dismantling or deregulating of the teacher education agenda suggests that universities and teacher education programs have too great a hold on the teacher preparation process.

The argument is made that subject matter knowledge and teachers' verbal ability are the main determinants of teaching success, and it is asserted that much of what is offered in professional education methods and foundation courses can be learned on the job through an apprenticeship (Zeichner, 2003, p. 503). Those who support this agenda believe that teacher education programs at the college and university level should be eliminated and other alternative routes, which put teachers into the K–12 classrooms as soon as possible, should be put into place. Teacher educators against this agenda would argue that the time spent in traditional teacher education programs is essential to the effective preparation of teachers.

Multicultural teacher educators also face the potential for student resistance to the MCTE pedagogy (Mazzei, 2008; Picower, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005; Thomas &Vanderhaar, 2008; Thompson, 2003). Solomon and colleagues (2005) suggest several reasons why pre-service teachers may be resistant to MCTE. The first

reason they might be resistant is because of an ideological incongruence, the idea that

students struggle with the fact that what they are being presented with in regards to

multicultural education and social justice is incompatible with their current ideologies

and beliefs. The second reason that students may be resistant is because of an inability to

see the ways in which they are privileged, especially in the case of White privilege.

Lastly, many pre-service teachers hold tightly to the notion that all people are afforded

the same opportunities or access to the same opportunities, and it is difficult for them to

believe that there could be problems with society and its various institutions.

There are a number of ways in which teacher education students enact their

resistance, but these pedagogies are most often met with one of two common responses.

The first is anger toward the teacher educator for making them feel guilty about their part

in the hegemonic structures (Picower, 2009; Thompson, 2003). Teacher educators are

questioned about the legitimacy of raising these issues in the classrooms. Second, instead

of anger or guilt, some pre-service teachers respond to these pedagogies with silence

(Mazzei, 2008). Typically, this is because they are afraid of saying the wrong things,

worried that what they say may offend their colleagues of color, may come across as

sounding "stupid" or "wrong" in the eyes of their teacher educators. Still others refuse to

talk about it at all, as they do not want to admit their part in the preexisting hegemonic

structures.

In this section I have discussed the need for and overviewed the historical

development of multicultural education and multicultural teacher education.

Additionally, I have detailed specific pedagogies being employed by teacher educators to

address multicultural education with their pre-service teachers. Lastly, I have addressed

the difficulties facing the teacher education movement. In the next section of this

chapter, I will specifically speak to LGBTQ issues in school and teacher education.

<center>**LGBTQ Issues, Schools, and Teacher Education**</center>

Multicultural teacher education coursework typically includes topics such as race,

religion, and socioeconomic status. As stated elsewhere in this dissertation, it is

estimated that around five percent of the United States population identifies as gay,

lesbian, bisexual or transgender. Just as teachers need to be prepared to work with

students who come from racial, cultural, or socioeconomic backgrounds different than

their own, they also need to be prepared to work with students who identify as LGBTQ or

come from LGBTQ families. It is important to understand how these students' needs are

both similar and different to their heterosexual and gender conforming peers. It also

important for teachers to understand the ways in which LGBTQ issues impact families

and, ultimately, the students in their classrooms.

LGBTQ Kids and Schools

Studies have shown that most students who "come out" and reveal their gender

identification or sexual orientation to friends, family or peers during their middle or high

school years experience moderate to severe levels of bullying, harassment, and hostility

from their peers (Holmes & Cahill, 2004; Vaccaro, 2009). The impact of bullying and

harassment due to LGBTQ students' gender and/or sexual identities can produce a

number of negative effects, including isolation from friends and family, depression, drug

and/or alcohol use and addiction, low self-esteem, lack of engagement in school,

<center>37</center>

academic failure, and fighting (Beam, 2007; Holmes & Cahill, 2004; Kosciw et al., 2010; Meyer, 2010; Wilkinson & Pearson, 2009). While many LGBTQ youth are facing difficulties based on their gender identification or sexual orientations, there are many that are thriving (Holmes & Cahill, 2004). These youth have supportive family, friends, schools, and communities. That being said, the success of some of these students cannot lead educators and researchers to ignore the fact that the majority of them are struggling.

Homophobia is not always overt as in the aforementioned verbal and physical harassment of LGBTQ students. Often, it is a much more subtle presence, embedded in the very day-to-day practices of schools. Sexuality is not a topic that is covered explicitly in most American schools, but when it is covered "the form of sexuality allowed is the straightest of straight versions" (Epstein, O'Flynn, & Telford, 2000). Most of the time, sexuality in schools is a deeply embedded heterosexual curriculum (Friend, 1993). The presence of gay and lesbians from history and literature are left out and ignored. Further, this subtle homophobia takes shape in an overall lack of sensitivity to non-heteronormative family structures or rigid assumptions about the role of gender in students' lives (Blackburn, 2003; Cosier, 2009; Epstein et al., 2000; Maney & Cain, 1997; Quinlivan & Town, 1999).

As a result, LGBTQ students employ a variety of strategies to help them cope with the institution that does not accept their non-normative identities. Friend (1993) identified five main strategies: passing for straight, accommodation, heterosexual overcompensation, overachievement, and confronting the oppression to build self-empowerment. Passing involves "acting" straight in homophobic contexts, especially

school, but also possibly at home. Covering, closely related to passing, is the act of "ton[ing] down a disfavored identity to fit into the mainstream" (Yoshino, 2007, p. ix). The strategy of accommodation (Friend, 1993; Blackburn, 2003) is one wherein closeted LGBTQ kids contribute to homophobia by making gay jokes or by harassing other students who are out in an attempt to maintain their own covering or passing. The idea behind this strategy is that no one will identify the person as gay or lesbian if they are contributing to the harassment of other gay students and appear to have a dislike for homosexuality and those who express their gender in ways different from the norm.

Heterosexual overcompensation (Friend, 1993) is a strategy wherein students live two separate lives, a public heterosexual life and a private homosexual life. When not in school, they may get involved with queer online forums or other venues where they feel safer expressing their true identities (Driver, 2007, 2008). When in school, however, they do everything possible to continue to cover and pass. Some may even take heterosexual partners and engage in heterosexual activity so that there can be "no doubt" of their sexuality in the eyes of their peers.

Friend (1993) also discusses the strategy of overachievement. When using this strategy, LGBTQ youth take one of two approaches. First, they might prove themselves to be exceptional in academics, art, music, etc. Second, "rather than trying to be exceptional, others may try to be the exception" (Friend, 1993, p. 229) in which they try to become the token gay, lesbian, or trans who does not fit the stereotypical mold of LGBTQ people. The final strategy is confronting oppression to build self-empowerment. Students who employ this strategy actively resist homophobia, transphobia, and

heterosexism in their schools (Blackburn, 2007; Friend, 1993; Vacarro, 2009). They may

do this by starting a chapter of a Gay-Straight Alliance (GSA) in their school, or by

bringing their same-sex or gender non-conforming partner to a school dance. Students

may also confront oppression via more negative routes. They may actively choose to drop

out of schools, arguing that the schools do not meet their needs. In large cities, there are

some examples of schools that cater to LGBTQ students (Beam, 2007; Friend, 1993) that

can be selected as an alternative. Unfortunately, these types of schooling environments

are the exception, not the rule.

Combating homophobia and transphobia in schools. As previously discussed,

the GLSEN 2009 survey (Kosciw et al., 2010) revealed that students' experiences dealing

with harassment and bullying due to their gender and sexual identities have not been

positive. The study also provided information about students' experiences with teachers

and administrators. Sixty-two percent of students who were harassed or assaulted in

schools did not report the incident to school staff, believing little to no action would be

taken or that the situation would become worse. Thirty-four percent of the students who

did report an incident said that school staff did nothing in response. Even more startling,

students reported experiencing homophobia and transphobia from their teachers. Sixty

percent of students reported hearing homophobic remarks from their teachers or other

school staff. Over half (59%) of students heard teachers or other staff make negative

comments about a student's gender expression at school (Kosciw et al., 2010). Schools

are a place where students are supposed to feel safe, yet statistics reveal that many

LGBTQ students do not, and that going to the authorities in the school will not do anything to stop the harassment and bullying.

Students' reluctance to go to school authorities regarding LGBTQ bullying and harassment incidents in schools is not completely unfounded. Research on teachers' attitudes about gays and lesbians and about addressing gay, lesbian, and gender issues has shown that teachers are hesitant to address these issues in schools. Some believe that talking about sex and sexuality are jobs best left for parents (Clark, 2010a; Kumashiro, 2004; Meyer, 2010; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001). Teachers are concerned that addressing these issues in the current political climate can put their jobs in jeopardy (Clark, 2010a; Kumashiro, 2004; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Rowell, 2007). Teachers also believe that they should not impose their own values on their students, and that it is up to the parents to address moral and value issues at home (Bower & Klecka, 2009; Clark, 2010a; Kumashiro, 2004; Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001). Finally, although some teachers would be willing to address sexuality, homophobia, and transphobia in schools, they feel that their teacher education programs have not adequately prepared them to do so(Clark, 2010a; Kumashiro, 2004).

Coiser (2009) argues that when teachers and administrators are committed to equity and social justice in their buildings, school experiences do not need to be negative for queer youth. There are things teachers can do both on a classroom level and on a school level to make schools more safe and inviting for LGBTQ students, the most basic simply being having teachers make their classrooms a "safe space" (Cosier, 2009). Students of all gender identities and sexual orientations benefit from knowing that they

have an ally in their teachers. This can be communicated by acts including displaying

queer friendly symbols in the classroom; not tolerating any homophobic or heterosexist

peer-to-peer harassment; and by letting students know that if any bullying and harassment

does occur, something will be done about it. But the safe space concept, although ideal, is

still flawed. Teachers cannot be aware of everything that goes on within the classroom at

all times, and the students know that, although a given classroom may be safe, they still

must leave that classroom, and are thus susceptible to bullying and harassment outside of

it. Therefore, when claiming their classrooms as safe spaces, teachers still need to be

aware of the realities students face outside of those four walls.

   There is substantial literature about the ways in which teachers can create a

curriculum that is LGBTQ inclusive across all subject areas and grade levels. In the early

years, students can investigate gender roles and stereotypes (Meyer, 2010). Teachers can

engage in critical conversations with young students about what happens when

individuals cross gender boundaries, like when boys play with "girl toys." Other

discussions can revolve around what jobs men and women stereotypically can or cannot

do. They can also begin to address LGBTQ issues through literature (Rowell, 2007).

There are a number of picture books that present non-traditional family structures,

including those with two moms or two dads. As Rowell points out, in many of these

books, homosexuality is not the main theme to the book, but instead, there are characters

in the book that are gay and lesbian. There are other books that specifically address the

stereotypes surrounding gays and lesbians. Increasingly, there is a growing body of

queer-themed young adult literature (Blackburn & Buckley, 2005; Clark, 2010a, 2010b; Martino, 2009; North, 2010).

Martino (2009) argues that merely including texts with queer themes or queer characters is not enough. He asserts that instead what is needed is a curriculum in which teachers teach students to see heteronormativity and critique it. When confronting the issue of the oppression of marginalized populations, one response is to use critical literacy, which involves "reading, writing, questioning, and revising the word as well as the ideologically constructed world" (Young, 2009, p. 109).

Blackburn and Buckley (2005) take this even further by specifically addressing LGBTQ oppression through the introduction of a queer-inclusive curriculum.

> A queer-inclusive curriculum is one that offers students a variety of
> characters and narrators who define themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual or
> queer (who suspend sexual and gender identities), alongside those who
> implicitly claim a normal identity. The guiding pedagogical concern is
> how best to have students comprehend and critique the social binaries that
> have cultural currency in their own lives, for example, young/old,
> logical/emotional, gay/straight. (p. 210)

Critical, queer-inclusive literacy gives teachers and students the opportunity to explore the existence and effects of heteronormativity and heterosexual privilege in their own lives (Gonzales, 2010; Kumashiro, 2001, 2002; Meyer, 2010; Quinlivan & Town, 1999; Smith, 2009; Young, 2009). It also gives queer students the opportunity to see

themselves represented in the curriculum, which may allow them to realize that they are not alone in their experiences.

In addition to literacy, a LGBTQ focused curriculum can be brought into other content areas as well. In fact, scholars (Crocco, 2008; Jennings, 2006; Kumashiro, 2002; Meyer, 2010; Thornton, 2010) have pointed out the lack of and the need for LGBTQ issues to be addressed as a part of the social studies curriculum. For example, Jennings (2006) emphasizes the importance of acknowledging the LGBTQ identity of historical figures that are traditionally included in textbooks, such as Alexander the Great, Susan B. Anthony, Langston Hughes, and J. Edgar Hoover. Additionally, Thornton (2010) argues that often times LGBTQ individuals, such as social activist Jane Addams, are completely omitted from the curriculum. These authors also argue that while various social movements are included in history lessons, such as the civil rights, women's equality, and Latino movements, social studies teachers need to make connections between these movements and gay and lesbian civil rights issues.

Students can be given the opportunity to discuss current events relevant to gay, lesbian, and transgendered/transsexual people, including same-sex marriage, gay and lesbian adoption, and local Gay Pride events (Meyer, 2010). Additionally, in health classes, Meyer suggests that same-sex relationships be included in teachings surrounding healthy relationships and healthy sexual activities. When discussions of HIV and AIDS arise, teachers can correct misconceptions by explaining to students that these diseases impact all people, not just gay men. Finally, Meyer calls awareness to the language being used throughout the curriculum. Just as there has been a trend to include more diverse

sounding names in examples and problems, Meyer argues that LGBTQ relationships can be included in problems and examples.

As discussed throughout Blackburn, Clark, Kenney and Smith's (2010) book, teacher activism to fight homophobia and heteronormativity in schools is critical. Regardless of their own sexuality, teachers can establish Gay and Straight Alliances (GSAs) (Cosier, 2009; Gonzales, 2010; Meyer, 2010; Schey & Upstrom, 2010). GSAs are spaces in which heterosexual students and those who identify as gay, lesbian, queer, straight allies, or those who choose not to identify come together. GSAs can have a number of functions. They can be places where LGBTQ students and allies can come together to find ways to learn more about each other. They can also be places where these students come together to create and implement programs in order to educate other students in the school. Kumashiro (2002) encourages all schools to provide places for oppressed students to go for support. Similarly, Meyer (2010) recommends encouraging the administration to permit school wide initiatives, such as "National Day of Silence" and "Wear Pink Day." Finally, it is important that policy changes (Cosier, 2009) are put into place, one of the most critical being schools' discrimination policies. In order to better protect queer students, these policies should have clear and specific language involving sexual and gender diversity (Kumashiro, 2008; Meyer, 2010; Schey & Upstrom, 2010). In other words, rather than policies simply stating that discrimination or bullying will not be tolerated in the school environment, they should state that discrimination or bullying based on race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. will not tolerated in the school. This type of inclusive language sends a much clearer message

regarding the administration's position on bullying, and allows teachers to be more assertive when addressing issues of bullying based on gender or sexual orientation in the classroom.

Pre-service Teachers Attitudes about LGBTQ Students and Families

Several studies have investigated pre-service teachers' attitudes about LGBTQ people, including both parents and students. Maney and Cain (1997) reported that nearly one half of the 200 pre-service teachers surveyed in their study agreed that male homosexuality is a lifestyle that should be condemned. Additionally, another study yielded that pre-service teachers had a greater negative attitude towards gay males than toward lesbians (Wyatt, Oswalt, White & Peterson, 2008). When broken down into sub-groups, Mudry and Medina-Adams (2006) also found that female pre-service teachers have more negative attitudes about homosexuality than male pre-service teachers. Secondly, they found that part-time students had a more negative attitude than their full-time counterparts. Finally, Mudry and Medina-Adams found that students who self-identified as having a minority racial or ethnic background had a more negative attitude than non-minority pre-service teachers.

Bower and Klecka (2009) also examined the attitudes and perceptions of practicing teachers about the lesbian mothers of their students. They found that the ten practicing teachers they worked with held some assumptions and norms about both lesbian mothers. The teachers felt that the lesbian mothers were more concerned with their own needs than the needs of their children. The teachers expressed the opinion that the lesbian mothers should not be making decisions about their personal or social lives

46

that would have a negative impact on their children. The teachers did not connect anti-bullying, anti-bias curriculum with teaching about diversity and respect. They did not realize the impact that good diversity pedagogy can have on both the LGBT and heterosexual students in the classroom. The participants also felt that addressing LGBT issues in the curriculum could offend some parents, and that teachers should not "contradict personal, moral or religious beliefs of parents" (Bower & Klecka, 2009, p. 367). But what is most important to recognize in all of these studies, is that the attitudes, assumptions, biases and beliefs held by teachers can not only impact the curricular pedagogy, but also the ways in which teachers interact with LGBT parents, students, or children of LGBT parents.

LGBT Inclusion in the Teacher Education Program

While most teacher education programs in the country cover some sort of diversity issues in their program, Sherwin and Jennings (2006) report that only 60% of the 77 teacher education program coordinators they surveyed said that issues of sexual orientation were explicitly addressed in their programs. Further, they found sexual orientation was predominantly covered in a foundations type class and not carried out across the teacher education program as other diversity issues (social class, race, special needs, etc) are.

Just as teacher education is responsible for teaching pre-service teachers about instructional methods, content, and classroom management, it is also responsible for teaching these teachers to address issues of diversity and social justice in the classroom. Kumashiro (2004) raises the point that there is no perfect format for teaching about

LGBTQ issues in teacher education. Every method has both strengths and weaknesses and can be problematic if not thought through properly, but this should not dissuade teacher educators from trying. Carefully planned and implemented educational interventions can have a positive effect on pre-service teachers' knowledge of and attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Butler, 1999).

Regardless of the format used with her teacher education students, Wolfe (2006) works to ensure that some basic points are always communicated. The first is that children are exposed from a young age to issues of gayness and gay oppression in out-of-school contexts. They are presented with images of non-heterosexual relationships on television and movies. As early as elementary school, many students think that the term gay is a negative one, so teachers can be working against that oppression from an early age. Secondly, Wolfe communicates that acknowledging LGBTQ families and issues in the classroom is a way to make the school more inclusive to all. It is up to teachers to create classrooms in which students and their families feel comfortable. Thirdly, Wolfe posits that, in most cases, dealing with sexuality issues in class has nothing to do with talking about sex. Instead, discussing issues of homosexuality, gender, and oppression is about relationships, families, and love. Finally, Wolfe argues that teachers need to separate themselves from their own feelings and attitudes about homosexuality. Regardless of whether or not a teacher feels that homosexuality is "right" or "wrong," they must not articulate these feelings to their students.

It is important for the teacher educator to think about the environment they are creating when addressing diversity issues in the classroom.

When the teacher education classroom serves as a safe space for students

to express their contradictions, doubt and questions as well as their

resistance and (author's emphasis) connection to issues of race, culture

and gender, we create opportunities for queering the gaze of future

teachers. (Asher, 2007, p. 71)

Copenhaver-Johnson (2010) attempts to "challenge, rather than alienate students as we

engage in critical discussions about systems that enable race, ability, gender, linguistic,

class and heterosexual privilege" (p. 17). The goal is to have teacher education students

use the materials presented by the teacher education program to examine their own

preconceptions about sexuality and gender, understand the connections between those

conceptions and homophobia and gender oppression, and to think critically about how

they enact change in their classrooms (Swartz, 2003).

One pedagogical strategy being employed by teacher educators to address

LGBTQ issues in the teacher education classroom involves using specific readings, both

personal narratives and academic journal articles (Clark, 2010a; Copenhaver-Johnson,

2010; Vavrus, 2009; Wolfe, 2006), followed by critical discussion. By engaging teachers

in critical dialogue, they can begin to interrogate their own thinking in relationship to the

readings. An offshoot of the critical discussions in the classroom, teachers should be

encouraged engage in critical reflection (Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001), which is often best

accomplished through written assignments (Clark, 2010a; Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010;

Vavrus, 2009). These assignments allow the students to tell their own stories about their

experiences with LGBTQ people and issues, or their experiences with heterosexism, homophobia, and transphobia.

An additional strategy is the use of guest speakers. These speakers can include gay and lesbian students or parents or teachers who are currently doing ally work in their own classrooms (Evans & Broido, 2005; Wolfe, 2006). There are several discussions of quality films that address queer issues in school that appear across the literature (Clark, 2010b; Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010; Mulhern & Martinez, 1999; Wolfe, 2006). These films address a number of issues, including how LGBTQ issues are being addressed in classrooms at all grade levels. Other films look deeply into the lived experiences of LGBTQ people, particularly their experiences in schools. These films can help teachers understand the way that their responsiveness (or lack of responsiveness) to the topic can either significantly help (or hurt) gay, lesbian, transgender, and ally students.

Finally, just as the use of children's and young adult literature can be used in Pre K–12 classrooms, they can also be used in teacher education classrooms to help teachers ease into these issues, as well as give them resources to use in their own classrooms (Clark, 2010a, 2010b; North, 2010; Wolfe, 2006). There are a growing number of picture books, short stories and young adult fiction that address sexuality issues, heterosexism, and homophobia. The work that Smith (2009) does in her high school English classroom could easily be applied to the work teacher educators do with pre-service teachers. Questions should be asked about why a particular book was chosen, how the book will be used, and what types of stereotypes are perpetuated or disrupted by using the text.

There are several difficulties when addressing LGBTQ issues in any classroom. "The introduction of sexual orientation—immediately laden with morality, religious intolerance, ignorance and lack of experience—creates unexpected challenges" (Mulhern & Martinez, 1999, p. 247). Several scholars (Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001; Vavrus, 2009) argue that the length of time in any course is not adequate enough to address such heavy topics as LGBTQ issues. Teacher educators are often limited by the amount of time allotted to address these issues, as they are only one component of a multicultural education course. Similar to the discussion earlier in this chapter about the resistance of pre-service teachers to general multicultural teacher education, pre-service teachers may also resist the addition of LGBTQ content into the teacher preparation program. This resistance can take a number of forms including vocal opposition to learning about these topics, silence during class discussions, and refusal to complete required classroom assignments. As Copenhaver-Johnson (2010) notes, "the 'problem' of the resistant student does not always reside with the student. It is important to reflect on the ways in which we instructors inadvertently create environments that reinforce resistance" (p. 33). Copenhaver-Johnson raises a very important point, in that it is incredibly easy for teacher educators to blame their pre-service teacher for his or her resistance. Thus teacher educators need to look closely at their own teaching practices and reflect upon strengths, weaknesses, and areas in need of improvement (Clark, 2010a; 2010b; Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010; Kumashiro, 2004).

Finally, there are some concerns that teacher educators, especially heterosexual or non-trans educators, need to consider. Covering issues of diversity in any classroom can

be challenging, especially when one is not a member of the group being discussed. It is difficult to speak for the needs of any group, let alone a group with which one is not affiliated. Teacher educators run the risk of unintentionally perpetuating stereotypes, heteronormativity, and homophobia (Robinson & Ferfolja, 2001) through the materials used in class and the way in which such materials are presented. It is critical that teacher educators reach out to LGBTQ authorities to make sure that what they are presenting to their students is as accurate and bias-free as possible. Even the most well intentioned, social justice oriented teacher educators may inadvertently perpetuate his or her own homophobia or the homophobia of his or her students (Copenhaver-Johnson, 2010; Mulhern & Martinez, 1999). A final element to consider goes back to the fluidity and the contextual nature of identities discussed earlier in this document. There is no one uniform LGBTQ experience. Teacher educators need to understand this and communicate it to their teacher education students.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy can be defined as one's belief in his or her own "capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, and Hoy (1998) give an extensive review of the literature on the concept of efficacy. They discuss, in detail, the two leading conceptual strands in this field that lead up to the current study of teacher efficacy. The first strand of efficacy studies were based on the social learning theory (see Rotter, 1966). The premise of this strand is that teachers view their efficacy as a result of extrinsic (external) or intrinsic (internal) factors. The second strand is based on the social

cognitive theory (see Bandura, 1977, 1997). The premise of this strand differentiates between outcome expectancy, an individual's view of the potential consequences of a given task based on his or her competency, and efficacy expectancy, an individual's expectation the she or he can plan the needed steps or actions necessary to perform a specific task. Bandura's (1997) work takes into account the multifaceted nature of teacher efficacy, including "efficacy to influence decision making, efficacy to influence school resources, instructional efficacy, disciplinary efficacy, efficacy to enlist parental involvement, efficacy to enlist community involvement, and efficacy to create a positive climate (Tschannen et al, 1998, p. 791). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy in the different areas of classroom instruction, interaction with students, and classroom management impacts why and how they engage in the various elements of classroom life.

Teacher efficacy can be defined as a "teacher's belief in his or her capacity to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context" (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 233). The concept of teacher efficacy can be applied to teaching specific content, to classroom management practices, or to working with specific populations of students. It is important to note, when discussing issues of self-efficacy, that self-efficacy deals with a self-perception of competence rather than actual level of competence. Based on their research, Friedman and Kass (2002), extended the definition of teacher self-efficacy:

Teacher self-efficacy is the teacher's perception of his or her ability to (a) perform required professional tasks and to regulate relations involve din the process of teaching and educating students (classroom efficacy), and

53

(b) perform organizational tasks, become part of the organization and its

political and social processes (organizational efficacy) (p. 684).

This definition of teacher-efficacy considers the fact that a teacher is a part of the

classroom and greater school contexts.

Multicultural Education Self-Efficacy

While there are studies that address a teacher's overall sense of efficacy in

teaching, there are far fewer studies in regard to multicultural education (Pang & Sablan,

1998; S.K. Silverman, 2008; Siwatu, 2011). In Pang and Sablan's (1998) study, the

authors researched teachers' sense of self-efficacy when working with African American

students. The authors adapted two teacher belief and teacher efficacy scales to address

their specific questions about teacher-efficacy in response to working with African

American students. They administered their survey to 100 pre-service and 75 in-service

teachers enrolled in multicultural education courses at a university. Their quantitative

results revealed that, for many of the questions in the survey, there was no difference

between the responses of pre-service and in-service teachers. Based on their surveys, the

authors concluded that both pre-service and in-service teachers' attitudes about race did

affect their self-efficacy beliefs. They also discovered that most of the White teachers

that participated in the study had little to no understanding about African American

students and their cultures. As previously stated, they also discovered that pre-service

teachers had a more positive attitude about their abilities to meet the needs of African

American students than their in-service counterparts.

There were several troubling results from Pang and Sablan's (1998) study. Forty-one percent of the teachers surveyed felt that, compared to the impact their home lives had on them, they could not make an impact on their African American students. Sixty-five percent did not disagree that "even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not be able to reach African American youth" (p. 53). A third disturbing result is that there seemed to be a belief that the African American community is not supportive of public education. In response to this, the authors argue that more must be done in the teacher education classroom to prepare teachers to work with African American students.

In her study, S.K. Silverman (2008) attempted to answer the following research questions:

> How do pre-service teachers make meaning of ambiguous terminology
> (e.g. diversity, multiculturalism, culture)?; What distinctions do pre-
> service teachers make among the theoretical constructs of efficacy,
> advocacy and responsibility?; and How do pre-service teachers
> differentiate among the theoretical constructs of responsibility, advocacy,
> and efficacy in comparison with the diversity-multiculturalism construct?
> (p. 302)

The methodology for S.K. Silverman's study was relatively simple. She surveyed 88 undergraduate and graduate pre-service teachers using a measure she developed entitled the Teachers' Sense of Responsibility for Multiculturalism and Diversity (TSR-MD). Items in this scale looked at the attitudes toward several different topics, including race, class, faith, gender, sexual orientation, disability, conflict, family values, and parents

opting-out of students participating in specific lesson topics. Silverman then conducted

several quantitative analyses on the pre-service teachers' responses.

As a result of her study, S.K. Silverman (2008) found that pre-service teachers

understand large ranges of meaning when confronted with ambiguous terminology, such

as diversity and multiculturalism. She goes on to argue that pre-service teachers'

attitudes toward issues of diversity and multiculturalism vary based on the specific

construct (race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.). Silverman argues that this may be due,

in part, to the fact that the terminology being used in teacher education programs

conceptualizes diversity in a way that does not include sexual orientation, faith, and

gender, and instead focuses more exclusively on race, class, and disability. A second

finding from Silverman's study involves pre-service teachers' sense of responsibility.

She argues that pre-service teachers feel that schools and communities are more obligated

to address issues of diversity and multiculturalism than are individual teachers.

Siwatu (2011) used a mixed-methods approach, very similar to the one used in

this study, to answer the following questions:

> What is the nature of pre-service teachers' CRTSE [culturally response
>
> teaching self-efficacy] beliefs? What types of culturally responsive
>
> teaching self-efficacy-forming experiences have pre-service teachers
>
> encountered during their teacher education program? How do pre-service
>
> teachers describe the influence that these self-efficacy-forming
>
> experiences had on the development of their CRTSE beliefs (p. 361)?

56

Siwatu conducted a mixed-methods two-phase study. In the first phase of the study, Siwatu used quantitative methods to examine the nature of a large sample ($N = 192$) of pre-service teachers culturally responsive self-efficacy beliefs. In the second, qualitative phase of the study, Siwatu conducted face-to-face interviews with eight of the 192 pre-service teachers to "identify the types of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy-forming experiences that pre-service teachers encountered during their teacher education program and the perceived influence that these experiences had on the development of their CRTSE beliefs" (p. 361). Siwatu notes that in this study, he gave more weight to the qualitative data than the quantitative.

The quantitative portion of Siwatu's (2011) study revealed that pre-service teachers were more confident in their ability to execute many of the more general teaching practices that may not require the integration of students' cultural and linguistic background (e.g., "build a sense of trust in my students"). On the other hand, pre-service teachers' self-efficacy beliefs were lower for successfully completing tasks that were specific to culturally responsive teaching (e.g., "identify ways that the school culture is different from my students' home culture" [Siwatu, 2011, p. 366]).

Siwatu (2011) found that the interviews were helpful in understanding the quantitative results. For example, the interviews revealed that the pre-service teachers who had more exposure to culturally relevant practices in their coursework had a stronger sense of self-efficacy. Those students who had opportunities to practice culturally relevant pedagogy reported even higher levels of self-efficacy. A second finding from Siwatu's study was the pre-service teachers' sense that the teacher education program did

not allow them to develop an in-depth theoretical and procedural understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy.

Siwatu (2011) raises two important implications in his study of the training of pre-service teachers. He argues that teacher educational programs should include self-efficacy activities surrounding culturally relevant pedagogy. These activities can include "supplementing lecture with demonstrations, video case studies, role-playing, field experiences, and simulations" (p. 368) with the goal of increasing pre-service teachers' competence and confidence. The second implication for Siwatu's study is the need for more comprehensive faculty development in teacher education programs. Any faculty member who teaches pre-service teachers should have an understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy. They should further understand how to infuse such pedagogy throughout the teacher education curriculum, grasping the practices in the classroom that allow pre-service teachers to gain the necessary confidence to implement culturally relevant pedagogy in their own classrooms.

Gaps in the Literature

After a thorough examination of the existing literature, several gaps were found. First, while there were studies examining both what and how multicultural content is addressed in teacher education programs, there is limited work examining what pre-service teachers take away from this instruction. There is also a need to understand pre-service teachers' perceptions of these pedagogies and whether or not such perceptions impact their conceptualizations of and self-efficacy in addressing multicultural content in their classrooms. Secondly, there were very few studies that address teachers'—

particularly pre-service teachers'— sense of self-efficacy in using what multicultural education instruction they did receive in their teacher preparation program in their own classrooms. Finally, there has been no work in the realm of addressing pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy in addressing LGBTQ issues in the classroom.

This study has been designed to address several of these gaps. First, the study investigates pre-service teachers' conceptualizations of multicultural education, and terms related to LGBTQ issues in education. Secondly, the study explores the pre-service teachers' perception of their multicultural teacher education instruction. Lastly, the study investigates the pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy in addressing specific LGBTQ content in the classroom, and working with and for LGBTQ students and students from LGBTQ families.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have laid out a conceptual framework of multicultural education, including a review of its historical development. I have discussed the ways in which K–12 teachers address multicultural education in their classrooms. This discussion was extended to include the ways in which teachers are prepared to address multicultural content in their classrooms and multicultural teacher education, covering both theoretical ideas behind MCTE as well as citing specific practices used by teacher educators. Additionally, I have presented the literature and established a need for multicultural education to include content about LGBTQ students and families. This chapter also includes a discussion about the work that has been done in the realm of multicultural education and self-efficacy of teachers. Finally, I have laid out some of the gaps in the

literature, situating this study as a first step to filling some of these gaps. In the next

chapter, I will present the methods for data collection and analysis used to investigate the

research questions of this study.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology
Introduction

When engaging in educational research, the researcher must determine what

research methods are best used to answer his or her research questions. Researchers may

choose to use a qualitative approach, a quantitative approach, or a mixed-methods

approach. D. Silverman (2000) raises the point that one method is not better than the

other, instead "the choice between the different research methods should depend upon

what you are trying to find out" (p. 1). The research questions framing this study are as

follows:

- How do pre-service teachers conceptualize multicultural education?

- Given these conceptualizations, how do pre-service teachers report that teacher

   educators in their teacher education programs addressed:

   - multicultural content;

   - issues of gender and gender non-conformity;

   - issues of sexuality.

- What sense of self-efficacy do pre-service teachers report related to:

   - working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning

      students and their families

   - teaching and discussing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or

      queer/questioning content and issues; and

- o identifying bias against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or

    queer/questioning people in school related materials and contexts?

While some quantitative statistical analysis will used in this project, the nature of the

project is mostly qualitative. Qualitative research seeks to understand a phenomenon

from the perspective of those who experience it (Glesne, 2006) and the meanings they

attach to it (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

> The key to understanding qualitative research lies with the idea that
>
> meaning is socially constructed by individuals in interaction with their
>
> world. The world, or reality, is not the fixed, single, agreed upon, or
>
> measureable phenomena that it is assumed to be in positive, quantitative
>
> research. Instead, there are multiple constructions and interpretations of
>
> reality that are in flux and that change over time (Merriam, 2002b, pp. 3–
>
> 4).

Methods used in qualitative research include interviews, ethnographies, life histories,

grounded-theory, case studies, action research, and participant research (Denzin &

Lincoln, 2011; Glesne, 2006; D. Silverman, 2000).

There are several key characteristics shared by all qualitative research. Rather

than trying to quantify, or capture in numbers, a specific phenomenon as in quantitative

research, a qualitative researcher seeks to understand the meaning individuals construct

about their world (Merriam, 2002b). Qualitative research seeks to understand people's

points of view, frames of reference, and value commitments (Stake, 2010). Another

characteristic of qualitative research is the tools used to get data. In quantitative research,

the researcher will use various measures, including experiments and methods that can be translated numerically, while in qualitative research, the researcher is the prime research instrument (Merriam, 2002b; Stake, 2010). It is up to the researcher to ask the interview questions and to be extremely observant in the field settings. The qualitative researcher is able to pick up data, such as pauses and hesitations in speech, facial expressions, changes in tone, and environmental and contextual changes, in a way that most quantitative methods cannot.

Another characteristic common to all qualitative research is the way researchers use data, theory, and hypotheses. Quantitative research is deductive and qualitative research is inductive (Merriam, 2002b). When conducting quantitative research, the researcher begins with a theory or a hypothesis. They then use their research data to either prove or disprove that hypothesis. Qualitative researchers do the opposite: they use the data they collect to form theories and hypotheses about a given phenomena. In qualitative research "often issues are emic (emerging from the people) more than etic (brought by researchers)" (Stake, 2010, p. 15). While quantitative researchers report their findings in terms of numbers, qualitative researchers report their findings in ways that describe, in detail, the context and other elements being investigated (Merriam, 2002b; Stake, 2010). Though theories do come out of the research data, qualitative researchers use theoretical frameworks to shape the research questions and methods.

This study uses the qualitative methods of interviews, document analysis, and open-ended survey questions. Table 1 shows the connections between each research

question, the data sources used to answer each question, and the methods of analysis

employed in interpreting the data.

Table 1. Research Question Alignment

Research question	Data source	Methodology
How do pre-service teachers conceptualize multicultural education?	Pre-service teacher surveys, Pre-service teacher interviews	Descriptive statistics, Comparison of interviews and qualitative survey data
Given these conceptualizations, how do pre-service teachers report teacher educators in their teacher education programs addressed: • multicultural content; • issues of gender and gender non-conformity; and • issues of sexuality	Pre-service teacher surveys, Pre-service teacher interviews	Triangulation of interviews, qualitative survey data and quantitative survey data
What sense of self-efficacy do pre-service teachers report related to: • working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning students and their families • teaching and discussing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning content and issues; and • identifying bias against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer/questioning people in school related materials and contexts?	Pre-service teacher surveys, Pre-service teacher interviews	Triangulation of interviews, qualitative survey data and quantitative survey data

Participants

The research site for this study was a large Midwestern university. The university

has a number of teacher preparation programs in a number of fields: Early Childhood

Education (ECE), Middle Childhood Education (MCE), Music Education (ME), Art

Education Teacher Education (AETE), Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE),

Foreign Language Education (FSLED), Special Education (SE), English Education (EE),

and Social Studies Education (SSE). Through departmental contacts, I was able to reach

the program managers, faculty leads, and university faculty members teaching teacher

preparation courses in each of these programs, and inquired if they would be willing to

have a brief survey administered to their students regarding multicultural education (see

Appendix A for the survey protocol). Of the 20 instructors contacted regarding the

student survey, four allowed me to distribute the survey and solicit interview participants.

Two of the instructors taught both ECE and MCE pre-service teachers, while the other

two instructors worked with pre-service teachers in the PETE and AETE programs.

Table 2 reflects the cohorts and the number of participants from each.

Table 2. Pre-Service Participant Cohort

Cohort label	Certification program	Number of participants
COHORT 1	Early/Middle Grades Teacher Preparation	26
COHORT 2	Early/Middle Grades Teacher Preparation	10
COHORT 3	Art Education Teacher Preparation	18
COHORT 4	Physical Education Teacher Preparation	13

The pre-service teachers ranged in age from 21 to 50, with an average age of 26 and a median age of 23. Most of the participants (46) fell between the ages of 21 and 25. This is not surprising giving that both the Art Education Teacher Education and Physical Education Teacher Education cohorts were undergraduate teacher preparation programs, while two early and middle grades teacher preparation programs were graduate teacher preparation and certification programs. Most students in these programs complete the one-year M.Ed. programs immediately following the completion of the undergraduate degrees. The table below reflects the other self-identified demographic categories of the participants.

Table 3. Participant Demographics

Race	Gender	Sexuality	Religion
92% White	65% Female	87% Hetersoexual	89% Christian
6% Multiracial	35% Male	3% Gay/Homosexual	7% None
2% Mexican-American		3% Straight Leaning/ Straightish	4% Atheist
2% Asian		1% Pansexual	

Overall, eleven pre-service teachers volunteered to be interviewed for this research project. While none of the pre-service teachers from the Physical Education Teacher Education class and only one of the Early/Middle Childhood class were interested in being interviewed, several pre-service teachers from the other two classes (Art Education Teacher Education and the other Early/Middle Childhood) were. Two pre-service teachers from each program were selected for interviewing. The interview participation forms were put into piles in alphabetical order based on the cohort the surveys were collected from. Names were put in reverse alphabetical order when sending requests via email to the participants to arrange interviews. The pre-service teachers were given 24 hours to respond. If they did not, requests were sent to the next individual on the list. The first two pre-service teachers from each class to respond were scheduled for interviews. Interviews took place in public places, as I wanted to respect the participant and let them choose a place in which they felt comfortable. Interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes each and were audio recorded. These audio recordings were destroyed at the completion of the study.

University faculty and staff who taught pre-service teacher coursework were contacted through departmental secretaries via email, requesting if multicultural or diversity issues were addressed in their teacher preparation courses, they should send the syllabus via inter-office mail or email (see Appendix C for the Instructor Syllabus Request). They were instructed to remove their name and contact information from the syllabus for a "blind review". In the email, the instructors were also asked to provide

their contact information if they were interested in being interviewed about the ways in which they address diversity in their teacher education courses. Although six syllabi were sent to me by the instructors electronically via email, none of them volunteered to be interviewed.

Pre-Service Teacher Data Sources

After gaining access to the pre-service teachers through their instructors, the pre-service teachers were approached during one of their class sessions about participating in the research project. I briefly explained to the class who I was, what I was studying, and why I was studying it. The pre-service teachers were then informed about the two parts of the project, and were invited to participate in one, both, or no parts of the study. They were then given the consent forms and an opportunity to consider. While most of the pre-service teachers in each cohort chose to participate in the project, a few from each cohort declined any participation. Those pre-service teachers who expressed interest in being interviewed were selected based on the criteria stated above. I will describe, in detail, the research-based rationales and methods used for designing and implementing the survey and interview protocols.

Survey design and implementation. The survey questions were developed based on both the research questions and on previously developed survey instruments. The first set of questions involved the pre-service teachers' general experiences in their multicultural education courses, and specific questions regarding what instruction, if any, they received about sexual orientation and gender nonconformity. The second section of the survey contained open-ended questions about their understanding of multicultural

68

education and various terms related to LGBTQ people. The third section addressed pre-service teacher's sense of efficacy in working with and working for LGBTQ students and families. The questions for this section were based on two other scales, including the Multicultural Efficacy Scale (Guyton & Wesche, 2005) and the Teachers Self-Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). The final set of questions included demographic information about the population being studied, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, and licensure program.

After contacting the instructors via email, we arranged a mutually convenient time for me to administer the survey to the pre-service teachers. Once I had arrived in class, I briefly explained the project and distributed the consent forms to the potential participants. As the pre-service teachers completed the survey, they were asked to hand in the materials in three piles: consent forms, survey, and interview interest form.

Interview design and implementation. Interviewing is a research method in which the researcher asks the research participant a number of questions. The goal of the interview is gain a deeper understanding of the ideas and perspectives of the participant.

> In an interview conversation, the researcher asks about, and listens to, what people themselves tell about their lived world. The interviewer listens to their dreams, fears and hopes; hears their views and opinions in their own words; and learns about their school and work situation, their family and social life (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. xvii).

There are three types of interviews: highly structured, semi-structured, and unstructured (Merriam, 2009). With highly structured interviews, the researcher uses a predetermined

list of research questions and does not divert from those questions. Usually, in qualitative research, the highly structured interview questions are those that ask about demographic data. More common in qualitative research are semi-structured and unstructured, or informal, interviews. Seidman (2006) suggests the use of all three of these types of questions. After gaining basic demographic information, Seidman suggests interviews within which the researcher asks semi-structured questions such as "Tell me about your experiences in school as a child." These focused life history questions both build rapport and help the researcher gain a broad sense of understanding of the participant's experience. Seidman then suggests that later interviews ask follow up questions about specific details of those experiences, and how the participant ascribes meaning to those experiences. It is important to remember that interviewing takes skill and is an art (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Merriam, 2009; Seidman, 2006). It takes practice to become skilled at this methodology, and while many qualitative methodologies involve an interviewing component, the amount of interviewing one does should be based on their comfort and experience. The pre-service teacher interview followed the interview protocol (see Appendix B for the Student Interview Protocol) with the understanding that the interview would be semi-structured and that questions could change based on the flow of the interview.

The interviews for this study were conducted in a public place, such as a restaurant or coffee shop, and were audio recorded with the consent of the participants. The audio recordings were later transcribed. The transcribed interviews were then emailed to the interview participants for a member check. Member checks involve taking

data and/or analyses (Merriam, 1988) and sharing them with the research participants to ensure that their ideas are being represented accurately (Glesne, 2006). Only two of the four participants responded to the member checks, and none had corrections or modifications made to the interview transcripts. The interviews were analyzed both before and after the participant member checks. Table 5 reflects the information for each survey participant, including the pseudonym that will be used for them throughout the rest of this document, the cohort from which they came, as well as their self-identified gender, age, and sexual orientation.

Table 4. Interview Participants

Name	Cohort	Gender	Age	Sexual orientation
Amy	Early/Middle 1	F	25	straight
Beth	Early/Middle 1	F	25	straight leaning
Tina	Art Education	F	22	pansexual[1]
Sarah	Art Education	F	23	heterosexual

Instructor Data Sources

When this project was originally designed, the hope was that the instructor and course data were desired to lend insight into pre-service teacher education course content, pedagogy, and student knowledge from a single program. Unfortunately this was not the case. Instead, the syllabi were collected from different teacher education programs

---

[1] Tina described her sexual orientation as pansexual. Pansexual is a term that refers to someone who is open to all types of sexual and romantic relationships with men, women, transgender or intersexed individuals.

within the same institution, and no instructors volunteered to be interviewed. I will describe the collection methods of the teacher educator data.

Syllabi collection. The original requests for syllabi were sent out in July 2012, but none were received. In mid-August a second round of emails requesting this data was sent. At this point, six syllabi from four instructors were collected via email. The six course titles are listed below:

- Course 1: Urban Teaching Seminar

- Course 2: Socio-Cultural Issues in Physical Education

- Course 3: Literacy, New Media, and Creative Pedagogies of Middle Childhood Classrooms

- Course 4: Teaching Students with Disabilities in an Inclusive Setting

- Course 5: Introduction to Exceptional Children

- Course 6: Professional Context of Teaching

Interview design and implementation. The project was designed with the intention of interviewing university faculty and staff who addressed multicultural/diversity issues in their teacher education courses. The instructors who would have volunteered to be interviewed as a part of this study would have been given access to a summary of the pre-service teacher survey results. They would have also been given access to the emergent themes and categories that came up in the syllabi collection. Similar to the pre-service teacher interviews, these interviews would have been semi-structured. The instructors would have been asked several questions about the ways in which they frame equity and diversity, with a special focus on gender expression

and sexual orientation. They would have also been asked about the findings of the survey: What surprised them? What did not? Finally, they would have been asked about what support they might need, as instructors, to help their students gain a greater sense of self-efficacy in working with and advocating for LGBTQ students and their families. Instructors would have been asked to share specific information about their own syllabi, unless they choose to share it independently. As previously mentioned, no instructors volunteered to be interviewed about their multicultural teacher education practices.

Data Analysis

After raw data is collected, the researcher needs to do something with it, a process called data analysis. Data analysis involves an organization of the raw data so that sense can be made of it. During data analysis, the researcher can describe, create explanations, and develop theories (Glesne, 2005). This section will outline the theoretical frameworks of the data analysis methods for this project.

Grounded Theory

Grounded theory is a method used to frame and analyze a study's data. Grounded theory is a theoretical framework "in which the researcher attempts to derive a general, abstract theory of a process, action, or interaction grounded in the views of the participants in a study" (Creswell, 2003, p. 14). As the name implies, when a researcher uses grounded theory, they work from the ground up. A researcher approaches the study looking at a specific concept or phenomenon and constantly go back to the data to find emerging categories and themes. In the case of this study, the insights gleaned from the surveys of a large number of pre-service teachers were used to inform the in-depth

73

questions being posed to the smaller number of interview participants. When employing

grounded theory, analysis occurs as soon as the first data is collected, as that analysis

informs later observations and interviews (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). In other words, as

the data is collected it is coded. From these codes, the researcher develops themes that

run across the various data sources.

Syllabi Analysis

Four teacher educators, two from Middle Childhood Education, one from Physical

education, and one from Special Education, who believe they cover issues of diversity

and multicultural education in their coursework, provided a total six syllabi for analysis.

The qualitative research method of document analysis was used to analyze this portion of

the data corpus. Document analysis is a process that "involves skimming (superficial

examination), reading (thorough examination), and interpretation. This iterative process

combines elements of content analysis and thematic analysis" (Bowen, 2009, p. 32).

There are benefits and drawbacks to using document analysis as a part of a qualitative

study. The major advantage to this type of data source is that it is not influenced by the

context of the study. In the case of this study, instructors were creating their syllabi

regardless of the analysis. The downside to document analysis is that it is far more

inferential than other sources of qualitative data. Document analysis does not give a

complete picture, instead only provides a small window into part of what is being studied.

The document analysis was based on a number of criteria, including the course

title, description and objectives; the specific topics laid out for each class session and the

readings assigned for each week; as well as the class activities and assignments, when

provided. Unfortunately, the limited amount of syllabi collected, combined with a lack of

instructor interviews, resulted in this data being removed from the data corpus.

Survey Data Analysis

When all of the surveys had been collected, the information was entered into a

database. The database allowed the analysis of data in a number of ways, holistically,

individually, and by cohort.   First, each survey was reported holistically so that overall

trends and themes could be explored. Then, each of the open-ended survey questions and

Likert-style questions were reported by question, so that the responses to each question

could be analyzed together. The Likert-style questions were also reported by cohort, and

some of the analysis will focus on particular subsets of responses, for example the

education cohort, the age of the participant, etc.

Interview Data Analysis

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed within a week of the

interview. The interviews were then coded and analyzed. At this point, I began a

primary analysis of the data, looking at overall themes and categories within each

interview based on the predominant themes, phrases, and key terms. At the same time,

the interviews were sent to the research participants via email for a member check in an

attempt to verify the accuracy of the audio transcription. Once the member check was

received, the interviews were coded a second time in relationship to the research

question, and third time in relationship to the survey data.

Triangulation

The interviews, qualitative survey data and quantitative survey data were analyzed separately and also triangulated. Triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Glesne, 2005; Merriam, 2002a; D. Silverman, 2000) involves using multiple sources of data to investigate any given research question. "Methodological triangulation combines dissimilar methods such as interviews, observations, and physical evidence to study the same unit" (Merriam, 1988, p. 69). When using triangulation in qualitative research, the various sources of data are used to verify different sources and methods (Bowen, 2009; Hatch, 2002).

Theoretical Framework

There are many theoretical research frameworks a researcher can take when engaging in a research project. The framework of critical multiculturalism was used for this project. Critical multiculturalism is a theoretical framework that is based on the theoretical frameworks of multiculturalism, feminist theory and critical theory. There are several commonalities between these two frameworks, and this section will provide a brief overview of them and the ways in which they impact this research project.

As the name implies, feminist research includes a focus on gender inequalities with the goal of reversing them; understanding the ways that gender discrimination and equality is embedded in society and its institutions; acknowledging the political nature of research; being aware that knowledge and values are filtered through the knower and situated culturally, socially, and historically; and that there are multiple ways of knowing (Mertens, 2005). It is important to understand that there is not just one form of feminist

research. Feminist research can be broken down into sub-sections of thought, including

post-colonial feminist thought, global and transnational feminism, standpoint research,

lesbian research, disabled women, and women of color. Yet, regardless of the type of

feminist research, there are some commonalities in the actual approaches taken (Olsen,

2011). Olsen notes that feminist research takes into consideration the biases a researcher

may hold and bring to the research process. Feminist researchers are also concerned with

issues of reflexivity, the way the researcher and participants interact and impact one

other. A third concern of feminist researchers is that of voice, in that researchers need to

be aware of how they are using women's voices in their work, being careful not to distort

or exploit them. A final area Olsen addresses is the ethics of feminist qualitative

research. Feminist researchers are very concerned with issues of process consent.

Process consent can be addressed by conducting member checks throughout the research

process in which the researcher shows the participants the work they are doing to ensure

that they are being represented accurately.   A part of the feminist research ethos includes

the constant examination of the power relationships between the researcher and the

participants. While these power differentials exist between individuals, researchers need

to take care not the exploit them.

Critical research is based on the work of Paulo Freire (1970/2000). For Freire, the

people being studied were partners in the research process. Friere was very concerned

with the representation and potential exploitation of research participants. Kincheloe,

McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) discuss the basic assumptions underlying all types of

critical research: critical theorists understand that power relations are socially and

77

historically situated; research "facts" are connected to the values and ideologies of those studying/being studied; relationships between objects and people are always in flux, often connected to social, political and historical factors; certain groups in society are more privileged than others, and oppression is an attempt to keep some groups in a subservient position; there are all types of oppression (class, race, gender, etc.) and they are often interconnected; and common, mainstreamed research practices often reproduce the oppression, and critical researchers hope to avoid this.

Critical Multicultural Research Methods

There are several fundamental principles involved in doing this type of research. First, those who engage in critical multicultural research methods attempt to make marginalized voices more visible (McDowell & Fang, 2007). While the voices of those in this particular project are dominant voices, the issue that the project itself addresses belong to a group that is often oppressed. McDowell and Fang also discuss the importance of interrogating the politics of knowledge creation. Critical multiculturalism, much like critical and feminist theory, looks at who creates knowledge, what factors influence that knowledge creation, and the power relations involved in that knowledge creation and maintenance. Critical multicultural research approaches "acknowledge that who we are, how we narrate our experience, is inseparable from the multiple structural contexts that locate us in society" (McDowell & Fang, 2007, pp. 554–555). Another element of critical multicultural research is that the researcher take into consideration the culture and context of the participants of the study; a researcher applying this approach understands that the data is influenced both by social, political, and historical factors and

the cultural background of the participants. Additionally, the researcher maintains an awareness of his or her position as the researcher. As previously discussed, reflexivity is central to critical multicultural research; researchers remain aware that they impact the participants and vice versa. Finally, critical multicultural research employs various research methodologies. Regardless of the process being used, "research is seen as an exercise of freedom and mutual responsibility of empowerment between the researcher and the participants" (McDowell & Fang, 2007).

When discussing the use of a critical multicultural framework shaping the methods of a study, it is important to understand the power differentials at play. In terms of collecting data from the pre-service teachers, they were approached during one of their teacher education class sessions. Although I explained that they had the option to participate in both, one, or no parts of the study, it is possible that the time and place of the recruitment played a role in who did or did not participate. Each time, students were encouraged by their instructors to participate in the study. Additionally, the students understood that I was a doctoral student, and this difference in academic programs is also a way that power can come into play.

While critical multicultural methods were used as the theoretical framework shaping the collection of the data, grounded theory was the theoretical framework that shaped the ways in which the data was analyzed.

Summary Timeline of Study

Data collection began in July 2012 and continued through January 2013. Below is a summary timeline of the study. It should be noted that several emails were sent to

79

the instructors requesting syllabi and interview participants. Additionally, survey data

collection for Early and Middle Childhood Cohort 2 had to be rescheduled several times

due to changing commitments of the course instructor.

Table 5. Study Timeline

Month	Data Collection	Analyses
July 2012	Instructor Syllabus and Interview Request 1; Arrange Survey Data Collection	
August 2012	Instructor Syllabus and Interview Request 2 & Collection; Arrange Survey Data Collection, COHORT 4 Survey Data Collection	Document Analysis, Preliminary Analysis + Coding, Preliminary Writing
September 2012	Arrange Survey Data Collection; Instructor Syllabus Request 2 & Collection	Document Analysis, Preliminary Analysis + Coding, Preliminary Writing
October 2012	Arrange Student Survey Data	Preliminary Analysis + Coding, Preliminary Writing
November 2012	Student Survey Data; COHORT 3 Survey Data Collection; Cohort 1 Survey Data Collection	Preliminary Analysis + Coding, Preliminary Writing
December 2012	Cohort 2 Survey Data Collection; Amy Interview?; Sarah Interview?	Transcribe + Code, Preliminary Writing
January 2013	Tina Interview; Beth Interview 4	Transcribe + Code, Preliminary Writing, Preliminary Analysis
February 2013-August 2013		Data Analysis & Writing – Complete Analysis and Write the Dissertation

Limitations of the Study

While the potential benefits to this study are great, there are also some limitations that should be noted. The first set of limitations is due to the nature of qualitative research. Beginning with representation, the sample of instructors and pre-service teachers was drawn from a large Midwestern university and is not representative of all teacher education instructors or students nationwide. Further, while a larger number of students ($N = 69$) were surveyed, a much smaller number ($n = 4$) were interviewed. The stories of those four pre-service teachers may not be representative of the 65 others.

Another limitation of the study also involves the participants themselves. The original scope of the project sought to survey a far larger number of participants, but I did not have the access required to reach those larger cohorts. Adding to this challenge, I had anticipated receiving more syllabi than the six I did receive. Finally, no instructors volunteered to be interviewed. I attribute this to instructors' unwillingness to examine, especially with a graduate student, their teaching practices, coupled with an unwillingness to specifically talk about LGBTQ issues in the classroom, and instructor time constraints. The initial plan was to have two members of each cohort surveyed participate in interviews. As previously mentioned, there were four separate cohorts of pre-service teachers that were surveyed, but only two of those groups had volunteers for the interviews. The small number of pre-service teacher interview participants may be due to the either a lack of comfort in talking about LGBTQ issues or due to time

constraints. It should also be noted that there is often a discord between an individual's beliefs and actions. While the pre-service teachers and/or instructors may believe they advocate or are willing to advocate for LGBTQ individuals in their classrooms, they may not actually do so in practice.

I also acknowledge my position as a doctoral student and a researcher and the impact this may have had on my participants. First, my position as a student may have helped me to relate to the pre-service teachers, making them more willing to participate in the survey portion of the study. Second, I got married while collecting my dissertation data. I note this because I was introduced to the pre-service teachers as Cathy Rosenberg Brant, and it was explained that I was recently married. While it was not specified whether I had married a male or a female, the students may have assumed that I was engaged in a heterosexual relationship, and this may have influenced their willingness to participate. The pre-service teachers may have been more willing to participate in my study because they assumed that I was "like them," being white, middle class and heterosexual. Finally, three out of the four course instructors expressed to the pre-service teachers the importance of helping me by participating in my study. Although the pre-service teachers were told that they were not required to participate in the study, they may have been influenced by the presence of their instructors during the data collection process.

Writing & Ethical Representation

Throughout the entire research process, from the proposal to the publications, it was ensured that the study be conducted in an ethical manner. After initial approval from

the dissertation committee, research plans went under review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of my institution. The IRB process seeks to ensure that participants, particularly those that are vulnerable, are not at risk. Part of the IRB process includes acquiring informed consent from each of the research participants. The basic tenants of informed consent include: letting potential participants know that participation in the study is voluntary; informing potential participants of any potential harmful effects; and letting them know that they can stop participating in the study at any time they desire without any type of penalty (Creswell, 2003; Glesne, 2005). Once an individual agrees to participate in the study, there is a level of confidentiality/privacy that is expected. "Participants have a right to expect that when they give you permission to observe and interview, you will protect their confidences and preserve their anonymity" (Glesne, 2005, p. 138). Additionally, the research participants should not be concerned that what they might reveal during the course of the study could influence their grades or potential teaching licensure. All potentially identifying information was removed from the study and pseudonyms were used for the interview participants.

In additional to ethical procedural practices, it was important to me, as a researcher, that I was ethical in the way I represented my research participants in writing after the study was concluded. This is one of the reasons that member checking was so important. Member checks allowed me to ensure that I was accurate in my interpretation of what my interview participants were saying. I recognize that some of the research participants may not have been used to or comfortable discussing LGBTQ issues, especially in the context of schools and schooling.

If participants share views that I myself may view as undesirable or inappropriate, I must nevertheless consider how I interact with them in the data collection process and how they are being represented in my writing. This came up several times during the interview portions of my study. All of the interview participants reported not having biases against LGBTQ people, yet in the interviews they said things that could be interpreted as heterosexist, homophobic, or transphobic. I did not, however, attempt to bring it to their attention or correct them. This was intentional only in part, as I had a very limited relationship with these participants. If I were conducting another study in which I would have had a stronger rapport with my participants, I may have interrogated them further on these issues, which I will discuss more specifically in the next chapter of this dissertation. Although I may have disagreed with some of what my participants said in these contexts— and raise issue with some of their statements— I present what they said without personal judgment on them as individuals. I cannot let my own biases and preferences influence their representation.

I recognize that I come to this study from a place of privilege; I am White, upper-middle class, and heterosexual. These parts of my social identity, among others, impact the ways in which I interact with the world. Not coming from an LGBTQ background, I may do things throughout this study that those who identify at LGBTQ may find offensive, and I attempt to remain aware of this as I write up the findings of my study.

Chapter 4: Presentation of Findings
Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore pre-service teachers' conceptualizations of multicultural education; to examine the methodologies and pedagogies used by teacher educators to teach about diversity and multicultural education; and to explore the perceived effectiveness of teacher educators' various multicultural pedagogical and methodological choices. Additionally, I investigate the perceived self-efficacy of pre-service teachers to be advocates and allies for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning (LGBTQ) students and families in and out of the classroom. The goal of this research is to better understand the experiences of pre-service teachers in terms of their multicultural education, as well as to inform the practices of teacher educators when it comes to how they address issues of multicultural education and LGBTQ advocacy and ally work as a part of the teacher preparation program. The specific research questions that frame this study are as follows:

- How do pre-service teachers conceptualize multicultural education?

- Given these conceptualizations, how do pre-service teachers report that teacher educators in their teacher education programs addressed:

    - multicultural content;

    - issues of gender and gender non-conformity;

    - issues of sexuality.

- What sense of self-efficacy do pre-service teachers report related to:

  o working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning students and their families

  o teaching and discussing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer/questioning content and issues; and

  o identifying bias against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer/questioning people in school related materials and contexts?

Alignment of the research questions to the data sources and methods of analyses can be found in Table 1, located in Chapter 3 of this document. The answers to these questions will be used to formulate implications to improve the quality of the multicultural education of pre-service teachers. These implications can influence the classroom pedagogy and policy development that can make classrooms and schools equitable and safe spaces for students who identify as LGBTQ, those who are perceived to be LGBTQ by their peers, or those who come from LGBTQ families, as recent studies (GLSEN & Harris Interactive, 2012; Kosciw, Gretyak, Diaz & Bartiewicz, 2010) have shown that LGBTQ students face bullying, oppression and persecution from fellow students and teachers.

The participants in this study are from four different teacher preparation programs at the same large Midwestern institution. Two of the cohorts, Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, were graduate Master of Education programs with a mix of Early Childhood and Middle Childhood pre-service teachers. Theses degrees were offered as "tag" degrees, meaning

the students will graduate with a Masters degree in Education and will have completed the state requirements to be recommended for teacher licensure. The other two cohorts, Cohort 3 (Art Education) and Cohort 4 (Physical Education) were both undergraduate, teacher licensure programs. Sixty-nine (n=69) surveys were collected from these students. Four pre-service teachers, two from Early and Middle Childhood Cohort 1 and two from the Art Education Cohort, volunteered to be interviewed. A call for syllabi from courses in which the instructor addressed multicultural content was sent out across the university to all of the teacher education programs, but only six syllabi were submitted and therefore did not provide enough data for the purposes of this study.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the analyses of these various data sources: the interviews, the qualitative survey data, and the quantitative survey data. The analyses of these data sources were triangulated to draw connections and supporting or contesting results across the data sources when possible. Throughout this chapter, I connect my findings briefly to the existing literature on multicultural education, self-efficacy, and teacher education. The implications of this data and suggestions for future research will be presented in the final chapter of this dissertation.

The chapter is divided into two major portions. In each of these sections, I discuss the relevant data, the themes that emerge from that data, and how the literature supports this data or how the data fills a gap in the existing literature. First, I analyze the ways in which pre-service teachers understand multicultural education and the way they understand various terminologies related to LGBTQ people. The pre-service teachers in this study understand multicultural education as teachers' beliefs about teaching students,

87

which involves understanding student diversity and recognizing the need for equality in education. Additionally, the participants understand multicultural education as a specific teaching practice, including teaching about others, bias awareness and advocacy. The data also reveals that the pre-service teachers have a vast array of understandings about terms normally associated with LGBTQ populations. Secondly, I address the sense of self-efficacy the pre-service teachers have in regard to LGBTQ issues in education, working with LGBTQ students and families, teaching about LGBTQ content, and identifying biases against LGBTQ people in curriculum materials and school contexts.

What Do All of These Terms Mean?

Survey and interview data was used to examine the ways in which pre-service teachers understood multicultural education and key LGBTQ terms. These answers were solicited through the open-ended survey items (See Appendix A, Questions 6-11) and interview questions (See Appendix B). The participants were given a prompt such as "How do you understand the term (insert term)?" and were given several lines to write their answers. The first research question will be used to frame this section of this document: How do pre-service teachers conceptualize multicultural education? What issues of equity/social justice are included in these conceptualizations?

Understanding Multicultural Education

As discussed in Chapter Two, there is often a disconnect between teachers and their students because of racial and cultural differences (Feistrizer, Griffin, & Linnajarvi, 2011; Ingersoll & Merrill, 2012; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). In this study, the participants self-identified as 92% White (race), 65% female (gender), 87% heterosexual (sexuality),

89% from a Christian upbringing (Christian). In the qualitative portion of the survey, the

participants were asked explicitly how they understand diversity and/or multicultural

education in the classroom (See Appendix A, Question 6). Most survey responses fell

into two non-mutually exclusive themes: teacher's beliefs and teaching practices. Each of

the themes can be broken down further into various categories. Table 6 shows the

themes, the corresponding categories, as well as number of each type of response.

Table 6. Understanding MCE

Theme	Category	# of Responses
Teachers' Beliefs	*Understanding Student Diversity*	28
	Equity in Education	17
Teaching Practices	*Teaching About Others*	10
	Bias Awareness	5
	Advocacy	2
Negative Cases	*Other Response*	8
	No Response	4
	Resistant Response	2

It should be noted that there is an obvious connection between teachers' beliefs about

equity, diversity and multicultural education and the specific multicultural

methodological practices they engage in while in the classroom, so this section will

include discussion about the connections between those beliefs and practices.

  Teachers' beliefs. Because many pre-service teachers, upon the completion of

their teacher preparation programs, will be teaching in classrooms with students who

come from different cultural backgrounds, gender identifications, linguistic diversities,

racial, religious, sexual orientations, and social classes from themselves, it is important to understand how they understand multicultural education (Cochran-Smith 2003b, 204; Gay, 2002; Grant and Gibson, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 2000; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). Forty-five of the sixty-nine of the pre-service teachers (65%) identified a number of specific teacher beliefs that will impact what and how K-12 are taught in the classroom. The two categories within these attitudes and dispositions include the ways in which teachers understand student diversity and equality in education.

   Understanding student diversity. Forty-one percent (41%) of the participants (28 responses) responded through the surveys that multicultural education and diversity in the classroom was related to understanding that students come from different backgrounds and cultures, with different beliefs, and that teachers need to adapt their instruction to meet their needs. "Diversity and multicultural education is understanding and respecting all [people's] backgrounds and cultures" (Early and Middle Childhood Education Cohort 1, Survey 24, 111/27/12). Another participant reported that not knowing about a group of students' culture and religion impacted the assignment given to the class. "It is important to be very educated on the multiple cultures your students come from. I recently assigned a project for students to draw/shade an eye and had a lot of students [that] were Somali not do it due to religion" (Art Education Cohort, Survey 5, 11/14/12). Art Education Cohort Survey 5's response reveals that at least this pre-service teacher is beginning to understand the way that a student's religion and culture can impact the way in which they engage with school instruction and assignments, and that as a teacher she needs to be conscious and aware of potential issues before they arise as to not exclude or embarrass

90

those students. These pre-service teachers identified multicultural education as knowing and respecting students' diversity and understanding the ways that said diversity might impact the students in the classroom. These responses reflect an undeveloped understanding of multicultural education, and are similar to Grant and Sleeter's (2007a, 2007b) human relations approach to multicultural education.

Tina (pseudonym) acknowledges that there are different levels of multicultural education. She is quick to differentiate between a surface-level understanding of multicultural education in which a teacher knows where a student comes from or works to ensure their name is pronounced correctly, and a more in-depth understanding that acknowledges the ways that race, religion and culture impact those from various backgrounds differently. In the excerpt below, she recognizes that issues of multiculturalism can have an impact not only on what she teaches, but on how her students may respond to the assignment.

> **Tina**: I did a project with them where they had to take a picture of themselves and then they would put it into a negative so it was two-toned and they could make silhouettes. And something I didn't think about…when [non-White students with darker skin] would take their pictures and reverse them it would completely black out. And I was like, why didn't I think of this? (Tina Interview, 1/12/13)

After realizing the problem with her assignment, she expressed to her students that she had made a mistake not thinking "about the fact that not all of us are so light skinned" (Tina Interview, 1/12/13). That evening, Tina went home and conducted research online,

using contrast to experiment with the project until she found a way that all students could participate. She noted, however, that she was embarrassed that this had happened, and was upset that her students would possibly feel bad that they could not complete the assignment in its original form. Tina also acknowledged that, based on this experience, she planned to be more aware of potential issues like this in the future.

Four of the pre-service teachers reported that understanding pre-service teachers' conceptualizations of diversity and multicultural education goes beyond merely knowing what diversity entails, but viewing diversity as funds of knowledge (Gonzales, Moll, Tenery, Rivera, Rendon, Gonzales, & Amanti, 1995) that students bring to the classroom. These pre-service teachers describe diversity and multicultural education as "viewing diversity as 'funds of knowledge', not viewing students as disadvantaged but with another perspective" (Art Education Cohort, Survey, 7, 11/14/12) and that "[student] cultures need to be shared and used a tool when learning (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 5, 12/3/12). Funds of knowledge can be described as "those historically developed and accumulated strategies (skills, abilities, ideas, practices) or bodies of knowledge that are essential to a household's functioning and well-being (Gonzales et al., 1995, p. 446-7). The idea of funds of knowledge is unique and important to multicultural education as it acknowledges, validates, and values the cultural knowledge students bring from home to their classrooms. The idea of funds of knowledge counters the deficit perspective of minority students, in that rather than focusing on what the students lack, teachers focus on the wealth of cultural knowledge and understanding they bring to the classroom. Teachers who have a good understanding of their students' funds of

92

knowledge use it to drive and inform their instruction. Abullah (2010) found similar

results in that many of his research participants understood multicultural education as

Understanding and Building on Student's Background Knowledge.

The pre-service teachers' responses to the question "How do you understand

diversity and/or multicultural education in the classroom?" suggests that a majority of

these pre-service teachers understand multicultural education and diversity as knowing

the diverse backgrounds students bring to the classroom, the way that race, culture and

other identity characteristics can influence the way students interact with schools and

schooling, and the ways that students' cultural backgrounds can be seen as an asset they

bring with them to the classroom. These results are similar to Abdullah's (2010) study in

which a large number of pre-service teachers understood multicultural education as

Having and Teaching Diverse Students. These findings, from both this study and

Abullah's study, correspond to part of Villegas and Lucas' (2002) conceptualization of a

culturally responsive teacher (Gay, 2002, Ladson-Billings, 1995), someone who is able to

meet the needs of the diverse students in their classroom. These authors argue that

culturally responsive teachers need to have a sociocultural consciousness, an

understanding that way people think, act and behave are all influenced by their race,

class, and culture.

Equity in education. Seventeen (25%) provided responses were coded as falling

into the equality in education category. The idea of equality in education can be linked to

Grant and Sleeter's (2007a; 2007b) multicultural education approach, in which there is

classroom and school reform based on the ideas of pluralism and equality. In the case of

93

this study, pre-service teacher responses included language about educational equality or equal opportunity in education. "In the classroom, all students regardless of race, gender, etc. should be given the same opportunities" (Physical Education Cohort, Survey 1, 8/22/12). Similarly, a response from a member of Early and Middle Education Cohort 1 recognized that "whether it is culture, race, sexual orientation or economic background, students have the right to an education and it is our job as educators to provide the best education we can give" (Survey 7, 11/27/12). Art Education Cohort, Survey 2 responded that multicultural education is "an education that is for all learners. Lessons are not geared toward one group of students; they are easily adapted lessons that teach concepts to all learners" (11/14/12).

The category of equality in education is linked to Banks' (2004) dimension of engaging in equity pedagogy in the classroom. Teachers who ascribe to equity pedagogy believe that all students are entitled to the same quality of education, regardless of background. They use this belief to then adapt their teaching techniques and methods to ensure the success of students who come to the classroom with different cultural backgrounds, gender identifications, linguistic diversities, racial backgrounds, religious backgrounds, sexual orientations, and social classes than their own.

Teaching practices. Seventeen (25%) of the pre-service teachers provided responses that can be classified as dealing with specific multicultural education teaching practices. The themes that came up in this category include teaching about others who come from diverse backgrounds, advocating for students, and promoting bias awareness in the classroom. While these categories emerged from the data, most of the data,

94

especially the survey data, does not necessarily reveal specifics of what or how the pre-service teachers would accomplish this in their future classrooms. The interview data does, on the other hand, provide an opportunity to interrogate the participants in greater detail.

Teaching about others. Ten (14%) of the pre-service teachers reported that their conceptualizations of multicultural education and diversity involved methodological and pedagogical choices, or teaching students about people from other cultures and backgrounds. This ideology corresponds to the single group studies approach to multicultural education (See: Grant & Sleeter, 2007a; 2007b). This approach involves teaching about different groups of marginalized people, focusing on the study of each individual group one at a time. The survey participants noted specific pedagogical strategies, such as incorporating specific information about people from different cultures and backgrounds in the curriculum as part of classroom discussion. One participant stated, "[diversity/multicultural education] should be integrated into all subjects, especially literature" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 2, 12/3/12). However, while these participants discussed the general idea of teaching about other cultures, it is not clear from these conceptualizations what is specifically involved in the teaching of others.

Another set of participants took the idea of teaching about others a step further and included the idea of teaching about respecting and tolerating those who are different from themselves. Three survey participants from Early Childhood and Middle Education Cohort 1 discussed tolerance as a part of their conceptualizations of diversity and

multicultural education. "Diversity and multicultural education extends beyond the obvious. I believe that children need exposure to diversity and multiculturalism in order to become tolerant and positive members of society" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 1, Survey 16, 11/27/12). The use of the word tolerance fits within the human relations approach (See: Grant & Sleeter, 2007a; 2007b) of multicultural education, in which the goal is to help students learn to respect those different from themselves. While ideologically, teaching tolerance seems like a good idea, it can be problematic, a point Tina addressed in our interview.

Language in definitions. Tina, an Art Education Cohort student, problematized the use of the word tolerance. She argued that there is a difference in meaning between tolerating other people and accepting other people. She attributes this shift in her thinking to her teacher educator, Dr. Rose (pseudonym). Tina reported a specific incident in one of her classes with Dr. Rose. A fellow classmate stated the importance of teaching tolerance in schools and, in response, Dr. Rose pointed out the distinction between tolerating someone (just putting up with them) and accepting them (embracing them). This had a real effect on Tina and the way she herself hopes to address issues of diversity and equity in her future classroom.

> **Tina:** Words are powerful…When I think of tolerance if [people] go "I'm
> going to tolerate your behavior but I am not going to like it." That kind of
> thing. So I think the right vocabulary is going to be key if you're going to
> talking about tolerating somebody else's lifestyle. Be accepting of their

lifestyle because you wouldn't want someone else just tolerating your

existence (Tina Interview, 1/12/13).

Tina raised an interesting point that goes beyond Grant & Sleeter's (2007a; 2007b) human relations approach. She understands the potential detrimental effects of just "tolerating" another human being and their identity.

Tina also recognized the ways in which marginalizing language is embedded in everyday society.

> **Tina:** I didn't realize until maybe a year ago that gyped meant gypsy, like
>
> something was stolen from you. And I'm like, wow, I'm glad I didn't
>
> know any gypsies. That would have been really bad because I know a lot
>
> of Romanic people that that as like the "N" word. Good job society (Tina
>
> Interview, 1/12/13).

People in our society use words such as "gyped" so frequently that many are not even aware that such terms are offensive and marginalizing for certain groups of people. Tina's awareness of this allows her to be more open to further interrogations of language as it relates to diversity and multicultural education. Tina took a very important point away from Dr. Rose's class: teachers need to be aware of the language that they use around issues of diversity and multicultural education. Words that, on the surface, seem benign can actually be loaded with a great deal of meaning. This can have a dramatic effect on children; whether that effect is positive or negative depends on the language.

It is encouraging that Tina's experience in her teacher education program led her to understand the significance of language for various groups. At the same time, Tina

97

failed to recognize some of her own language that could be marginalizing for those who identify at LGBTQ. Throughout her interview, when speaking about LGBTQ people, she constantly used the terms sexual preference and lifestyle when referring to someone's sexual orientation. These terms are problematic as they imply that LGBTQ people have a choice when it comes to their gender and sexual orientation. But many LGBTQ people would argue that it is no more of a choice than it is for someone who is gender conforming or heterosexual. At these points in the interview, I would have liked to have stopped Tina and problematized her language with her. But because our interviews were limited to one session, I did not want to disrupt the rapport we were building.

The data regarding the teaching about others presented here is consistent with Banks' (1991, 1992, 2004) idea of content integration and Abdullah's (2010) discussion of multicultural education as curriculum and instruction. These understandings of multicultural education involve the inclusion of multicultural materials in their content areas in classes. These ideas of content integration involve the teaching about various cultures and their peoples, and can include the use of specific pedagogies, such as the use of multicultural literature during Social Studies or Language Arts lessons and presenting the accomplishments of various scientists of color. The goal of this multicultural strategy is two-fold. First, it can help boost the self-esteem of students from those groups because they see themselves represented positively in the curriculum. Secondly, it can help teach members of the dominant group both about the culture surrounding and the oppression of the marginalized groups.

Bias awareness. Participant responses also included language involving the ideas of anti-bias and bias awareness in teaching and learning. A member from the Physical Education Cohort described multicultural education as "ensuring that teaching, assessment, curriculum and behavior aren't biased toward or against children of diverse backgrounds" (Survey 13, 8/22/12). Another participant's response focused more generally on being aware of and prepared to combat biases that might arise in the classroom. She wrote that teachers needed to "be prepared to discuss or deflect each issues and create learning and understanding from this" (Art Education Cohort, Survey 18, 11/14/12). Nieto (1996) describes multicultural education as something that "challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers represent" (Nieto, 1996, p. 307). These responses reflect the idea that bias is embedded all over the school context— in the curriculum, with students, with teachers, and in policies. These pre-service teachers understand the need for being aware of these biases as they engage in the classroom. While the responses reflect the importance of recognizing the need for the bias awareness in schools, they do not indicate specific ideas or practices on how to do so, and it is unclear what biases they are specifically referring to. They could be referring to explicit racist, sexist and homophobic remarks coming directly from students, or to more subtle forms of bias in school contexts and in the curriculum.

These results are consistent with Abdullah's (2010) classification of responses into a category of fostering intercultural dispositions that is based, in part, on J. Banks'

99

(1991, 1992, 2004) idea that multicultural education involves prejudice reduction in the classroom. This classroom strategy is one in which teachers actively try to reduce the stereotypes and biases of their students in order to create a more democratic classroom and society. This strategy involves elements of teaching about the other in order to dispel myths and stereotypes about people from different races, cultures, religions, etc., and to both address the explicit bias as well as any bias that is more embedded in the curriculum, school and society.

Advocacy. Survey participants included ideas of advocacy and ally work into their conceptualizations of multicultural education. For one survey participant, diversity and multicultural education "means being an advocate for diversity and supporting student diversity as well as being aware of how multiculturalism can and will effect your classroom" (Art Education Cohort, Survey 16, 11/14/12). For another Art Education Cohort student, multicultural education means being "an advocate for students to take action to get to know each other rather than to marginalize each other" (Survey 17, 11/14/12). In the survey, participants were also asked about their status as advocates and allies. Nearly 82% of the respondents reported that, before their teacher education program, they identified as an advocate or ally for a group marginalized due to race, class, gender, sexual orientation or disability.

The pre-service teachers were also asked about their ability to advocate for specific marginalized populations in the classroom. Table 7, below, reflects the breakdown, by Cohort, for which marginalized groups the pre-service teachers identified as being able to serve as an advocate.

Table 7. Advocacy Ability

	Race	Class	Gender	Linguistic Diversity	Disability	Sexuality
Early and Middle Cohort 1	100%	86%	86%	71%	93%	57%
Early and Middle Cohort 2	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	60%
Art Education Cohort	83%	94%	94%	78%	94%	89%
Physical Education Cohort	100%	77%	100%	15%	85%	69%

These data supports the finding that pre-service teachers felt least able to advocate for English Language Learners and lesbian, gay, and bisexual students. While it is encouraging that the pre-service teachers felt that they could advocate for most students, the data is unclear on how exactly the survey participants understand advocacy and ally work.

All four of the interview participants were asked about this idea of advocacy and ally work as individuals and as teachers. Amy (pseudonym) was hesitant to use the words advocacy and ally work for her practices.

> **Amy:** I don't know if I would use such a strong word. I mean, I don't really carry any prejudices myself and I have friends that are gay and lesbians and things like that. I don't go to rallies, but I stick up for them if that's what you mean. But I don't have anything against them…and they're my friends (laughs) (Amy Interview, 1/14/13).

Amy's statement raises an interesting point, which ties back the earlier discussion about the significance of language. While Amy was willing to engage in practices that might be classified as ally or advocacy work in nature, she was unwilling to call it such. For Amy, advocacy or ally work, in itself, was not problematic, but calling it such was. Amy's statement raises other questions. Why was she so hesitant to use the term ally or advocacy? In several instances throughout the interview, Amy seemed uncomfortable talking about LGBTQ issues. It was often difficult to draw information from her. Amy was far more comfortable talking about issues of race or class than discussing gender and sexuality. Was she afraid of being labeled as homophobic or transphobic by saying the wrong thing? Was she afraid of actually being labeled as gay, lesbian or transgender?

When asked about her specific ally practices, Sarah explains "I haven't really done any work for it, but I try to. Just in my everyday life, I try to, when people talk about stereotypes or when people offend gay people, I just make sure I stand up for them" (Sarah Interview, 12/18/12). For example, Sarah discussed that she comes from a small rural community and that her parents are very conservative. She mentioned that several times she has confronted her parents when they have shown biased or stereotypical views of people, particularly of gays and lesbians. Sarah's experiences living with lesbian roommates have broadened her understanding of the need for LGBTQ advocacy and ally work. While Sarah noted that her specific ally and advocacy work was limited, she has participated in activities on campus as a part of the school's ally week. She recounted one ally week activity in particular. Participants were asked to complete the statement "I am an ally because…" The responses were posted publically on campus.

Both Amy and Sarah link most of their ideas around advocacy and ally work to standing up for LGBTQ individuals when they are being wronged or by showing public support for them. Similarly, Tina discussed her thoughts about engaging in ally and advocacy work, especially in regards to publically supporting LGBTQ individuals. Prior to her teacher education program, she said that she thought of herself as an ally mostly in ideology. Tina did say that she intends to have an ally sticker in her classroom window when she gets a full time job. She felt that this is important because she wants to let students know that they are safe when they are with her.

These three interview participants reflect a desire to engage in advocacy and ally work in their everyday lives and in their future classroom, yet indicate some hesitancy in doing so. This hesitancy leads to questions as to whether or not they will feel confident enough and be able to actually able to engage in such practices when they complete their teacher education programs and begin their careers in their own classrooms.

It appears that these interview participants do not actually engage in ally work. Instead, they engage in anti-work. Clark (2010b) distinguishes between the two. "Anti-work serves, primarily to interrupt racist, heterosexist and homophobic discourses...[and] ally-work invites critical dialogue and discussion, interrogating perceived lines of difference and inquiring into the possibilities for creating productive alliances across these lines" (p. 705). In other words, the interview participants engaged in work that interrupts heterosexist, homophobic and transphobic discourses as they arise in school contexts, but do not go beyond that to question and combat the structural inequities that keep these inequities in existence in schools.

103

Additionally, teacher education programs, in an attempt to create culturally responsive teachers, can help teachers develop the commitment and skills to act as agents of change. "Teachers need to believe that schools can be sites for social transformation even as they recognize that schools have typically served to maintain social inequalities" (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 24). The idea of advocacy goes beyond that of bias-awareness in that there is an action component that seeks to eradicate the inequities that exist in the classroom, school or society.

Negative case analysis. Several survey responses were not consistent with the emergent themes and categories and did not occur frequently enough to be classified into their own theme or category. For example, one participant responded that she understands multicultural education "to be something that should be practiced as a part of education as a whole and not marginalized as a separate entity" (Art Education Cohort, Survey 15, 11/14/12). Another stated that they understood diversity "through the experiences and personalities of my students through their eyes and experiences" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 4 12/3/132). The first response recognizes some of the flaws of addressing multicultural education as the single group studies (Grant & Sleeter, 2007a; 2007b) and something deeper along the lines of multicultural education(Grant & Sleeter, 2007a; 2007b). The second response indicates a preliminary understanding of funds of knowledge. The analyses of these responses in particular, however, are limited, because without an interview to inquire into the participants' thought processes, only speculations can be made.

In addition, four respondents did not provide answers to the question as to how they understand multicultural education and/or diversity. Two were left blank, one stated that it was too broad of a question and the other responded concisely "diversity is different to everyone" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 3, 12/3/12). While it is difficult to identify the exact reasons for these responses— or lack of responses— without interviews, one possibility is the idea of resistance to multicultural education, as discussed in Chapter 2. Many pre-service teachers are uncomfortable discussing issues around diversity and equity, so rather than responding with the wrong answer, they respond with no answer (Mazzei, 2007). Another reason for the resistance could be due to the nature of the data collection process. The pre-service teachers were approached during one of their teacher education programs. Although they were informed that there would be no negative repercussions from their teacher educators for not participating in the study, the instructors were still in the room while the survey was being completed. Leaving answers blank or being curt may have been a way for them to attempt to resist the process, especially if they felt that they were not able to decline participation in the study. Finally, this may also be due to the pre-service teachers' lack of comfort or lack of experience in discussing these issues, especially with someone like myself whom they do not know and trust. Beth (pseudonym), a member of Early and Middle Childhood Education 1, recalled her experience while taking the survey:

> **Beth:** I remember at the time I was dating someone who was also in the
> program. And he is, just so sheltered and country. And so I remember
> looking over and he had his brow furrowed (laughs). He had no idea what

half of these terms are…It's just another realm for those the people who

live around Medford. Not an accepting thing even to talk about, let alone

be (Beth Interview, 1/9/13).

Beth explained that members of her class had expressed discomfort in their

literacy and multicultural education classes when discussing issues of gender and

sexual orientation. Many of them had acknowledged that they had not previously

read about or discussed these topics in a university classroom setting.

In addition to exploring pre-service teachers' understanding of

multicultural education, the study provides some valuable information as to how

the pre-service teachers understand various terms in relationship to gender

expression, gender identity and sexual orientation.

Understanding LGBTQ

In the survey, participants were asked explicitly how they understand the terms

sexual orientation, gender expression, gender non-conforming, transgender and queer

(See Appendix A: Questions 7-11). It is important to understand these terms, as students

or their families might use them to describe themselves. Across the literature, there are

several definitions for most of these terms. Whenever possible, I have cited one of the

definitions that frame my conceptualizations of these terms and that I used when crafting

the survey questions for this study. While it may appear too easy to classify someone

based on these definitions, it is important to understand that much of identity has to do

with how a person chooses to self-identify. It is not the job of teachers, researchers,

friends, or family to make this identification for them. The analysis of this data could be

its own study in itself, but I will briefly highlight the main themes and categories that were carried across the data.

How pre-service teachers understand the term sexual orientation. When the pre-service teachers were asked how they understood the term sexual orientation (See Appendix A, Question 7), the participants had varied responses; Table 8 shows the breakdown of these responses.

Table 8. Sexual Orientation Definition

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
Sexual Attraction or Sexual Preference	46	67%
Categories of Sexual Orientation	12	26%
Uncategorizable Responses	11	16%

46 of the respondents (67%) provided answers that dealt with the sexual attraction preference or attraction. Out of those responses, 26 (57%) provided responses that were general about sexual preference or attraction. Twelve (26%) responses were categorized as defining sexual orientation as sexual preference or attraction based on gender. Six (13%) responses specifically provided a definition of sexual orientation that involved sexual preference or attraction based on sex. The remaining two (4%) responses defined sexual orientation as sexual preference or attraction based on both sex and gender. These distinctions are interesting when considering the differentiation of sex as biological construct and gender as a social construct. This differentiation is important to understand

because an individual's biological sex includes not only physical body parts, but also hormones. Ideas of gender, on the other hand, being socially constructed, can change as society continues to change. For example, it was not long ago where women were not allowed to wear pants or be doctors, lawyers or professors. American society's rules about what is appropriate have changed over time. It is unclear whether or not the pre-service teachers study makes such a distinction. As far as it can be seen, at least these final two (4%) participants do.

Out of the total 69 survey responses, 12 (26%) defined sexual orientation in terms of the categories or classification of sexual orientation. Table 9 shows the breakdown of these responses.

Table 9. Sexual Orientation as Categories

Type of Response	Number of responses	Heterosexual and homosexual categories	Homosexual categories only
Sexual orientation as categories	12		
Sexual preference or attraction & sexual orientation categories	5	3	2
Categories of sexual orientation only	7	4	3

Five of these responses described sexual orientation in terms of sexual preference or attraction, but also included specific sexual orientation categories. Three of these five responses refer specifically to both heterosexual and homosexual orientations. For

example, one participant responded that "sexual orientation refers to the range of preferences can have in partners-be it straight, gay, bi (and everything in-between, asexual, pansexual, etc." (Art Education Cohort, Survey 12 11/14/12). The other two mention only non-heterosexual sexual orientations such as, "Your sexual preference-gay, lesbian, bisexual, asexual, pansexual" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 1, Survey 1, 11/27/12). It cannot be determined whether or not these two responses reflect thinking about sexual orientation as only being reserved for non-heterosexuals, or whether it was unintentionally left off their lists. Seven responses (64%) only provided categories of sexual orientation without any further definition of explanation. Four of these included the whole spectrum of sexuality including gay, straight and bisexual. The other three referred only to non-heterosexual orientations and identities. This is interesting in that these participants suggest that the term "sexual orientation" only refers to non-heterosexual orientations. The remaining responses to this question could not be easily categorized in relationship to this study. It is important to problematize, again, the language used by the participants in this selection of the data. As previously mentioned, the term sexual preference is problematic because it implies that sexual orientation is a choice.

How pre-service teachers understand the term transgender. Question 8 (See Appendix A) asked the participants to explain how they understand the term transgender. Table 10 gives an overview as to how the participants responded to this question.

Table 10. Transgender Definition

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
Disconnect between sex and gender	27	39%
The use of surgery to change one's body	10	14%
Being both male and female	8	12%
Negative case response	4	6%
Having to do with sexuality	2	3%

The largest number of participants, 27 (39%), gave responses that reflected a disconnect between someone's biological sex and their gender. Sex is a term that is biological in nature and includes physical attributes such as sex chromosomes, sex hormones, internal reproductive structures, and external genitalia. Gender, on the other hand, is more complicated and includes far more than an individual's biological makeup. The idea of gender includes societal expectations based on a person's biological sex. Several respondents, 8 (12%), responded that transgender meant that someone is or wants to be both male and female. One respondent (Early and Middle Education Cohort 1, Survey 25) gave no response to the question. Another survey participant (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 5) responded, "I don't." Since no one from these two cohorts was interviewed, it is unclear to draw conclusion about whether or not this response was due to lack of knowledge or to resistance to the topic.

How pre-service teachers understand the term gender expression. When the pre-service teachers were asked about their understanding of gender expression (Appendix A, Question 11), the findings were relatively consistent. Table 11 presents the findings from this question.

Table 11. Gender Expression Definition

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
How individuals conform to and act to societal gender expectations and roles	52	75%
No answer	4	8%
I don't know	4	8%
Gender Identification	2	3%
Uncategorizable Responses	7	10%

Three-quarters (75%) of those surveyed responded that gender expression had to do with how individuals conform to societal gender expectations and roles. Responses ranged from a more general response on how someone chooses to express their gender to more specific examples, such as the way an individual "chooses to act, dress, play, walk, speak, etc., based on their gender" (Physical Education Cohort, Survey 13, 8/22/12). This response is congruent with the definition provided by GLSEN (n.d.), "The manner in which a person represents or expresses gender to others, often through behavior, clothing hairstyles, activities, voice or mannerisms" (p.4).

The remaining responses varied. Four participants (6%) provided no answer. This response may be an act of resistance against the survey. It could also be due to a lack of knowledge about what gender expression means, or an inability to transform their ideas about gender expression into words. One responded with, "I don't." This response is also interesting in that it is unclear what the pre-service teacher's intention was. "I don't" could be a literal response to how they understand the term. It could also be an act of

resistance, meaning that they do not even think about the idea of gender expression. Four others (6%) indicated that they did not know. Two responses (3%) thought that gender expression involved gender identification. While gender identification is "a person's deeply held sense of psychological knowledge of their own gender. One's gender identity can be the same or different than the gender assigned at birth" (GSLEN, n.d., p. 4). In short, one's gender identification does not always result in how they choose to express it.

How pre-service teachers understand the term gender non-conformity.
There was far less consistency regarding the participants understanding of gender non-conformity.

Table 12. Gender Non-Conformity Definitions

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
Person does not fit society's gender stereotypes	38	55%
Person does not identify as either male or female	14	20%
No answer	11	16%
Uncategorizable Response	5	7%
Openly Resistant Response	1	<1%

Gender non-conformity can be defined as "a term for people whose gender expression differs from stereotypical expectations, such as 'feminine' boys, 'masculine' girls and those who are perceived as androgynous. This includes people who identify outside traditional gender categories or identity as both genders" (GLSEN, n.d., p. 4). A majority

112

(55%) of the respondents provided responses that indicated that a person who was gender-nonconforming did not fit society's gender stereotypes. "When someone chooses to dress, act, speak participate in, etc. in ways that [do not] conform to what society has deemed the 'norm' for their gender" (Physical Education Cohort, Survey 13, 8/22/12). A large number of participants (20%) described gender non-conforming individual as someone who does not identify as either the male or female gender. It is unclear whether these responses indicate the perception that this lack of gender identification is due individual's choosing to be gender non-specific, or whether it is due to a conflict within the individual. For example, one participant stated that gender non-conformity means someone "who has trouble identifying with either gender, but is not transgender" (Art Education, Survey 11, 11/14/12).

Eleven respondents (16%) either left the space blank on the survey or indicated being unsure or not knowing that the term meant. One participant openly showed resistance to this question. This individual, who provided no demographic information, responded, "This term makes no sense and should not even be a term. Man and woman are the only genders" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 1, Survey 5, 11/27/13). This response indicates a very traditional understanding of the concept of gender. Although it is difficult to read tone in a written response as short as this one, it is evident that this participant does not approve of the term and attempts to counter it in the response.

The participants indicated that issues of gender non-conformity were addressed in their teacher education programs, in either their coursework or their field placements. In her interview, Beth explained that transgender students were brought up in her adolescent

113

literature course. Similarly, Tina indicated the use of a documentary of a ten-year-old

transgender boy going through the gender transition to female. Sarah recounted her

experience with gender non-conforming students in her field placements. In these

experiences, she worked with students who did not fit stereotypical gender norms, mainly

in the ways they dress and spoke.

> **Sarah:** There was one that I thought was a girl, but then found out it was a
>
> boy. Not much else was brought up about it. She was, you know, the way
>
> they were. The teacher didn't have a problem with it. I don't think there
>
> was any lessons that they did specifically about any of that because they
>
> were in elementary school" (Sarah Interview, Field notes, 12/18/12).

Sarah admits that she did not receive any instruction around issues of gender in this

placement. This does not mean that it did not go on; it may have just occurred when

Sarah was not in the school.

> *Gender non-conformity and transgender: A distinction.* While it may appear, at

first glance, that transgender and gender non-conformity are terms that can be used

interchangeably, they cannot. It is important to examine how the pre-service teachers

understand these terms for a number of reasons. Based on the statistics presented in the

first chapter of this dissertation, it is inevitable that, during their careers, teachers will

come into contact with either students who identify as LGBTQ or students who come

from LGBTQ families. The data presented in this section shows that there is great

disparity among the survey participants about their understanding of sexual orientation

and transgender. This disparity leads to greater questions about these pre-service

teachers' ability to work with and to meet the needs of LGBTQ students in their classrooms. Further, these definitions and perceptions raise some questions about the self-efficacy data I am about to present. Can pre-service teachers really have a strong sense of self-efficacy about working with or working for LGBTQ students and families if they have inaccurate understandings of LGBTQ people?

The data presented in this section suggests that there are a number of ways that the pre-service teachers studied understand the ideas of multicultural education. Their responses can be divided into non-mutually exclusive categories that involve teachers' beliefs about students and their diversity and the ways in which teachers address multicultural content in the classroom. Even within Cohorts who took the same courses, the definitions vary greatly. Cohort 2, the largest Cohort of students surveyed with 28 surveys, contained a huge range of responses that involved understanding differences, teaching children about diversity, and issues of equality. Just as the definitions of multicultural education across the literature vary, so do teacher educators' understanding of and implementation of them. The pre-service teachers' understanding of this topic may indicate the ways in which they might engage in multicultural practices in their future classrooms. While not all of the pre-service teachers' conceptualizations come from their multicultural teacher education, it does help to examine the specific topics, strategies and practices they experienced as a part of their teacher preparation programs.

LGBTQ Methods

The participants discussed a number of methodologies used by their teacher educators to address LGBTQ issues in the teacher preparation programs. The most

common response was that of readings and class discussions. Participants cited having to read academic articles, course textbooks, case studies, and children's/adolescent literature. Both Tina and Sarah recounted the positive experiences they had using a specific textbook in their diversity course.

> **Sarah:** We had this book. I can't remember the name of the book, but it was really good. They were all short chapters, but they were all different issues of diversity that someone had to deal with, from their point of view (Sarah Interview, Fieldnotes, 12/18/12).

Sarah and Tina reported that the textbook presented stories and perspectives from the marginalized population represented in that chapter.

Six participants reported the use of multicultural literature as a part of their multicultural education about sexual orientation, gender expression and gender non-conformity. Children's and adolescent literature can be used in a number of ways to address issues relevant to LGBTQ students and their families. Literature can be used as early as early childhood education to address when students are being teased or hear mean comments based on alternative family structures (Rowell, 2007). For middle and high school students, LGBTQ characters in the literature that they read can go beyond giving students characters to relate to. It can be transformative in the ways it can help students become allies against the homophobia and transphobia (fear of transsexuals or transgender individuals) they encounter in their lives (Blackburn, 2010).

In her interview, Beth talked about the use of adolescent literature to address LGBTQ issues. She discussed that for one week of the class, the pre-service teachers

116

were broken into smaller groups and each group was given a young adult novel that addressed sexuality or gender identity. "So we talked about that and how you would address that if you thought the students wanted to explore that further" (Beth Interview, 1/9/13). Beth had to read the book Parrotfish (Wittlinger, 2007).

Memorable Methodology and Pedagogy

This research project was designed to examine the types of multicultural education instruction pre-service teachers received as a part of their teacher education programs. In addition to what was taught and how it was taught, the goal was to understand what the pre-service teachers learned from this instruction and what they perceived as having an impact on them (Research Question 2). It is evident from the various data sources that all of the research participants took away something related to issues of multicultural education, equity or diversity from their teacher education programs. For some, it was through their courses that were designed specifically to address this content. For others, it was through coursework in which multicultural content was integrated. Regardless of the source, all four of the pre-service teachers who were interviewed were able to identify practices that they found effective or transformative in terms of their thinking, as well as identify practices that they felt did not expand their thinking or that further perpetuated stereotypes of traditionally marginalized populations.

Amy and Beth, both members of Cohort 1, Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education, recalled specific practices in their diversity course as a part of their teacher education program that seemed to marginalize populations further and were thus

117

not effective in terms of their understanding of diversity and multicultural education. Beth even went as far as to call some of the practices racist.

> **Beth:** She would give us ideas of certain things but they were just so
> stereotypical. Like, Black History Month. Oh, you have to do a lesson
> about Martin Luther King, Jr., and you need to teach it this way. And you
> show the difference between blacks and whites…I was floored at some of
> the things she was saying. She tried but it was such a close-minded
> approach to diversity (Beth Interview, Fieldnotes, 1/9/13).

Similarly, Amy spoke of other practices that she felt marginalized students. She said she remembered a class activity in which groups of students were given a doll and were asked to fill out student paperwork based on the physical attributes of the doll. "To me, that wasn't really realistic because you can't judge somebody by how they look. Like, as far as, just because they are a Mexican it doesn't mean they don't speak English" (Amy Interview, 1/14/13). It is important to note here that there is no way to really know what went on during these class periods, as I was not provided with either the syllabi or the opportunity to interview the course instructor. But regardless of the intention of the instructor for the Cohort 1 Diversity Course, Amy and Beth both found it to be a very negative experience. Experiences such as these do not provide pre-service teachers with the skills they need to be effective multicultural educators, and could even possibly lead pre-service teachers to enact similar problematic practices in their own classrooms.

The perceived experiences of Amy and Beth stand in stark contrast to those of Tina and Sarah. Tina and Sarah, both members of the Art Education Teacher Education

118

Cohort, spoke positively of their experiences with Dr. Rose in their diversity class. Specifically, Tina spoke of how effective an instructor Dr. Rose was. Part of that effectiveness was due to the way she dealt with the pre-service teachers in her classroom.

> **Tina:** And she always had another point of view that would make you look at a situation from a different standpoint.
>
> **Cathy:** Like helping students reframe their thinking?
>
> **Tina:** Yeah, reframing your thinking. Maybe just broadening your thinking….I don't think there was ever a fight in that classroom, verbally, because she was a good facilitator. (Tina Interview, 1/12/13).

Throughout the interview, Tina discussed the impact that Dr. Rose had had on her, not just because of the content she addressed in the class, but because of the way that she addressed it. She really appreciated Dr. Rose's no-nonsense approach to teaching about issues of equity, social justice and multicultural education. Tina credits this to the fact that Dr. Rose was willing to share her personal experiences with diversity in addition to her academic work in that area.

The goal here is not to laud Tina and Sarah's instructor and to demonize Beth and Amy's, or to say that the use of children's and adolescent literature is the only way to address multicultural education in the teacher education program. Instead, it is important to recognize the ways that the experiences of the research participants can inform the practices of future educators. The pre-service teachers seemed to really connect with the methodologies and pedagogies of those teacher educators that they interpreted as being passionate and knowledgeable about the multicultural content. What makes Dr. Rose

119

appear to stand out is her commitment to equity and multicultural education, not only in what she teaches but how she teaches it.

Other studies have been conducted which have shown a variety of methods and multicultural ideologies being employed in multicultural teacher education courses. Gorski (2010) conducted an analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework. He summarized the findings of his study into three main forms of multicultural teacher education: conservative, liberal and critical. These approaches range from preparing teachers to teach minority students in a way that assimilates them into mainstream culture to helping teachers engage in critical work which examines power and oppression in schools and society, helping them view themselves as agents of change. These delineations are very similar to Grant and Sleeter's (2007a, 2007b) approaches to teaching students in the classroom. The results from this study expand upon the work of Gorski to take into consideration the experiences and feelings of the pre-service teachers as they engaged in these coursework. These experiences have had a lasting impressions on the pre-service teachers in terms of their views about the importance of multicultural education, as well as about specific multicultural education practices they can or may employ in their future classrooms.

In this section, I addressed the data as it relates to Research Question 2: What methods do teacher educator's employ in multicultural aspects of the teacher education program? To what degree are issues of gender and sexuality included in multicultural instruction? What methods, strategies, and content employed by teacher educators do pre-service teachers find effective and/or useful in their future career? Teacher educators

employ a variety of methods when they are addressing multicultural education and LGBTQ content in the teacher preparation program. The pre-service teachers interviewed reported varying levels of effectiveness in these methods, citing both practices that seemed to trivialize issues of diversity as well as practices that exemplified the kind of multicultural education they themselves strive to implement in the future. These findings are important because how and what pre-service teachers are taught about multicultural education can and will impact how they understand multicultural education, how they enact multicultural pedagogies in their own classrooms, and how strong their own sense of self-efficacy will be in addressing multicultural pedagogy. In the next section, I will discuss the ways which the pre-service teachers understand various issues of multicultural education.

Pre-Service Teacher Perceived Self-Efficacy

The pre-service teachers were asked about their sense of self-efficacy in two places in the survey. First (See Appendix A, Question 5), they were asked to circle the names of the various groups that they felt they could advocate for in the classroom. Sixty-four of the total participants (93%) reported being able to advocate for students based on their gender. However, this result does not indicate whether this is in reference to the binary form (male/female) idea of gender, or whether it refers to transgender or gender non-conforming students. Overall, 47 (68%) reported being able to advocate for students based on their sexual orientation. The Likert scale items at the end of the survey help explore these ideas further.

121

Based on the work of others in the realm of self-efficacy and, more specifically, multicultural self-efficacy (Silverman, S.K., 2010; Siwatu, 2011), a Likert-scale instrument was created to attempt to understand pre-service teachers perceived sense of self-efficacy in various areas in regard to teaching about and for LGBTQ people in their classrooms (See Appendix A, Section C). The participants were provided fourteen statements in which they had to respond using the following instructions and key: To the best of your knowledge, self-assess your ability to do the various items listed below. On the line provided, use the key to write the letter of the response which best fits your self-assessment. Key:

- A=I do not believe I could this very well;

- B=I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be very difficult for me;

- C=I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare;

- D=I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.

The statements in this section were divided into three major sections: working with students and families; the implementation and development of instructional materials and activity; and the identification of bias in instructional materials and contexts.

One participant from Cohort 4 (Physical Education) did not have his/her responses included in this analysis because rather than selecting one response per statement as per the instructions, this respondent gave answers such as A/B or C/D. Since it is unclear from this response precisely what the participant was thinking, it was removed from analysis. Similarly, three responses to statements from the Cohort 2, Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education, were not included because the responses

122

were unclear. One was C-B, and while the other two were C, they had a question mark after them. These two respondents raise an interesting point. Respondents may have found it difficult to select the one statement that fit best. This may be due to the way the statements were written, it may be attributed to the respondents being unsure as to their level of self-efficacy in regards to those statements, or some combination of the two. Regardless, without interviewing these participants and being able to follow-up with them, the answer will remain unclear, which is why I made the decision to remove those responses from analysis. The presentation of the remaining responses from this section of the survey will be supplemented by the other data sources, primarily the interviews and syllabus analyses. Additionally, the data will be examined holistically as well, and more specifically by Cohort. The work around these ideas of self-efficacy in working with and for LGBTQ students and families is groundbreaking in that, while there are studies that address pre-service teachers' attitudes about LGBTQ people, studies that address general multicultural self-efficacy (Silverman, 2010), and studies that address self-efficacy in working with various marginalized groups (Siwatu, 2011), there are none that investigate pre-service teacher's self-efficacy in this specific niche of multicultural education.

Working With and For LGBTQ Students and Families.

The survey participants reported a strong sense of self-efficacy in working with gay (G), lesbian (L), bisexual (B), transgender (T), queer (Q) and gender non-conforming (GNC) students and parents using the following key:

- A=I do not believe I could this very well;
- B=I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be very difficult for me;

123

- C=I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare;

- D=I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.

In fact, for the four questions that addressed these issues, 83% or more responded that they believe that they could do this reasonably well, if they had time to prepare, or that they were quite confident that this would be easy for them to do. The breakdowns for the individual questions are as follows:

Table 13. Working with LGBTQ People Self-Efficacy

I can work with…	A	B	C	D
LGB Students.	3%	9%	19%	69%
GNC, T, or Q Students,	1%	15%	28%	56%
LGB Parents.	3%	3%	25%	69%
GNC, T, or Q parents.	3%	7%	31%	59%

The responses from the interview participants echo the results of the survey. In her interview, Sarah expressed a degree of confidence in working with LGBTQ students and parents. Similarly, Tina felt that she could create a "safe" space in and around her classroom for LGBT students. When she has her own classroom, she intends to have an

ally sticker on her classroom door. Tina also expressed the importance of being vocal about her support for these students.

> **Tina:** I think it's going to be important for when I'm a teacher to make it
> known that, whether it be a sign on my door or publically being, "Hey,
> I'm cool. You can come hang out with me. I'm going to make sure you
> feel safe. Nothing's going to happen to you" (Tina Interview, 1/12/13).

For Tina, she wants her students, especially those who exist on the margins of school and society, to be free to be who they are in her classroom.

Interestingly, while the pre-service teachers in both the Early and Middle Childhood Cohorts and the Art Education Cohort reported a great degree of confidence, Answer D (I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do), for 60% of the participants or more, the Physical Education Cohort, showed dramatically different results. When it comes to working with lesbian, gay and bisexual students, only five (42%) reported being extremely confident. Another three (33%) reported being able to work with them if given time to prepare, and two (17%) reported a belief that they would not be able to do this well. It is interesting to think about why there is such a discrepancy between the Physical Education Cohort and the other three cohorts. In the Physical Education Cohort, all participants did receive instruction around issues of gender, but without the opportunity to interview any of them, it is unclear whether or not the instruction was about students who may identify as queer or exhibit gender non-conforming traits, or solely about the difference in gender between male and female

students. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the Physical Education Cohort reported receiving instruction about sexual orientation in their teacher education program.

Development of Instructional Materials and Activities

The pre-service teachers were also asked about their self-efficacy in regards to their ability to plan instructional activities that reduce prejudice and dispel myths about LGBTQ people. The table below reflects the results of these questions using the aforementioned key:

- A=I do not believe I could this very well;

- B=I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be very difficult for me;

- C=I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare;

- D=I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.

Overall, the pre-service teachers reported a sense of self-efficacy in doing these things reasonably well with the proper time to prepare.

Table 14. Developing Instructional Materials Self-Efficacy

	A	B	C	D
I can….				
Plan instructional activities to reduce prejudice about LGB people in my current or future classroom	6%	16%	47%	31%
Plan instructional activities to reduce prejudice about GNC, T or Q people in my current of future classroom.	6%	15%	46%	34%
Develop instructional materials that dispel myths about LGB people.	7%	16%	53%	24%
Develop instructional materials that dispel myths about GNC, T or Q people.	4%	28%	46%	22%

While most of the responses in this area involve being able to succeed only if given time to prepare, this should not be viewed as negative. I argue that when addressing any multicultural issue in the classroom, teachers should allow for a considerable amount of time preparing to do so. It comes as no surprise that these novice teachers feel that they would need time to be prepared to teach this type of content in their classrooms.

The Physical Education Cohort reported a more centralized sense of self-efficacy. While for these questions they had fewer responses at the extremes (being quite confident and not believing they could do it well), a majority of their responses (over 80%) were clustered around being able to do it, but it being difficult, and being able to do it given adequate time to prepare. This may be attributed to the content they are teaching. It is much more challenging to present content around gender and sexual orientation in a physical education classroom than it would be in a traditional K-12 classroom. At the

127

institution where this study was implemented, physical education teacher certification does not include health education, as it does at many other institutions. It is important not to fault these pre-service teachers for this lack of self-efficacy, but rather to concentrate on ways we might increase it.

In contrast, Early and Middle Education Cohort 2 reported an abnormally high sense of self-efficacy in developing instructional activities that reduce prejudice and dispel myths of LGBQ, gender-nonconforming and transgender people. Sixty percent (60%) of this cohort agreed with the statement "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" for LGB people, and 50% agreed with it for gender non-conforming, transgender or queer people. Four these four statements, no one in this cohort reported an inability to do this well. This raises questions as to what has attributed to this cohort's greater sense of self-efficacy. Possibly, this could be attributed to instruction they received in this domain. One participant discussed an assignment they were given as a part of the diversity class. "We also had to have a real life experience. We went to a drag queen pageant. It was an awesome experience" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 6, 12/6/12). It might also be attributed to the fact that they have greater experience with LGBTQ people, since two members of this cohort self-identified as gay males. There may be other factors that brought about this higher sense of self-efficacy, but there is not any further data to identify them.

Several respondents indicated a conflict between their desire to include this type of material in the curriculum and actually be able to do. "I foresee difficulty in parent perceptions and viewpoints for doing this, but I could do it" (Early and Middle Education

Cohort 1, Survey 2, 11/27/12). "I can only provide students with lessons that the school will let me. I see some schools having no tolerance for lessons about race, gender, religion or sexual orientation" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 2, Survey 10, 12/6/12). Beth expressed a similar sentiment. "Even though I do feel strongly about this issue, I don't know that I would risk a job over [not being able to teach about these issues there] I think that I would be looking for other jobs" (Beth Interview, 1/9/13). These responses reflect a societal view that schools are not the place to address issues of sexuality and gender, particularly gender non-conformity.

Identification of Bias in Materials and Contexts

The participants were asked a series of questions regarding their sense of self-efficacy in identifying LGBTQ bias in instructional materials and school practices using the following key:

- A=I do not believe I could this very well;

- B=I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be very difficult for me;

- C=I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare;

- D=I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.

Table 15. Bias Identification Self-Efficacy

I can….	A	B	C	D
Identify biases against LGB people in commercial materials used in teaching.	7%	7%	40%	46%
Identify biases against GNC, T or Q people in commercial materials used in teaching.	6%	13%	46%	35%
Analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content about LGB people.	4%	16%	40%	37%
Analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content about GNC, Q or T people.	6%	21%	40%	33%
Identify school practices that may be harmful for those who identify as GNC, Q or T.	4%	13%	37%	45%
Identify school practices that may be harmful for those who identify as LGB.	6%	4%	43%	46%

Beth and Tina both discussed the ways in which the term "gay" is used as part of a

negative discourse in schools.   Beth told me about an experience she had in her long-

term substituting assignment. When one of her students used "gay" as a derogatory term

in her classroom, she wrote him up. She had a conversation with this student about the

use of the term. Beth asked the student what he had meant by the term, and he said that it

means "stupid." She explained, "that's someone's identity or sexual orientation. It has

nothing to do with them being stupid… So you are just not going to use that word in my

classroom. So then he said it again and then he got written up" (Beth Interview, 1/9/13).

It is evident from these actions that Beth was willing to stand against homophobia in her classroom.

These results raise an issue in regard to the pre-service teacher's understanding of the various categories of sexual orientation and gender expression and identity. How can teachers teach about and for these marginalized populations when many of them do not understand, at a basic level, what they are? The pre-service teachers' conceptualizations of these terms are varied and often incorrect, especially in regard to transgender, gender expression, queer and gender-nonconformity. Teacher educators need to have a better understanding of these terms so that they can be sure to communicate them clearly to their students.

Sources of Efficacy in Working With and Working for LGBTQ People

While the interview participants attribute some of their self-efficacy in working with and working for LGBTQ students and families to their teacher education programs, they also identify a number of other experiences outside of their teacher education programs. For example, one participant indicated that she feels that she could advocate for students in all of the marginalized groups listed, but attributes it less to the teacher education program and instead to her "core beliefs" (Early and Middle Education Cohort 1, Survey 1, 11/27/12). Survey and interview participants also attributed their sense of self-efficacy to their personal experiences with LGBTQ people. Two survey participants specifically noted that they had gay family members and indicated that this has had a significant impact on them. Similarly, in their interviews, Beth, Sarah, Amy and Tina all

131

discussed that having gay and lesbian friends and roommates has contributed to their desire to make their classrooms more equitable for all students.

Beth also recounted her experiences training as a resident assistant at another mid-western institution as having had a great impact on her. While training to be a resident assistant, they received diversity training, and it was her assessment that this training contributed more to her sense of self-efficacy in having strategies that translate to her future classroom than what she has received in her teacher education program.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the results of the data sources for this project. While all participants agreed that they had taken a course that specifically addressed multicultural education or diversity, and most agreed that these topics were covered in some of their other teacher education courses as well, their perceptions of multicultural education varied. Responses regarding the pre-service teachers' conceptualization of multicultural education or diversity fell into the following non-mutually exclusive categories: understanding diversity, equality in education, diversity as funds of knowledge, teaching about others, teaching tolerance, advocacy, and anti-bias awareness. I also discussed responses that did not fit these categories, especially those that could be interpreted as resistance to the survey questions.

I also examined the multicultural topics that were addressed in various teacher education classrooms, and explored the perceived effectiveness of the methodologies used by the teacher educators. As expected, the topics and methods varied greatly. Some of the methodologies that were used most frequently included textbook or scholarly

article reading assignments, lessons taught by classmates, videos and media clips, as well as children's and adolescent literature. The participants reported the positive effects of having a good teacher educator, Dr. Rose, who was committed to equity and social justice, not just in what she taught, but in how she taught it.

Finally, I explored pre-service teacher's sense of self efficacy when it comes to working with LGBTQ students and parents, designing instructional materials about LGBTQ content, and identifying bias in commercial materials and school contexts. While in the case of most of these questions, respondents reported a high degree of self-efficacy, particularly when having an appropriate amount of time to prepare, some cohorts had responses significantly higher or lower than the major. I attributed the lower sense of self-efficacy mainly to the Physical Education Cohort's content area. In a physical education classroom, the curriculum does not lend itself to teaching about LGBTQ people in the same way that an elementary school, middle school or art classroom may. At the institution where this study took place, those in the physical education teacher preparation program are prepared to teach only physical education, not health. They can apply for and enroll in a separate Health Education licensure that would permit them to teach health content such as sex education. On the other hand, Early and Middle Education Cohort 2 reported a higher sense of self-efficacy in many categories. I attributed this either to their instruction, or to the fact that two members of this cohort self-identified as gay. This cohort was the smallest out of all surveyed. This small cohort size may have allowed for stronger interpersonal relationships between the pre-service teachers, and therefore may have allowed them a greater sense of self-efficacy.

Throughout this chapter, I have explained the results of this study by triangulating the various data sources and by considering the relationship between these results and the existing literature on multicultural education, multicultural teacher education, and LGBTQ issues in education. In the final chapter of this dissertation, I will discuss the implications of these results. It is important to understand what these results mean in terms of the work of teacher educators who continue to address these topics in their classrooms. I will also discuss the implications of these findings for an agenda for future research in multicultural teacher education, particularly around issues of sexual orientation, gender expression and gender non-conformity.

Chapter 5: Discussion
Introduction

While the findings of any study are important, it is critical that a researcher not

only discuss the how the data can be used in practice, but also how it informs future

research in the discipline. In this final chapter, I discuss the study data in relationship to

the implications for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning (LGBTQ)

youth and families, as well as the implications for teacher educators. I also discuss the

limitations of this study. I then make recommendations for further research in

multicultural teacher education, integrating LGBTQ issues in teacher education, boosting

the self-efficacy of teachers when it comes to working with LGBTQ students and

families, teaching LGBTQ content in the classrooms, and combating oppression and bias

in the school setting. Finally, I end this chapter with a brief summary and conclusion of

this study in its entirety.

Implications of the Study

It is not enough to just report the results of a study, but instead a researcher must

discuss the practical implications of the research. As an educational researcher, I want

this study to inform the practices of teacher educators in the future, and to hopefully have

a positive impact on teacher education students and K-12 students. That being said, the

bulk of this study has been broken into two major sections: issues around multicultural

education and issues around the self-efficacy of pre-service teachers to work with and for

LGBTQ students and their families. The data from this study suggests several

implications, first of which regards the impact of the data on the potential lives of

LGBTQ youth and their families. Second, the data suggests the implementation of several

important tools for teacher educators to utilize as they work with their students around

issues of multicultural education, equity and diversity, but especially LGBTQ issues.

Implications for LGBTQ Youth and Families

This study began with a discussion about the fact that LGBTQ students face many

issues in schools. LGBTQ students, or those who are perceived to be LGBTQ, are often

bullied by their peers, and sometimes even by their teachers. With the startling statistics

about the issues LGBTQ students face presented earlier in this dissertation, a case was

made that while teachers need to be prepared to work with students from all diverse

backgrounds, they especially need to be prepared to work with those students who

identify as LGBTQ. The data from this study suggests that while pre-service teachers

understand sexual orientation, they have less of an understanding about those students

who do not exist within the traditional gender binary, those who may identify as queer,

transgender, or who just do not fit the norm prescribed for their biological sex. This lack

of understanding raises the question about the pre-service teacher's ability to really help

those students when required in the school setting. They may, for example, be able to

stop bullying and harassment when they see it in their classrooms or in the hall, but may

not be able to actually teach about gender non-conformity, the issues facing those who

identify as queer or transgender, or be a true advocate or ally for them in the school and

greater community. This puts all students, gender conforming or not, at a disadvantage.

136

The data from this study also suggests that most pre-service teachers feel that they are willing and able to work with LGBTQ students and their families. They feel that they can stand up for students when their peers are bullying them. They do, however, have a lesser sense of self-efficacy when it comes to teaching LGBTQ content and to identifying biases against LGBTQ people in the curriculum. In their interviews, several respondents expressed a desire to know more about how to deal with issues that come up pertaining to LGBTQ students and their families. They wanted more explicit training on how to support these students and how to deal with issues of bullying when they arise in the classroom and the school. It is clear that while the desire exists to assist LGBTQ students, pre-service teachers are still hesitant to do so due to a lack of information and concerns about maintaining employment in school contexts that are often conservative. The data suggests the reexamination of specific ways pre-service teachers are prepared to address multicultural education in their teacher education programs.

Implications for Teacher Educators

It is clear from the data that pre-service teachers have a broad range of understanding about multicultural education. Most understand it to be about teachers' attitudes and dispositions regarding issues of equity and diversity, or about specific classroom practices about equity and diversity. Instead, it is critical that they understand that multicultural education is both about what we think about diverse students and how we teach about and honor that diversity in the classrooms. Teacher educators who address these issues in their teacher preparation classrooms need to consider these two sides of the multicultural education coin. They need to help pre-service teachers

137

understand how different understandings of multicultural education impact the ways in which multicultural education is enacted in the classroom. To do this effectively, teacher educators need to have a strong understanding of how their own perceptions of multicultural education impact how they enact it in their own classrooms.

The study has also revealed the lasting impact of various multicultural education methodologies on pre-service teachers. Tina and Amy both identified multicultural teacher education practices that stood out to them. For Tina, it was the exceptional practices of Dr. Rose, whose approach to equity and justice was successful both because of what she taught and how she taught it. She encouraged her students examine their beliefs about various aspects of diversity in a way that led to their growth. In contrast, Amy felt that many of the practices of her teacher educator were almost racist in nature. It is important to note that these are just these particular pre-service teacher's perceptions of what went on in the classroom; there is no way to be sure what the teacher educator actually did or why they did it. It is clear, however, that multicultural teacher educators really need to think about their practices and, further, check in with their students to find out if their students are taking the intended messages away from the instruction.

Most commonly, the pre-service teachers cited multicultural education as something that was only being addressed in their diversity classes, special education classes, and social studies classes. This suggests a need for better training of content area teacher educators to see how multicultural content can be addressed in math, science, physical education and other methods courses. If we want pre-service teachers to buy into the idea that multicultural education needs to be addressed in all content areas, it

must be reinforced in all of their content courses, not just their stand-alone diversity courses. Teacher educators need to be exposed to the literature on LGBTQ issues in education to understand why this population needs to be discussed in the teacher preparation program just as much as populations of diverse race and class.

Limitations

As with any study, this study has limitations that need to be addressed. While many potential limitations were addressed during the original design of the study, such as adding the analysis of instructor interviews and the syllabi analysis, many limitations came out during the data collection and analysis as well. Some of these limitations were simply based on the nature of qualitative research; other limitations were based on flaws in the data collection methods. In this section, I will address these limitations and the impact they had on the study.

Nature of Qualitative Research

Several of the limitations are a result of the study being qualitative in nature. Glesne (2005) describes qualitative research methods as a research approach that is "used to understand some social phenomena from the perspectives of those involved, to contextualize issues in their particular socio-cultural-political milieu, and sometimes to transform or change social conditions" (p. 4). The first limitation involves the fact that this study was situated within one socio-cultural-political context of a large Midwestern university, a university that claims to be committed to equity and social justice.   The experience of the 69 pre-service teachers may not be representative or generalizable, even to other similar-sized institutions in the area.

A second issue, one which involves the context of the study, is that it occurred at a certain point in time in the pre-service teacher's education. As this study is being written up, the participants have already had other experiences in other classes, they have possibly seen examples of multicultural education in the media, or have had interactions with LGBTQ people that may change their responses to the study questions, if they were presented with them today. Additionally, it is important to recognize the reflexive nature of qualitative research. The qualitative research process is a give and take between the researcher and the researched. The issues brought up in the interviews and surveys may lead the participants to seek out further information on the topics presented. For example, many of the participants were unsure about terms like transgender, queer and gender non-conformity. Their participation in the study may have made them want to learn more, and this could lead to a potential change in how they might respond if the survey or interviews were re-administered.

Data Collection and Analysis

Other limitations can be linked to the data collection process, the data collection methods and the analysis of that data. As previously noted, the initial intent of this study was to survey and interview students in many of the different teacher education programs across the institution. Although I was successful in getting participants in the Physical Education, Art Education, Elementary and Middle Childhood Education teacher education programs, there are still many other cohorts that were left out of the study, including specific secondary education content, such as Social Studies Education, English Education, as well as other programs such as Special Education and Music Education.

140

While including all of these cohorts would have provided a significantly larger data corpus, it would also have been more representative of the experiences of the teacher education students across this institution. Additionally, the original intent was to interview two pre-service teachers from each cohort of surveyed. Only two of the cohorts, Art Education and one of the Elementary and Middle Childhood Education cohorts, had students volunteer for this portion of the study. It would have been beneficial to have further interviews to triangulate with the survey and syllabi data.

There were also several limitations stemming from the instructor portion of the study, which led to the removal of this data from the findings of the study. It is important, however, to take a few moments to address them here. The initial goal was to collect syllabi from courses that address multicultural issues that the survey and interview participants had actually been enrolled in. Unfortunately, none of the syllabi submitted for analysis were directly linked to the participants who were surveyed and interviewed; it would have been very revealing to have seen Dr. Rose's syllabus for the course she had with Tina, for example, and to have had the opportunity to interview her about her experiences designing and teaching the course. While the limited syllabi collected do give a picture as to what and how pre-service teachers were taught, they do not allow for an in-depth analysis of those methods and the perceived effectiveness of those methods. Additionally, as stated in Chapter Three of this study, the initial intent was to interview instructors about their experiences teaching multicultural content in their teacher preparation programs, but no instructors volunteered for this portion of the study. The

goal was to share with the instructors the results of the survey portion of the study in order to help them gain insight into the perspectives of their students.

While it is only speculation, there may be a number of reasons as to why I only had access to a limited number of cohorts and syllabi, and why no instructors agreed to be interviewed. The first may simply be timing; I requested the syllabi over the summer months. Although the request was sent out a number of times, instructors may not have completed their syllabi, or may have forgotten to share the syllabus once it was complete. Secondly, instructors may have been reluctant to share their syllabi and be interviewed by a graduate student. Most of the time, people do not like to think about the things they may not be doing well— or not doing at all— in their classrooms, especially by someone of lesser authority. Finally, instructors may not have been willing to open up their classrooms to my study due to the timing of the semester. Many instructors already feel that they do not have enough time with their students, let alone having to give up some of that time for a researcher. Again, it should be noted that this is merely speculation, as it is impossible to know the true motivations of people.

It should also be noted that, regardless of level, students want to please teachers and those in authority. Some of the participants may only have participated in the study because their instructor was in the room, even though they were told that there would be no penalty for lack of participation. Additionally, some participants may have felt the need to please me and answer my questions in such a way they would perceive as being "correct," especially those questions related to self-efficacy.

Finally, several of the limitations of this study stem from the study instruments themselves, especially the pre-service teacher survey. For example, the first question of the survey (Multicultural Self-Efficacy Survey) asked the respondent to agree or disagree with the following statement: Prior to my teacher education program I identified as an advocate or ally for one or all of the marginalized populations listed (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, disability). In retrospect, it may have been beneficial to begin with having the pre-service teacher first define advocacy and ally work. It may have also been beneficial to have the students circle the specific groups, like in Question 5. Additionally, providing opportunities for the respondents to elaborate would have provided much more dynamic data. If revising the study, I would also consider adding a question about specific methodological practices that stood out to the respondent as positively or negatively impacting their ideas about diversity and multicultural education, including an opportunity for the respondent to explain why they answered the way they chose to.

Questions 2 and 3 asked about courses that address multicultural education and diversity. Since the focus of this study was multicultural education, the term "diversity" should have been removed from those questions. Additionally, the respondents should have been asked a follow-up question to illuminate what topics were addressed and how they were addressed. This missing data was a huge gap that I found when analyzing my data. Finally, in the self-efficacy portion of the study, the questions asked about multiple concepts simultaneously, for example, gay, lesbian, or bisexual. It might have proved more useful to actually break each of these questions down further. This would have provided an opportunity for an in-depth look at how pre-service teachers differentiate

between these various populations.   It would also have provided a stronger link between how the pre-service teachers understood the various terms and their actual sense of self-efficacy.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the results, implications and limitations of this study, I recommend several areas that need further examination. In many ways, this study can serve as a pilot study. If the issues above were addressed, especially those involving flaws in the survey and interview instruments, the study could and should be replicated. It would be interesting to expand the study nationwide; there are variety of on-line survey programs which would permit the researcher to reach a broad range of participants both nationally and internationally. Instructors could still be asked to submit syllabi via email, and interviews could be done via phone or video conferencing. In addition to a basic expansion of the current study, I suggest several separate projects to investigate each research question in further detail.

Multicultural Teacher Education Methods

While studies discussed elsewhere in this document (See: Gorski 2009, 2010; Sherwin and Jennings, 2006) examined much of the "what" and "how" multicultural teacher education is applied in the teacher preparation program, they do not account for the effectiveness, or perceived effectiveness, of the methodological practices on the pre-service teachers. This study only scratched the surface of the multicultural education practices that pre-service teachers found either stifling or empowering. It would serve the multicultural teacher education movement well to continue to explore these issues.

Studies in this area could contain a multi-pronged approach in which the researcher observes in the teacher education classroom, examines documents associated with the course, such as syllabi and course assignments, and interviews both the instructor and students multiple times throughout the course term. This would provide insight into the precise practices being employed by the teacher educator, including rationales for how the teacher educator addresses various content, and the perceived effectiveness of these practices on the pre-service teachers.

LGBTQ Self-Efficacy

It is not enough to be taught about multicultural education related issues. In order to enact these pedagogies in the classroom, teachers must feel a sense of self-efficacy. While studies (S. Silverman, 2010; Siwatu, 2011) have attempted to explore various areas of multicultural self-efficacy, they have failed to explicitly address issues of gender identity and expression and sexual orientation. A driving purpose of this study was to explore pre-service teacher's sense of self-efficacy in addressing LGBTQ issues in their classrooms, teaching LGBTQ content, and identifying bias in the school and curriculum that could negatively impact LGBTQ students or students who come from LGBTQ families.

This study has only begun to scratch the surface in regards to pre-service teacher's sense of LGBTQ self-efficacy. I suggest that this portion of the study continue to be replicated in other contexts to see how students differ across institutions, programs and the country. Further revisions could be made to Likert questions in an attempt to gain a better understanding as to what sources the pre-service teachers attribute their self-

145

efficacy. In this study, Beth felt that her experiences working as a Resident Advisor better prepared her to work with LGBTQ students than did her experiences in her teacher education program. It would be interesting to investigate what other sources of efficacy pre-service teachers identify.

Conclusion

In this study, I have presented a discussion about the need for multicultural education as a part of all teacher education programs. Schools are becoming increasingly diverse, yet the teaching population is not itself experiencing a reflective rise in diversity. In order to be effective, teachers need to understand the needs of all of the students in their classrooms, and they also need to specifically prepare their White, Christian, middle-class students to be able interact with others in this increasingly diverse, global world.

With the goal of informing the practices of future teacher educators, I have explored the ways in which pre-service teachers understand multicultural education and the specific practices they have experienced in their teacher education programs that may have helped shaped this understanding. Most of the pre-service teachers studied understood multicultural education as teachers' beliefs or as specific content practices. Few, however, were able to articulate the connection between these beliefs and the actual practices themselves.

Finally, I have sought to examine the sense of self-efficacy of pre-service teachers in working with LGBTQ students and families, integrating LGBTQ content into the curriculum, and identifying LGBTQ biased curriculum and school content. While it

146

appears that most of the pre-service teachers studied have a strong sense of self-efficacy when it comes to working with LGBTQ students and families, they are less confident when it comes to integrating the content into the curriculum and identifying biases in the curriculum. This has shown that they require further instruction in this area to help increase their sense of self-efficacy. This instruction must come from the teacher educators, and can be accomplished in many ways. First, teacher educators need to be explicit in addressing these issues as a part of the teacher preparation process. Beth's comments about feeling like she learned more about LGBTQ through resident advisor training than through her teacher preparation program revealed that teacher educators may need to find alternative ways to disseminate this information to their students. One suggestion would be to give students access to LGBTQ students and teachers who do LGBTQ ally work in their own classrooms and schools. Making these personal, real life connections may help pre-service teachers more clearly see the need for finding feasible ways to teach about and teach for LGBTQ individuals.

All students, regardless of background, deserve equal access to quality education. All students deserve to feel safe when in the school environment. They need to have teachers who believe in them and advocate for them. They need teachers who are advocates for them, not only in terms of bullying, but also in terms of the materials they teach and how they teach them. Multicultural education, specifically education around LGBTQ issues, is just one vehicle for teachers to create these environments for their students. For most teachers, they need to be educated on how do so as a part of their teacher education programs, and it is the duty of teacher educators to do so.

<center>**References**</center>

Abdullah, A. (2010). *Examining pre-service teacher's understanding of multicultural education.* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://www.ohiolink.edu/etd/ (OCLC No. 733323059).

Alridge, D. P. (2008). *The educational thought of W. E. B. DuBois: An intellectual history.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Asher, N. (2007). Made in the (multicultural) U.S.A.: Unpacking tensions of race, culture, gender, and sexuality in education. *Educational Researcher, 36*(2), 65–73.

Baldwin, S., Buchanan, A., & Rudisill, M. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 315–327.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Banks, C. A. M. (1996). The intergroup education movement. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 251–277). New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Banks, C. A. M. (2004). Intercultural and intergroup education, 1929–1959: Linking schools and communities. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 753–781). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (1991). The dimensions of multicultural education. *Multicultural Leader, 4,* 5–6.

Banks, J. A. (1992). Multicultural education: Approaches, developments, and dimensions. In J. Lynch, C. Modgil, & S. Mogdil (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in the schools, Vol. 1, Education for cultural diversity: Convergence and divergence* (pp. 83–94). London, UK: The Falmer Pres.

Banks, J. A. (1996). The African American roots of multicultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 30–45). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 3–29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L. Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., … McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In. L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232–274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beach, R. (1997). Students' resistance to engagement with multicultural literature. In T. Rogers & A. O. Soter (Eds.), *Reading across cultures: Teaching literature in a diverse society* (pp. 69–94). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Beam, C. (2007). *Transparent: Love, family, and living the T with transgender teenagers*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Books.

Bennett, C. I. (2003). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (5th ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Blackburn, M. V. (2003). Losing, finding, and making space for activism through literacy performances and identity work. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *2*(1), 1–23.

Blackburn, M. V. (2007). The experiencing, negotiation, breaking and remaking of gender rules and regulations by queer youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *4*(2), 33–54.

Blackburn, M. V. (2012). *Interrupting hate: Homophobia in schools and what literacy can do about it.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Blackburn, M. V., & Buckley, J. F. (2005). Teaching queer-inclusive English language arts. *International Reading Association*, *49*(3), 202–212.

Blackburn, M. V., Clark, C. T., Kenney, L. M., & Smith, J. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Acting out: Combating homophobia through teaching and activism*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40.

Bower, L., & Klecka, C. (2009). (Re)considering normal: Queering social norms for parents and teachers. *Teaching Education, 20*(4), 357–373.

Boyle-Basie, M., & Sleeter, C. E. (2000). Community-based service learning for multicultural teacher education. *Educational Foundations, 14*(2), 33–50.

Bruna, K. R. (2007). Finding new words: How I use critical literacy in my multicultural teacher education classroom. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 33*(1), 115–118.

Burant, T. J., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanding an "educative practicum" in an urban school and community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 561–575.

Butler, K. L. (1999). Preservice teachers' knowledge and attitudes regarding gay men and lesbians: The impact of a cognitive educational intervention. *Journal of Health Education, 30*(2), 125.

Clark, C. T. (2010a). Inquiring into ally work in teacher education: The possibilities and limitations of textual practice. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 37–54). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Clark, C. T. (2010b). Preparing LGBTQ-allies and combating homophobia in a U.S. teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 704–713.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003a). Standing at the crossroads: Multicultural teacher education at the beginning of the 21st century. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(3), 3–11.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003b). The multiple meanings of multicultural teacher education: A conceptual framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30*(2), 7–26.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds*.).* *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931–975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Comber, B. (1998). Critical literacy: What's it all about? *Learning Matters, 3*(3), 9–14.

150

Copenhaver-Johnson, J. F. (2010). Learning about heterosexism as a teacher educator: The resistant student as a catalyst for change. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 17–36). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*(1), 418–427.

Cosier, K. (2009). Creating safe schools for queer youth. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 285–304). New York, NY: Routledge

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crocco, M. S. (2008). Gender and sexuality in the social studies. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in Social Studies Education* (pp. 172–196). New York, NY: Routledge.

Davis, R. B., Ramahalo, T., Beyerbach, B., & London, A. P. (2008). A culturally relevant teaching course: Reflecting pre-service teachers' thinking. *Teaching Education, 19*(3), 223–234.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1–20). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.

Dozier, C., Johnston, P. H., & Rogers, R. (2006). *Critical literacy, critical teaching: Tools for preparing responsive teachers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Driver, S. (2007). *Queer girls and popular culture: Reading, resisting and creating media*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Driver, S. (2008). "Introducing queer youth cultures." In S. Driver (Ed.), *Queer youth cultures* (pp. 1–18). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., & Telford, D. (2000). "Othering" education: Sexualities, silences, and schooling. *Review of Research in Education, 25,* 127–179.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (2005). Encouraging the development of social justice attitudes and actions in heterosexual student. *New Directions for Student Services, 110*, 43–54.

Feistritzer, C. E., Griffin, S., & Linnajarvi, A. (2011). *Profile of Teachers in the U.S. 2011*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: a classroom-organisation conceptualisation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 675–686

Friend, R. A. (1993). Choices, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia in schools. In L. Weiss & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race and gender in United States Schools* (pp. 209–235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Friere, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)

Gates, G. J. (2011). How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender? Retrieved from: http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.

Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network. (n.d.). *Model district policy on transgender and gender nonconforming students.* Retrieved from: http://transequality.org/Resources/Model%20District%20Trans%20and%20GNC%20Policy%20FINAL.pdf

Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network & Harris Interactive (2012). *Playgrounds and prejudice: Elementary school climate in the United States, a survey of students and teachers*. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network.

Glesne, C. (2005). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Educational.

Gonzales, J. (2010). Risk and threat in critical inquiry: Vacancies, violations and vacuums. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 74–87). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gonzales, N., Moll, L. C., Tenery, M. F., Rivera, A., Rendon, P., Gonzales, R., & Amanti, C. (1995). Funds of knowledge for teaching in Latino households. *Urban Education, 29*(4), 443–470.

152

Gorski, P. C. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 309–318.

Gorsk, P. C. (2010). The scholarship informing practice: Multicultural teacher education philosophy and practice in the United States. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 12*(2), 1–22.

Grant, C., & Gibson, M. (2011). Diversity and teacher education: A historical perspective on research and policy. In A. Ball & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. 19–62). Lanham, MD: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2007a). Race, class, gender and disability in the classroom. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed., pp. 63–84). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2007b). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender and disability* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Guyton, E. M., & Wesche, M. V. (2005). The multicultural efficacy scale: Development, item selection and reliability. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(4), 21–29.

Hadijoannou, X., & Fu, D. (2007). Critical literacy as a tool for preparing prospective educators for teaching in a multicultural world. *The New England Reading Association Journal, 43*(2), 43–48.

Hatch, J. A. (2002) *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Holmes, S. E., & Cahill, S. (2004). School experiences of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 1*(3), 53–66.

Human Rights Watch. (2001). *Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students in U.S. schools*. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch.

Ingersoll, R., & Merrill, E. (2012). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force.* (Consortium for Policy Researching in Education Working Paper #WP-01), Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Researching in Education.

Jennings, K. (2006). "Out" in the classroom: Addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) issues in social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.) *The Social studies curriculum* (3rd ed., pp. 255–264). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jetton, T. L., & Savage-Davis, E. M. (2005). Preservice teachers develop an understanding of diversity issues through multicultural literature. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(1), 30–38

Johnson, L. (2002). "My eyes have been opened" White teachers and racial awareness. *Journal of Teacher Education. 53*(2), 153–167.

Kincheloe, J. T., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163–178). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., and Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2001). "Posts" perspectives on anti-oppressive education in social studies, english, mathematics, and science classrooms. *Educational Researche*r, *30*(3) 3–12.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy* (1st ed.). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kumashiro, K. (2004). Uncertain beginnings: Learning to teach paradoxically. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(2), 111–115.

Kumashiro, K. (2008). *The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Education Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of teachers in diverse classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3–12.

Leland, C. H., Harste, J. C., & Huber, K. R. (2005). Out of the box: Critical literacy in a first-grade classroom. *Language Arts, 82*(5), 257–268.

Lofquist, D. (2011). *Same-sex couple households: American community survey beliefs*. Retrieved from: http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-03.pdf.

Maney, D. W., & Cain, R. E. (1997). Preservice elementary teachers' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Journal of School Health, 67*(6), 236-241.

Marshall, J., & Klein, A. M. (2009). Lessons in social action: Equipping and inspiring students to improve their world. *Social Studies, 100*(5), 218-221.

Martino, W. (2009). Literacy issues and GLBTQ youth: Queer interventions in English education. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 386–399). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mayo, J. B. (2013). Critical pedagogy enacted in the gay-straight alliance: New possibilities for a third space in teacher development. *Educational Researcher, 42*(5), 266–275.

Mazzei, L. A. (2008). Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24,* 1125–1136.

McCready, L. T. (2004). Some challenges facing queer youth programs in urban high schools: Racial segregation and de-normalizing whiteness. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies in Education*, *1*(3), 37–51.

McDowell, T., & Fang, S. S. (2007). Feminist-informed critical multiculturalism: Considerations for family research. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*(4), 549–566.

McLean, C. A., Boling, E. C., & Rowsell, J. (2009). Engaging diverse students in multiple literacies in and out of school. In L. M. Morrow, R. Rueda, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on literacy and diversity* (pp. 158–172). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McNair, J. C. (2003). "But the Five Chinese Brothers is one of my favorite books": Conducting sociopolitical critiques of children's literature with preservice teachers. *Journal of Children's Literature, 29*(1), 46–54.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2002a). Assessing and evaluating qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 18–36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2002b). Introduction to qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp. 3–17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, E. J. (2010). *Gender and sexual diversity in schools.* New York, NY: Springer.

Milner, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 6*(1–2), 118–131.

Minami, M., & Ovando, C. J. (2004). Language issues in multicultural contexts. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 699–715). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mudrey, R., & Medina-Adams, A. (2006). Attitudes, perceptions, and knowledge of pre-service teachers regarding the educational isolation of sexual minority youth. *Journal of Homosexuality, 51*(4), 63–90.

Mulhern, M., & Martinez, G. (1999). Confronting homophobia in a multicultural education course. In W. J. Letts & J. T. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling*. Laham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 180–187.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1993). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9*(1), 27–39.

North, C. (2010). Threading stitches to approach gender identity, sexual identity, and difference. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 43*(3), 375–387.

Olmedo, I. M. (1997). Challenging old assumptions: Preparing teachers for inner city schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(3), 245–258.

Pang, V. O., & Sablan, V. A. (1998). Teacher efficacy: How do teachers feel about their abilities to teach African American students? In M. Dilworth (Ed.), *Being responsive to cultural differences* (pp. 39–58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 12*(2), 197–215.

Quinlivan, K., & Town, S. (1999). Queer pedagogy, educational practice and lesbian and gay youth. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(5), 509–524.

Robinson, K. H., & Ferfolja, T. (2001). 'What are we doing this for?' Dealing with lesbian and gay issues in teacher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(1), 121–133.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80,* 1–28.

Rowell, E. H. (2007). Missing: Picture books reflecting gay and lesbian families. *Young Children, 6*(3), 24–30.

Schey, R., & Upstrom, A. (2010). Activist work as entry-year teachers: What we've learned. In M. V. Blackburn, C. T. Clark, L. M. Kenney, & J. M. Smith (Eds.), *Acting out! Combating homophobia through teacher activism* (pp. 88–102). New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Sears, J. T. (1999). Teaching queerly: Some elementary propositions. In W. J. Letts & J. T. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 3–14). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Seidl, B., & Friend, G. (2002). The unification of church and state: Working together to prepare teachers for diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 142–152.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sherwin, G., & Jennings, T. (2006). Feared, forgotten, or forbidden: Sexual orientation topics in secondary teacher preparation programs in the U.S.A. *Teaching Education, 17*(3), 207–223.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Silverman, S. K. (2010). What is diversity? An Inquiry into preservice teacher beliefs. *American Education Research Journal*, *47*(2), 292–329.

Siwatu, K. O. (2011). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy-forming experiences: A mixed methods study, *The Journal of Educational Research*, *104*(5), 360–369.

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). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1947–1957.

Sleeter, C. E., & Milner, H. R., IV. (2011). Researching successful efforts in teacher education to diversify teachers. In A. F. Ball & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. 81–104). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Smith, J. M. (2009). Montana 1948: Crossing boundaries with queer theory. In A. O. Soter, M. Faust, & T. Rogers (Eds.), *Interpretive play: Using critical perspectives to teach young adult literature* (pp. 161–174). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Smolkin, L. B., & Suina, J. H. (1999). Cross-cultural partnerships: Acknowledging the "equal other" in The Rural/Urban American Indian Teach Education Program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 571–590.

Solomon, R. B., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How White teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'White privilege.' *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(2), 147–169.

Stachowski, L. L., & Mahan, J. M. (1998). Cross-cultural field placements: Student teachers learning from schools and communities. *Theory into Practice, 37*(2), 155–162.

Stake, R. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work.* New York: Guilford Press.

Swartz, P. (2003). Bridging multicultural education: Bringing sexual orientation into the children's and young adult literature classrooms. *Radical Teacher*, *66*, 11–16.

Thomas, S., & Vanderhaar, J. (2008). Negotiating resistance to multiculturalism in a teacher education curriculum: A case study. *The Teacher Educator, 43*, 173–197.

Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 7–29.

Thorton, S. J. (2010). Silence on gays and lesbians in social studies curriculum. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today* (pp. 87–94). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202–248.

United States Census Bureau. (2012). *Table 7. Resident Population by Sex and Age: 1980 to 2010*. Retrieved from: http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0007.pdf

Vaccaro, A. (2009). Intergenerational perceptions, similarities and differences: A comparative analysis of lesbian, gay, and bisexual Millennial Youth with Generation X and Baby Boomers. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 6*, 113–134.

Van Sluys, K., Larna, T. T., Legan, N., & Lewison, M. (2005). Critical literacy and preservice teachers: Changing definitions of what it might mean to read. *Journal of Reading Education, 31*(1), 13–22.

Vavrus, M. (2009). Sexuality, schooling, and teacher identity formation: A critical pedagogy for teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 25*(3), 383–390.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32.

Wake, D. G., & Modla, V. B. (2008). Using multicultural literature to teach culturally responsive instructional approaches. *College Reading Association Yearbook, 29,* 179–200.

Wilkinson, L., & Pearson, J. (2009). School culture and the well-being of same-sex-attracted youth. *Gender & Society, 23*(4), 542–568.

Wittlinger, E. (2007). *Parrotfish*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Wolfe, R. B. (2006). Choosing to include gay issues in early childhood teacher preparation coursework: One professor's journey. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 27*(2), 195–204.

Wyatt, T. J., Oswalt, S. B., White, C., and Peterson, F. L. (2008). Are tomorrow's teachers ready to deal with diverse students? Teacher candidates' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 171–185.

Yoshino, K. (2007). *Covering: The hidden assault on our civil rights*. New York, NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Young, S. L. (2009). Breaking the silence: Critical literacy and social action. *English Journal, 98*(4), 109–115.

Zeichner, K. M. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record, 105*(3), 490–519.

Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' Characteristics: Research on the demographic profile. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 111–156). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A: Multicultural Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey

Section A:

Directions: Please circle the statement that best fits your answer to the question. For open-ended questions, please provide as much information you feel comfortable.

1)   Prior to my teacher education program I identified as an advocate or ally for one or all of the marginalized populations listed (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, disability).

                    Agree   Disagree

2)   My teacher education program included a class that explicitly addressed diversity and/or multicultural issues.

                    Agree   Disagree

3)   Issues of diversity/multicultural education were addressed in other classes in my teacher education program.

                    Agree   Disagree

4)   How, if at all, were issues of gender identity/nonconformity and/or sexual orientation addressed in any of your teacher education coursework?

5)   After my teacher education program I feel that I could advocate for students in the following marginalized populations in the classroom (circle all that apply):

Race   Class   Gender

Sexual Orientation   Linguistic Diversity   Disability

Section B:
Directions: Respond to each open-ended question. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. Please provide as much information as you feel comfortable.

6) Please describe how you understand diversity and/or multicultural education in the classroom:

7) How do you understand the term: sexual orientation?

8) How do you understand the term: transgender?

9) How do you understand the term: queer?

10) How do you understand the term: gender non-conforming?

11) How do you understand the term: gender expression?

Section C:

Directions: To the best of your knowledge, self-assess your own ability to do the various items listed below. On the line provided, use the key to write the letter of the response which best fits your self-assessment:

KEY: A=I do not believe I could do this very well.
      B=I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be very difficult for me.
      C=I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare.
      D=I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.

_____ 12) I can work with students who identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

_____ 13) I can work with students who are gender non-conforming, transgender or queer.

_____ 14) I can work with students' parents who identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

_____ 15) I can work with students' parents who are gender non-conforming, transgender or queer?

_____ 16) I can plan instructional activities to reduce prejudice about lesbian, gay, and bisexual people in my current or future classroom.

_____ 17) I can implement instructional activities to reduce prejudice about gender non-conforming, transgender or queer people my current or future classroom

_____ 18) I can identify biases against gay, lesbian or bisexual people in the commercial materials used in teaching.

_____ 19) I can identify biases against gender non-conforming, transgender or queer individuals in the commercial materials used in teaching.

_____ 20) I can develop instructional methods that dispel myths about lesbian, gay or bisexual people.

_____ 21) I can develop instructional methods that dispel myths about gender non-conforming, transgender or queer people

_____ 22) I can analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content about lesbians, gays and bisexuals.

163

____ 23) I can analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content those who identify as gender non-conforming, transgender or queer.

____ 24) I can identify school practices that may be harmful for who identify as gender non-conforming, transgender or queer.

____ 25) I can identify school practices that may be harmful for who identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

Section D:

Gender (Please Describe):

_____

Age: _____   Current Degree Program:_____

Racial/Ethnic Background (Please Describe):

Religious Background (Please Describe):

Sexual Orientation (Please Describe):

Additional Self-Description and/or Comments:

Please Turn to the Last Page.
Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If you are interested in participating in the second part of this study and be interviewed and audio recorded (for approximately 30 minutes) about the multicultural elements of your teacher education program and your sense of self-efficacy in implementing multicultural education in your future classroom, please fill out the form below and hand it in SEPARATE from your

survey. If you are selected to participate in the interview portion of your study you will be contacted via email and/or phone to set up an interview time.

If you are not interested in participating in the interview, thank you again for your time and please hand this page in separately from your survey.

_____   I am interested in participating in the interview portion of this study.

Name (please print):_____

Email:_____

Cell phone number:_____

Appendix B: Student Interview Protocol

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. I am going to ask you a few questions about your experiences in issues of diversity in your teacher education program. You can choose to not to answer any of the questions during this interview or terminate the interview at any time without any penalty. This interview will be recorded. Is this okay?

1. Tell me about your experiences in your teacher education coursework around issues of diversity?

2. How were issues of sexual orientation or gender expression addressed, if at all?

3. What did you think about the instruction you received in regards to sexual orientation or gender identity of students and people? What instruction would you have liked to receive about these issues that you did not?

4. Prior to your entry into your teacher education program would you would you have considered yourself an LGBTQ advocate or ally? If so, what have you done as a part of that advocacy work?

5. In your student teaching placement, have you tried to integrate information about LGBTQ people into your lessons? Why or why not?

6. Would you integrate information about LGBTQ people in your future classroom? Why or why not?

Appendix C: Instructor Syllabus Request Script

Dear Dr. _____,

My name is Cathy Rosenberg and I am a doctoral candidate in the School of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education and Human Ecology. I am doing my dissertation research project on pre-service teacher's sense of self-efficacy in regards to implementing multicultural education, especially education about sexual orientation and gender expression.

The first part of the project involves survey data and interviews with pre-service teachers from several departments in the university. The second part of the project involves the instructors. I am requesting that if you address issues of equity and diversity in your teacher education courses (content courses, pedagogy courses, etc.) you send me your syllabus. You can send it to me via email or anonymously through inter-office mail (see contact information below). I am also asking university instructors to sit down with me in one-on-one interview to discuss the analyzed data from student surveys, student interviews and collection of syllabi. If you are interested in participating in one of these audio recorded interviews (approximately 45-60 minutes) please contact me via email or inter-office mail with your name and the program(s) in which you teach for.

I have also attached the consent form for the project. If you choose to participate in the project please scan and email it back to me or send it to me via inter-office mail (separate from your syllabi).

Thank you, in advance, for your help on my dissertation.

Cathy A. Rosenberg
Doctoral Candidate
School of Teaching & Learning
College of Education & Human Ecology

848.702.1400
cathy.rosenberg@gmail.com

Appendix D: Instructor Interview Protocol

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. I am going to ask you a few questions about your experiences in teaching diversity issues to your pre-service teachers. You can choose to not to answer any of the questions during this interview or terminate the interview at any time without any penalty. This interview will be recorded. Is this okay?

1) Tell me about your experiences as you address issues of diversity and equity as you teach teacher education courses?
2) What diversity issues did you address?
3) What methods did you use to address them?
4) How did your students to respond to this part of their instruction?
5) Did you specifically address issues of sexual orientation and gender expression in your course?
6) How did you do so?
7) How did your students respond?
8) In a previous part of this study, I surveyed and interviewed pre-service teachers across the university. These were their responses. What are your thoughts on these?
9) Would you integrate information about sexual orientation and gender expression in the future?
10) What might you do the same/differently?
11) What support might you need to address sexual orientation and gender expression in the future?