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Abstract:
This study examined changes in student teachers’ White racial identity and color-blindness (using scores on the WRCDS-R and CoBRAS), as well as their perceptions of working with students of color, following a semester of student teaching in diverse classrooms. Paired samples t-tests demonstrated student teachers were more color-blind about institutional discrimination and blatant racial issues at the conclusion of student teaching. Responses to open-ended questions showed that White student teachers entered placements with biased expectations, and most stated that students of color were biased toward White teachers, yet their explanations neglected the impact of sociological factors, such as institutional racism and historical oppression.
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As the student population in the United States becomes increasingly diverse, the teaching population remains predominantly White (Howard, 2011; National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Schools of education must train White teachers to be culturally responsive in their teaching. Cultural responsiveness necessitates an understanding of students’ cultural backgrounds, as well as factors that affect student performance (Zamudio, 2011).

White preservice teachers enter teacher preparation programs with minimal cross-cultural experience (Keengwe, 2010) and often adopt a color-blind approach to teaching, failing to
understand the role that race plays in teaching (Fasching-Varner, 2012). Without adequate training, White teachers remain unaware of biases and privileges affiliated with Whiteness (Fasching-Varner, 2012) and perceive aspects of the White dominant culture as the norm.

The purpose of our study was to examine whether experiences in racially diverse settings influenced student teachers’ White racial identity development and their perceptions about teaching students of color. Our research extended a prior study we conducted on student teachers’ White racial identity (Groff & Peters, 2012) in a different state in the northeastern United States. Collecting additional data, we hoped to determine pathways to culturally-responsive teaching and to identify areas in need of attention.

For this study, we were interested in examining student teachers placed in racially diverse settings, specifically student teachers placed in “high needs” schools where greater than 50 percent of the students received free or reduced lunch. High needs schools were also deemed racially diverse, as greater than 50% of the students were students of color (See Table 1).

**Review of Literature**

**White Teachers’ Perceptions of Students of Color**

Given the diversity of students in today’s classrooms, teachers will undoubtedly teach students of color. Evidence suggests, however, that White teachers struggle to understand the role that race plays in their interactions with students of color (Ruggles-Gere, Buehler, Dallavis, & Shaw-Haviland, 2009). Without a critical understanding of racial issues, biased and racist practices will inadvertently permeate classroom practices (Cross, 2005; Zamudio, 2011). White teachers are often unaware of their biases (Ruggles-Gere et al., 2009; Rychly & Grave, 2012) and have lower expectations of students of color (Cross, 2003; Howard, 2010). Moreover, some research indicates that White teachers might perceive themselves with the capability to rescue their students of color, as if students of color are deficient due to their cultural backgrounds (Endres & Gould, 2009; Howard, 2010; Pennington, Brock, & Ndura, 2012).

Many White preservice teachers enter teacher preparation programs with little, if any, exposure to cultures of people dissimilar to themselves (Howard, 2010; Keengwe, 2010). White teachers with limited knowledge about cultures beyond their own are likely to perceive other cultures as inadequate (Howard, 2010), which manifests in teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, and expectations (Howard, 2010; Zamudio, 2011). For example, White teachers offer higher praise for students of color more than for White students when demonstrating low quality work (Harber et al., 2012).

White preservice teachers who enter racially diverse placements for the first time frequently feel uncomfortable, as the setting is incongruent with their past experiences (Groff & Peters, 2012). Feeling uncomfortable, coupled with lack of understanding, might be responsible for negative first impressions of racially diverse neighborhoods and schools. Prior research (Groff & Peters, 2012) demonstrated that White preservice teachers entered urban and racially diverse settings with biased assumptions; results showed negative stereotypes of diverse neighborhoods as “unsafe” and “rundown,” as opposed to preservice teachers in predominantly White settings who initially perceived the environment as “safe” and “clean” (Groff & Peters, 2012).

Lacking cross-cultural experience, White preservice teachers need guidance to confront racial issues that arise in the classroom. Research indicates, however, that White teacher educators tend to avoid discussions of race and racism in the classroom (Haviland, 2008; Ruggles-Gere et al., 2009), often for fear of saying the wrong thing (Keengwe, 2010). Moreover, Haviland (2008) found that White educators avoid discussions of White privilege,
stating that, “…these practices in White-dominated educational settings that may constitute the ‘White educational discourse’ that can insulate participants from implication in social inequality, value social cohesion over challenge, and promote a noncritical stance to race, racism, and White supremacy” (p. 44). Before White educators can attempt to dialogue about the conditions of people of color in the United States, deKoven (2011) suggests that White educators must first understand privilege and teach preservice teachers about the history of racism. Kendall (2013) defines White privilege as inherent advantages associated with being White, wherein the White culture is the norm, creating a system of White superiority, racial stratification and racism.

Without critical examination and discussion of racial issues, White preservice teachers have no mechanism to address these challenging issues. Avoiding these topics cannot lead to positive teacher growth. As research has shown, White student teachers who had a semester of student teaching in racially diverse settings exhibited lower teacher efficacy than student teachers placed in predominantly White classrooms (Bloom & Peters, 2012); the diversity of the placement negatively affected teacher efficacy. Siwatu (2011) similarly reported that preservice teachers in suburban settings, with a lower percentage of students of color, had higher teacher efficacy for working with diverse students than those who were placed in urban settings. Therefore, experience in racially diverse settings, by itself, does not appear to positively influence teacher efficacy for working with students of color.

**Color-Blindness**

Educators should consider that omitting discussions of race and racism might fallaciously signify to White preservice teachers that race is irrelevant, leading to false assumptions about teaching. Delgado and Stefancic (2001) define color-blindness as a “belief that one should treat all persons equally, without regard to their race (p. 144).” Without adequate preparation, White teachers are likely to adopt a color-blind approach to teaching, failing to address students’ cultural backgrounds in their teaching (Cross, 2003). Lensmire (2010, p. 161) stated, “Color-blind racism is the current racial ideology that sustains racial inequality in the United States.”

White teachers often espouse a color-blind approach to teaching, failing to recognize the long-term effects of oppression and racism in the United States on student performance (Howard, 2010; Zamudio, 2011). Without awareness of the history of oppression and institutional racism, White teachers may adopt a belief in meritocracy, that success is based solely on hard work (Howard, 2010). Such beliefs ignore the long-term sociological impact of oppression and racism and sustain the status quo (Gushue & Constantine, 2007; Howard, 2010). White teachers with a color-blind approach might depreciate the value of multicultural education and fail to see the impact of race on learning (Han, West-Olatunj, & Thomas, 2010).

Though seldom addressed, inequities between the White dominant culture and people of color still exist in the United States (Lensmire, 2010; Zamudio, 2011), and the curriculum in schools is one avenue through which inequities are maintained (Cross, 2005; Howard, 2010). A curriculum that primarily reflects the dominant culture signifies to students of color that their cultures and ways of knowing are less important (Howard, 2010; Zamudio, 2011). “When hegemonic assumptions about the nature of knowledge and learning go unquestioned, schools normalize ‘Whiteness,’ thus privileging affluent and middle-class White students” (Gainer & Larrotta, 2010, p. 42).

Examination of critical race theory is essential to any discussion of White privilege and racial identity with profound implications for education programs touting the preparation of preservice teachers capable of serving diverse student populations with culturally-relevant pedagogy (Lynch, 2006). Using critical race theory as a lens through which one approaches the
education of teachers, White privilege and racial identity can and must be addressed; teacher training should require reflection on the inherent belief that color-blindness can erase decades of political, social, and economic injustice in the evolution of American education, egregiously and disproportionately affecting people of color as well as those who are ethnically and socioeconomically different than teachers who are representative of the dominant culture (Lynch, 2006). Without the systematic use of critical race theory as a framework in confronting the complex landscape of inequity, preservice teachers, predominantly White, middle-class females, cannot confront and reflect on their own narratives of White privilege and racial identity to consider their roles as educators (Lynch, 2006). Continued deference to colorblindness and empathy (Bigelow, 1994) promotes and sustains inequity rather than advancing the understanding and practice of meaningful and effective culturally relevant pedagogy.

Fasching-Varner and Siriki (2012) underscore that the examination of White privilege and racial identity is essential if educators are to effectuate culturally relevant teaching practices. Teacher preparation programs cannot legitimately suggest that preservice educators can become adept at understanding and initiating culturally relevant pedagogy if in the context of said programs there is not systematic and explicit attention to critical race theory as a framework for identity work. Fasching-Varner and Siriki (2012) state, The idea of being culturally competent is not just an awareness of what teachers assume to be their students’ cultures but rather a complex understanding of teachers’ own identities and how culture is framed and understood with the context of students’ lives, reconciling differences in open and transparent ways. (p. 3)

If schools of education seek to prepare teachers who serve historically underrepresented populations in diverse settings, explicit and systematic attention to issues of privilege and identity in coursework is imperative. By ‘foregrounding’ race (Lynch, 2006) in preparatory courses, preservice teachers from historically overrepresented groups have the opportunity to develop efficacious, culturally relevant practices.

Schools of Education and Multicultural Competence

Teacher preparation programs have attempted to address the lack of cross-cultural experience of their White preservice teachers through placements in diverse settings, but experience alone might not produce positive teacher development (Gainer & Larrotta, 2010; Rychly & Graves, 2012). For example, Gainer and Larrotta (2010) found very few examples of culturally responsive pedagogy in their work with White preservice teachers who were placed in diverse settings. Moreover, White preservice teachers appeared to downplay the importance of diversity in their teaching methods (Gainer & Larrotta, 2010). Additional research suggests that White preservice teachers negate the existence of racism (Haviland, 2008).

Further evidence supports the need to move beyond diverse placements to effect teacher change. For example, a previous study by the lead author (Groff & Peters, 2012) compared White preservice teachers in racially diverse and non-diverse settings and found that those in diverse placements exhibited no change in color-blindness or White racial identity. However, those in the predominantly White settings became more color-blind by the end of the semester, indicating the deleterious, insular nature of lack of inter-cultural experiences. Furthermore, their (Groff & Peters, 2012) findings indicated that White preservice teachers in racially diverse placements commented about the cultural differences between them and their students of color. Therefore, experiences in diverse settings may create opportunities for dialogue about racial
issues that emerge during these placements, which is not documented as common practice in empirical studies of WRI.

Cross (2003) reported that White graduates of a teacher education program felt that their programs failed to prepare them for the realities in the field. Graduates failed to connect with their students in meaningful ways and thus were not teaching in culturally-responsive ways (Cross, 2003). In a subsequent article, Cross (2005) conveyed the importance of analyzing:

the larger systems in place that maintain the privileges of Whiteness, power, and racism. Because teacher education reform efforts are too silent on these issues, along with the inequities and injustices manifested by them, those prepared to teach through these programs are taught to blindly, silently, and paradoxically reproduce the same inequities and injustices under the rhetoric of diversity and multiculturalism. (p. 265)

If our goal is to promote teachers who are culturally responsive, we must move beyond merely placing White preservice teachers in racially diverse settings. Some (Fasching-Varner, 2012; Middleton, Erguner-Tekinalp, Williams, & Dow, 2011) recommend that preservice teachers engage in rigorous, painstakingly honest self-exploration about their own race before entering classrooms. Amos (2010) conducted research on White and non-White preservice teachers enrolled in a multicultural education course and concluded that, “...acknowledging the fact that inequality still exists was the starting point to becoming a multicultural teacher” (p. 34). Amos’s (2010) study elucidated the challenges of dialoguing about race, as non-White preservice teachers were fearful of their White peers’ reactions to their instructor’s discussions of racism and became silent; they also expressed outrage over their White peers’ color-blind approach to teaching. Therefore, ongoing dialogue and critical discussion of racial issues are paramount to foster multicultural competence.

**White Racial Identity**

In addition to ensuring that White preservice teachers have experience in diverse placements, schools of education also attempt to address multicultural competence through coursework, typically through a single course on diversity. Coursework seldom addresses tenets of White racial identity, such as racism, historical oppression, and White privilege. Research by Amos (2010) and Middleton et al. (2011) suggests that exploring White racial identity should be a major component of teacher preparation programs. Furthermore, Johnson and Jackson-Williams (2014) found that White racial identity (WRI) influences multicultural competence.

Helms (1990, 1995) proposed a theory of White racial identity development that consists of six different statuses at two different levels. At lower-level statuses, Whites are unaware of Whiteness and the history of racism or deny the existence of institutional discrimination. At higher-level statuses, they understand the impact of their Whiteness on inter-cultural relationships. Higher-level statuses represent greater awareness of White privilege and historical oppression, a shift to a non-racist identity, and a commitment to social justice.

Teacher preparation programs seldom address tenets of White racial identity, yet self-awareness is an important component of developing multicultural competence. As seen in prior research, color-blind attitudes are related to less advanced levels of White racial identity (Gushue & Constantine, 2007). Other research (Pollock, Deckman, Mira, & Shalaby, 2010) indicates that preservice teachers recognize the need to come to terms with their own White privilege and guilt before they can attempt to develop specific classroom skills for working with students of color. Understanding one’s own White privilege promotes multicultural competence (Hays, Chang, &
Havice, 2008). Therefore, we need to address issues of Whiteness and White privilege before introducing culturally-responsive pedagogical strategies for working with students of color.

Research Questions

As White educators of White preservice teachers who are placed in schools with a high percentage of students of color, we are committed to enacting change. Our first step is to identify preservice teachers’ self-awareness and perceptions of students of color. Prior research has been limited primarily to small sample sizes, so we hope to add to the body of literature on this topic. Using both quantitative surveys and responses to open-ended questions as our data sources, our study addressed the following two questions:

1. Do student teachers placed in schools identified as high needs, with greater than 50 percent of students of color, show change in White racial identity following a semester of student teaching?
2. Do student teachers placed in schools identified as high needs, with greater than 50 percent of students of color, show change in color-blindness following a semester of student teaching?
3. What are student teachers’ initial perceptions about their diverse placements?
4. What are student teachers’ perceptions about working with students of color following a semester of student teaching in high needs schools?

Method

Participants and Context

Our study took place at one private, comprehensive, independent, coeducational institution enrolling nearly 5,000 students, offering 70 undergraduate programs, 52 masters’ degrees, and 22 certificate programs. The School of Education is one of three schools at the College, responsible for over 2000 students, with approximately 1,500 graduate students and 700 undergraduates. The School of Education offers programs leading to certification in Early Childhood, Elementary, Special Education, Adolescence, and Bilingual Studies.

In the spring of 2013 we asked all undergraduate and graduate preservice teachers in degree programs for initial teacher certification, enrolled in student teaching seminar courses, to participate in our study. Of the 103 student teachers enrolled, 97 agreed to participate. Given our focus exclusively on White student teachers, our target sample was 87 White student teachers. However, our final usable sample consisted of 75 (70 f, 5 m) White student teachers (response rate = 86%), as 12 failed to complete both pre and post surveys. Most participants were enrolled in programs for initial certification in Elementary Education (n = 23) or dual certification in Elementary Education and Special Education (n = 32). Twenty were enrolled in Adolescence Education. Interestingly, 14 student teachers reported no prior diversity training or coursework. Others stated that they had previously completed one workshop (n = 19), two workshops (n = 23), or one or two courses on diversity (n = 12). Seven participants omitted the question on diversity. In addition, prior to student teaching, participants completed an experience in a high needs school, designated as high needs if greater than 50 percent of its student population qualified for free lunch.

The demographics of the “high needs” schools are aligned with enrollment data provided by the New York State Education Department (2013-2014). The approximate breakdown of the schools included in this study can be seen in Table 1.

Each undergraduate and graduate teacher candidate completes two eight-week student teaching placements. Prior to student teaching, candidates must also complete programmatic mandates, 5-25 hours of course-embedded fieldwork, in a high needs school. The requirement is
verified by a checkmark on an evaluation form indicating that the preservice teacher has worked in a high needs school, indicating eligibility to student teach. Looking at the racial distribution of the high needs placements, although expressed as policy for placement, the economic diversity is concomitant in each case with at least 50% students of color enrolled in designated high needs schools.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Native Hawaiian/9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses common to all programs of study for initial certification include Early Childhood/Childhood/Adolescence Psychology and Development, Educational Psychology/Instructional Technology, Foundations of Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Literacy, Methods, Student Teaching, Student Teaching Seminar. There is no course dedicated to the study of multicultural education in programs for initial certification.

The researchers in this study all had published previously on the topic of White racial identity. The lead researcher had previously conducted focus groups with counselor education students who were enrolled in a group counseling course that focused on Whiteness. Two of the researchers worked for several years with preservice teachers in a racially diverse high school. Our research team consisted of White female researchers, and we all struggled with ways to teach preservice teachers to effectively work with students of color. We frequently discussed our own WRI development and the impact of our WRI on our own work with preservice teachers. Therefore, our critical perspectives influenced our choice of instruments (e.g., WRCDS, CoBRAS) and our interpretation of the data.

Instruments

**Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).** The CoBRAS (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000) is a 20-item, self-report instrument that utilizes a 6 point likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 6 = strongly agree) and assesses three dimensions of color-blind racial attitudes: Unawareness of Racial Privilege; Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination; and Unawareness to Blatant Racial Issues. Higher scores on each subscale indicate greater color-blind views and a belief in meritocracy, that is, that a person’s success is individually determined and based on hard work; racism and discrimination are not perceived as determinants (Neville et al., 2000). Lower CoBRAS scores, therefore, represent greater awareness of the influence of societal factors on outcomes for persons of color.
A prior study provides evidence of the CoBRAS’s reliability and validity. Neville et al.’s (2000) research demonstrated concurrent validity with two other measures of prejudice. Inter-item reliability analyses indicated Cronbach alphas that ranged from .70 to .86 for each of the subscales (Neville et al., 2000). We conducted reliability analyses, using our data set of 75 student teachers. Results indicated moderate-to-high reliability for each subscale: (1) .73 for Unawareness of Racial Privilege; (2) .53 for Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination; and (3) .52 for Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues.

White Racial Consciousness Development Scale-Revised (WRCDS-R). The WRCDS-R is a 40-item instrument aligned with four of Helms’s White racial identity statuses (Lee et al., 2007). (1) Contact reflects ignorance or obliviousness to racial issues; (2) Reintegration suggests that as individuals become aware, they begin to resent ideas of racism and resist thoughts of racism and oppression and perceive people of color as inferior to Whites; (3) Pseudo-independence represents the awareness of White privilege and the long-term impact of oppression and discrimination on people of color; and (4) scores on Autonomy indicate a nonracist identity, wherein individuals embrace racial differences and are committed to equitable treatment of all individuals. The instrument utilizes a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree), with higher subscale scores representing agreement with that particular status (e.g., a high Contact score would represent greater obliviousness to issues pertaining to racism).

Past research indicates high levels of reliability and validity of the WRCDS-R. Lee et al. (2007) revised the original WRCDS-R based on results of an extensive study. The original scale was much shorter, thus Lee et al. conducted individual and focus group interviews with White students to gather feedback. After adding several new items to the original scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. The final 40-item scale shows high reliability, with Cronbach alpha coefficients as follows: (1) .81 for Contact; (2) .86 for Reintegration; (3) .84 for Pseudo-Independence; and (4) .71 for Autonomy. Our past research (Bloom & Peters, 2012) also shows high levels of reliability, with Cronbach alphas ranging from .77 - .84. We again conducted our own reliability analyses and found high inter-item consistency. Cronbach alphas ranged from .72 to .81 for the four subscales.

Open-ended questions. To support the quantitative findings, we also gathered participants’ perceptions about working with diverse students. We collected written responses to open-ended questions at the culmination of their student teaching semester. Based upon prior research (Groff & Peters, 2012), we asked the following five questions: (1) What were your initial impressions about the neighborhood of your fieldwork school?; (2) How did the diversity in your field placement make you think about your own ethnic background and social status?; (3) How have you changed your thinking about working with diverse students?; (4) Has your student teaching experience influenced your level of confidence for working with diverse students?; and (5) Do you think that students of color have biases toward White teachers?

Research design. We utilized a quantitative single group pre-post design. We quantitatively examined pre-post changes on the CoBRAS and WRCDS-R following a semester of student teaching. Qualitative data, responses to the five open-ended questions, were utilized to substantiate the quantitative findings.

Procedures. This study draws upon our own recent research (Bloom & Peters, 2012). Our study was approved by the Institutional Review Board and followed all guidelines for ethical treatment of participants. After gaining approval, one researcher contacted all instructors of all sections of student teaching seminars and received permission to attend all seminars to solicit
participation. A researcher first read the Informed Consent form aloud to each class and collected signed consent forms from those who agreed to participate. Next, the researcher handed out packets that included a demographics questionnaire, the WRCDS-R, and CoBRAS. Participants placed completed packets into individual envelopes, which were collected when everyone was finished. The researcher arranged to revisit the seminar classes at the culmination of student teaching to collect post-test data. At that time, participants were asked to complete the WRCDS-R, CoBRAS, and an additional five open-ended questions. The quantitative data were entered into SPSS, and the open-ended responses were entered into a Microsoft word file to facilitate coding.

Data analysis. For the quantitative analysis, we conducted paired sample t-tests to investigate changes on the WRCDS-R and CoBRAS after a semester of student teaching. For the qualitative analysis, we initiated the coding process, using a reliable, previously validated coding template from a parallel study on WRI as a point of departure (Groff & Peters, 2012). Since the current investigation closely replicates the structure of our prior study, we conducted a confirmatory analysis of the open-ended responses to ensure a reliable coding template for this study. In addition, based upon findings from a previous study by the lead author, we added an additional open-ended question. We deductively coded questions one through four, using the prior coding scheme to examine consistency and discrepancies. For the new question (#5), the responses were compiled and themes/categories developed with a tri-level, recursive analysis, commencing with the extrapolation of descriptive, interpretive, and pattern codes. Once the coding scheme was finalized with satisfactory inter-coder reliability, the researchers proceeded independently to code responses (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

For each open-ended question, inter-coder agreement was greater than .90. A third researcher utilized the coding scheme to independently recode 25 percent of each data set for each of the five questions. Inter-coder agreement remained greater than .90. Given the high reliability, we adopted our pre-established themes/categories derived from our prior work, and added the categories we developed for question five, to code responses. Themes, definitions, frequencies and percentages are reported subsequent to the quantitative data that follow.

Results

Quantitative Results

We first conducted paired-samples t-tests on all subscales of the CoBRAS and WRCDS-R to investigate changes in White racial identity and perceptions of students of color (e.g., color-blindness). The results indicated no significant changes on any of the WRCDS-R subscales; after a semester of student teaching in a racially diverse school; scores on all aspects of WRI (Contact, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy) were similar to scores prior to those student teaching experiences. Therefore, placing students in diverse student teaching contexts with no prior multicultural education coursework did not impact their WRI.

For the CoBRAS, however, we found significant changes on two of the three subscales: Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination and Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues. As previously noted, higher scores on each subscale represent less awareness of societal factors related to race. Examination of the pre- and post-test means illustrated that individuals became less aware (higher scores on unawareness) of these racial issues after a semester of student teaching in racially diverse schools (See Table 2). Therefore, despite experience with students of color during student teaching, student teachers became less aware of institutional discrimination, which represents a denial that racism exist and a disbelief that policies are needed to eradicate the history of the consequences of racism that have permeated institutions (Neville et al., 2000).
Unawareness of Blatant Racial issues represents an overt denial of the pervasiveness of racism in our society (Neville et al.), and again, student teachers showed less awareness of the pervasiveness of racism after experience in a racially diverse school.

Table 2

*Paired-Samples T-Tests Examine Semester Changes on WRCDS-R and CoBRAS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>M Time 1</th>
<th>M time 2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRCDS-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URP</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UID</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBRI</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. URP: Unawareness of Racial Privilege; UID: Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination; UBRI: Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues.

Qualitative Results: Five Open-Ended Questions

We coded all responses to the five open-ended questions. We calculated frequencies and percentages for each question separately, with frequencies representing the number of student teachers whose comments indicated that particular category.

The first question asked student teachers to share their first impressions of the locations of assigned student teaching placements. Most commonly (25%), participants’ comments demonstrated biases, conveying assumptions, expectations, and/or judgments about the students or community, without mentioning any previous personal experience in the school or the neighborhood. Several participants mentioned issues pertaining to safety (16%). Teacher candidates also noted the level of diversity of the school and community (15%), and some remarked either about the similarities or dissimilarities to their prior experiences (12%), with statements that reflected feelings of comfort or discomfort with their placement schools. Other comments referred to economic status or the cleanliness of the environment (See Appendix).

While engaged in the process of coding each response with the designated coding template, we noticed a trend. Student teachers apparently equated diversity with an inner-city environment, noticing people of color, poverty, few employment options, issues of safety, and “shabby” conditions. When discussing diversity, student teachers frequently used terms such as, “dirty and in disrepair,” “few job opportunities,” “uneasiness,” “poverty,” and “people of color.” The second question asked student teachers if they had changed their perceptions about their own ethnicity and social status. See Table 3 for codes, definitions, and exemplary quotes. Thirty percent of respondents noted the level of diversity among their students. Statements also commonly showed that student teachers were aware of the advantages/privileges they possessed in contrast to their students (20%), and other statements suggested they became more cognizant of their race and economic status (15%). Taken together, 35 percent demonstrated an increased self-awareness of the disparity between themselves and the backgrounds of their students. Furthermore, an additional nine percent stated that the setting/environment was familiar/congruent with past experiences, noting the comfortable setting; the student teachers perceived the setting as “ordinary,” “common,” “normal.” A few (7%) reported no change in
thinking about their own race, ethnicity or economic status, or they maintained a belief that everyone learns the same, recognizing the need to treat everyone equally, statements akin to color-blindness (4%).

Table 3
Perceptions of Own Ethnicity and Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Sample Quotes</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level of Diversity          | Awareness about students’ diversity/economic status (either noticing lack of diversity or abundant diversity) | “The diversity in the classroom made me grasp my ethnic background because all of the students are very aware of their backgrounds.”
                                                                                          | “There was not much diversity in my student teaching placement and most of the students were the same ethnic background as me.” | n = 22 (30%)                          |
| Privilege                   | Recognizes advantages or benefits due to one’s own socio-economic or racial background | “I feel that I was much more privileged than the students. And my home life was stable.”
                                                                                          | “The students made me feel as if my ethnic background automatically provided me with better opportunities than my students. Many of them did not speak English and came from broken homes. It made me understand that social status does exist because I had never seen an example of it until my student teaching placement.” | n = 15 (20%)                          |
| Self-Awareness              | Awareness about one’s own race or economic status                             | “It made me feel superior but due to the population being very diverse. I felt I did not belong.”
                                                                                          | “The lack of diversity made me reflect upon my own educational upbringing and the lack of diversity I was exposed to as well.” | n = 11 (15%)                          |
| Familiarity                 | The setting/environment is familiar/congruent with past experiences; experience seems ordinary, common, normal, thus feeling comfortable in the environment. | “The diversity of the community did not make me think of my ethnic background or social status. [Town] is a town similar to my own in economic and diversity.”
                                                                                          | “It appears to me that the students I had the privilege and pleasure to teach were/are very similar to my own childhood background.” | n = 7 (9%)                            |
| No Change                   | Participants stated there was no change in thinking about their own race, ethnicity or economic status | “The diversity of the student population did not play much of a part as I try to teach to the entire group first and then learn individuals preferred learning style.”
                                                                                          | “There really wasn’t much diversity- so I didn’t do much thinking about my own back-ground and social status.” | n = 5 (7%)                             |
| Color-blindness             | A belief that everyone learns the same; recognize the need to treat everyone equally | “I didn’t think about ethnic background going into this internship. A student and myself were the only white people in the class, but it didn’t change my views of anything. Everyone should be looked at evenly.”
                                                                                          | “I actually didn’t think of my background and social status at all. We get children from some of the richest and poorest towns in the state. When they arrived at school the color of their skin and how much money their parents made had no effect on me educating them.” | n = 3 (4%)                             |

The third question asked student teachers if they had changed their thinking about working with diverse students. See Table 4 below for codes, definitions, and sample quotes. One common response (20%) showed that participants felt comfortable working with diverse students. An additional 20 percent indicated that they had not changed their thinking about working with diverse students. Very few offered explanations for this lack of change, but some explanations reflected preconceived bias (e.g., “I knew all the risks of being in the diverse placements, and everything happened as I expected. The schools and the kids were bad, but my
peers, professors, and supervisors warned me. I thought I could make a difference. I could never go through that again.") Another 20 percent of student teachers also remarked about the need to learn about their students’ backgrounds, perhaps a starting point to becoming a culturally-responsive teacher.

Less frequently (5 %), student teachers discussed equality, not equity, stating that race is not a factor in the classroom (color-blindness). The respondents’ comments about equality and equity were used interchangeably, with no indication of an awareness that equality suggests equal outcomes expected for all students and equity means equal access to educational opportunities. The distinction between these terms, used randomly by the respondents, may affect how student teachers interpret pedagogy. Also, a few participants (4 %) either recognized that each student learns differently or that teaching accommodations might be useful to reach each student.

**Table 4**

*Changes in Perceptions about Diverse Students in the Classroom*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Representative Quotes</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>The experience did not change the way they view working with diverse students.</td>
<td>“I haven’t really changed my view” I do not think my views have changed.”</td>
<td>n = 15 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Expressed the need to learn more about cultural differences and understand students' cultural backgrounds and home lives.</td>
<td>“It’s important to learn about their home lives because there is such a large range of support and backgrounds.” “I have not realized that home life and customs are an important part of a child’s life and makeup. And so they should be studied and taken into consideration when having a diverse population in your classroom.”</td>
<td>n = 15 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Participants stated that they feel comfortable teaching in diverse settings.</td>
<td>“Teachers should be using the diversity as a positive learning experience.” “You need to meet all students in terms of diversity. Whether its differences in economics, race, ethnicity, or disabilities.”</td>
<td>n =15 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-Blindness</td>
<td>Belief that skin color does not define students; all students are the same; “everyone is equal.”</td>
<td>“I have come to realize that they are capable of learning just like white students; they should be held to the same expectations.” “I treat everyone the same.”</td>
<td>n = 4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Accommodations</td>
<td>Belief that students need additional support &amp; modified lesson plans; need to reach all students.</td>
<td>“I am more open minded and try to accommodate all different types of students.” “I have seen how I can change the way I respond to them and how much I take their person life into account when I teach them. I try not to let stereotypes affect the way I teach and respond to students.”</td>
<td>n = 3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>Participants stated that they embrace &amp; appreciate unique talents of every individual; they recognize that all students learn differently.</td>
<td>“I have learned to view every student independently and not base anything off of racial stereotypes.” “Each student brings in their own strengths.”</td>
<td>n = 3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, when asked if their student teaching experience influenced their level of confidence in working with diverse students, 75 percent indicated that the experience did influence their
level of confidence, whereas 11 percent stated that the experience did not change their level of confidence. Only two student teachers (3%) reported that their level of confidence in working with diverse students remained the same. Student teachers who reported an increase in their level of confidence gave extremely positive responses. Exemplary statements included, “I never worked with diverse students, and they like me. It was good,” and “I was worried at first working with diverse students, but now I can’t imagine not being in a school with a diverse student population. Yes!” For student teachers who indicated that the student teaching experience had not influenced their level of confidence for working with diverse students, the majority of comments were negative, moving on a continuum from “I don’t know how the cooperating teacher can handle this. The kids need constant discipline,” to blatantly pejorative, “I would never work with these diverse students again!”

The final question, new to this study, asked student teachers if students of color have biases toward White teachers. Forty-four percent said yes. Among these responses, student teachers often attributed biases to students’ home lives, transmission of intergenerational biases, or the neighborhood. Sample quotes included, “At times, some who have been taught all by white people are racist,” and “Yes, because they feel inferior.”

Twenty-five percent of student teachers did not believe that students of color were biased against White teachers, with explanations often related to the establishment of mutual respect during the student teaching experience. Sample quotes included, “No, I think some have respect for them,” and “I do not see that in my school, so I have no reason to believe they are bias [sic].”

An additional 11 percent said that students of color are sometimes biased toward White teachers. These participants typically mentioned conditions that might contribute to biases, such as the student’s background, family, parents, or home life. Examples of statements included, “I do think some students of color can have biases toward White teachers depending on what they were taught and family values,” and “I think that depends on the family values/past experiences. A bias is not something a young student would be born with. It would have to be influenced or experienced.”

**Discussion**

This study examined whether White student teachers changed their White racial identity and color-blindness, as well as their perceptions of working with students of color, following a semester of student teaching. According to the quantitative results, student teachers were more color-blind at the conclusion of student teaching, particularly regarding awareness of institutional discrimination and blatant racial issues. The qualitative data provide additional insight about the challenges White preservice teachers face when working with students of color.

Color-blind racial attitudes have negative effects on teaching and learning, negating the history of racism and discrimination in the United States and its continued influence on people of color. This obliviousness also ignores the influence of a student’s culture on learning (Cross, 2003; Han et al., 2010). Ignoring race enables White teachers to avoid discussions of racism and historical oppression and deny the benefits associated with being White (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Howard, 2010; Zamudio, 2011). As Delgado and Stefancic (2001) state, “Whites do not see themselves as having a race, but being, simply, people. They do not believe that they think and reason from a White viewpoint, but from a universally valid one—“the truth”—what everyone knows” (p. 80). We believe that teacher education must address tenets of White racial identity throughout the curriculum so that preservice teachers continuously reflect on issues of race, including the role that Whiteness plays in their interactions with students of color (Fasching-Varner, 2012).
Many teachers entered their placements with biased expectations, similar to findings from a prior study (Groff & Peters, 2012). Castro (2010) suggested that prior cross-cultural experience makes it more likely that White preservice teachers will have positive views toward teaching diverse students. Although most of our participants noted prior workshops or coursework on diversity issues, it is difficult to discern the quality of their cross-cultural experiences prior to their field placements. We need to ensure that diverse experiences are coupled with background knowledge and critical reflection (Cross, 2005). Failure to effectively address race may promote a color-blind approach wherein White preservice teachers deprecate the value of multicultural education (Han et al., 2010).

We asked participants if their student teaching experiences changed their perceptions about working with diverse students, and forty percent said they either experienced no change or were comfortable teaching diverse students. In addition, a few said that a student’s race was irrelevant, a color-blind approach. One-fifth of the participants stated that they became more cognizant of the need to be culturally aware of their students’ backgrounds (Fasching-Varner, 2012).

Despite the higher levels of colorblindness as measured by the CoBRAS, as well as the number (40%) who noted little change in their perceptions about working with diverse students, the majority of student teachers indicated greater confidence to teach diverse students. We were curious about these apparent discrepancies in the data, and although some student teachers stated the need to know more about their students’ cultural backgrounds, perhaps most desire to appear non-racist, thus ascribing to a color-blind approach.

Critical race theorists believe it is paramount that schools of education address issues related to historical oppression, discrimination, institutional racism, as well as White privilege (Fasching-Varner, 2012; Zamudio, 2011). Ample evidence suggests that Whites resist acknowledging that racism still exists (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001) and avoid discussions of race (Haviland, 2008). Looking at the origins and evolution of American education, it is imperative to explore the effects of institutionalized education on those who have historically been marginalized. If race remains a determinant of increasingly predictable outcomes for students of color in public education, understanding why is central to the issue. As we found in our study, White preservice teachers enter the classroom with biased expectations, based on the location of the school.

We recognize the inequities and de facto segregation still exist across schools in the United States today (Kozol, 2012). When the Supreme Court ruling in the Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) case upheld separate but equal schools, segregation and institutionalized racism were essentially codified and considered acceptable. The ramifications were seemingly redressed with the 1954 Brown v. Board Supreme Court decision to integrate public schools. Frequently cited as a pivotal consideration by the Supreme Court for the transformative ruling is the work of an African-American psychologist, Kenneth Clark, and his co-investigator. Clark reported that African-American children, as young as three, were acutely aware of the social and psychological impact of race, expressing rejection and self-deprecation (Clark & Clark, 1939, 1940, 1950).

When we asked our White student teachers whether students of color harbored biases toward White teachers, most said yes, but primarily attributed the biases to what the students observed or learned in their own personal lives. The student teachers did not exhibit any introspective remarks recognizing that Whiteness carries a sense of dominance and superiority that students feel and react to, covertly or overtly (Fasching-Varner, 2012). Furthermore, White
teachers tend to ignore cumulative negative effects of inferiority that people of color experience (deKoven, 2011). When White teachers fail to openly discuss racial issues or lack acknowledgement of historical oppression and racism, students of color will perceive teachers to be biased. Before White educators can attempt to understand the reasons behind student performance or disengagement from school, they must first understand historical, political, social, and economic issues (deKoven, 2011).

Struggles and challenges persist contemporarily at the state and federal levels of government. The Brown v. Board (1954) ruling underscores the schism between the de jure and de facto realities of our educational institutions. Candidates in teacher preparation programs are still identified as predominantly White, whereas the student body continues to diversify (NCES, 2011).

Castro (2010) investigated changes in the focus of research on White preservice teachers’ views of cultural diversity from 1985 through 2007. He found that White preservice teachers maintained misconceptions; the trend showed that they lacked critical consciousness about privilege and social inequities and held beliefs in meritocracy. Thus, despite over two decades of emerging research and attention to culturally relevant teaching, preservice teachers maintained biases about teaching diverse students (Castro, 2010).

Our qualitative results indicated that after a semester of working with students of color, some student teachers changed their perceptions, with several reporting greater comfort and confidence. Entering diverse settings, many student teachers noticed the differences between the school setting and their own prior life experiences, comparable to prior findings (Groff & Peters, 2012), which also suggested that student teachers frequently felt uncomfortable in a setting that was incongruent with their past experiences.

Although respondents in our study showed awareness of the diversity of their students and noted increased levels of comfort with students of color at the end of the semester, very few expressed any need to adapt their teaching to meet a range of student needs. Cross (2003) provides an explanation of these results, noting that White teachers who espouse color-blindness fail to address students’ cultural backgrounds in their teaching. Han et al. (2010) also note that White teachers with a color-blind approach to teaching might depreciate the value of multicultural education and fail to see the impact of race on learning. Howard (2010) reports that White teachers may perceive other cultures as inadequate, which may account for the preservice teachers’ intransigence and unwillingness to confront the fact that culturally-responsive teaching may be efficacious for the student, inferring the possibility of preconceived notions about students of color and potential inherent biases made manifest in their comments.

Durden and Truscott (2013) provided evidence that even when White preservice teachers articulated culturally relevant teaching strategies for working with diverse students, their classroom behaviors did not exemplify culturally-responsive teaching. Furthermore, one example demonstrated a preservice teacher whose explanations for a culturally relevant lesson reflected a deficit view of student learning (Durden & Truscott, 2013).

Considering all the evidence gathered, it appears that some student teachers in our study began to understand that race is an issue in teaching, yet many remained oblivious or convinced that race did not matter. Culturally-responsive teaching requires, first and foremost, that teachers understand and integrate their students’ cultural backgrounds into teaching (Stairs, 2010). Given that most White preservice teachers enter schools of education with limited cross-cultural experience, preparation programs must include critical content on racism, historical oppression
and White privilege, along with immersion experiences and constant critical reflection (Cross, 2005; Durden & Truscott, 2013; Fasching-Varner, 2012).

To frame the research findings of this study in the context of Helms’s (1990, 1995) theory of WRI development, based on the confluence of both quantitative and qualitative data, our findings suggest that participants remained at what Helms would describe as a lower-level status of WRI development. Institutions of teacher preparation must confront WRI as it pertains to the attitudes and efficacy of White teachers and the effects on student achievement. Mindful of increasingly diverse student populations in our public schools, there is little empirical verification that exposure to diversity impacts WRI and the perceptions of White preservice teachers. Our findings, coupled with the emergent literature on WRI, suggest that avoidance of or minimal attention to WRI perpetuates a systemic stratification in our schools, sustaining the achievement gap and perhaps inadvertently maintains long-standing control by the dominant culture.

Implications for practice. We posit that the development of WRI requires a concerted effort in teacher education programs to prepare candidates poised to enter the profession. There are critical features of all programs that must work in tandem to maximize the likelihood that preservice teachers will make conscious and effective pedagogical choices for their students. The suggestions are: (1) Ongoing dialogue and critical discussion of racial issues in multiple courses throughout all programs (Chao, 2013; Fasching-Varner, 2012; McGaha & Linder, 2012); (2) self-awareness by introspection, reflection, and discussion of personal narratives to facilitate the development of an in-depth and integrated understanding of WRI and its relationship to classroom practice (Fasching-Varner, 2012; Pennington et al., 2012); (3) fluid transitions and support in the field to avoid the possible disconnect between theory and practice in working with students (Cross, 2003; Fasching-Varner, 2012); and (4) immersion in the community where the schools are located (Cross, 2003; Fasching-Varner, 2012).

The efficacy of teacher education may depend on incorporating multiple opportunities to cohesively and systematically address WRI. Based on data regarding current demographic shifts in public schools, preservice teachers are likely to work in racially diverse settings, which may be inconsistent with their own educational and personal experiences. The awareness that White privilege is related to classroom practice and may directly influence students is a point of departure in developing non-racist identities and aspirations of equity and achievement in public schools for all K-12 students.

In summary, we suggest the following steps for promoting multicultural competence and culturally-responsive pedagogy for teacher candidates: 1) Faculty must undergo training on critical race theory, White racial identity, and privilege, and they must be trained on how to integrate this information in their programs and courses; 2) incorporate tenets of critical race theory, White racial identity and privilege throughout the curriculum. This coursework must be simultaneously coupled with reflection and guided dialogue prior to entry into the field and also continue throughout field experiences; and 3) the exploration of counter-narratives that evoke understanding of what it means to be a member of a marginalized group, along with reflection on how students of color perceive White teachers as members of the dominant group, must be a significant component of teacher training.

Limitations

This study examined student teachers placed in diverse schools during one semester at one institution in the northeastern United States. Additional research could replicate this study and include a larger sample of multiple universities to add validity to the findings. Furthermore,
we elected to use the CoBRAS and WRCDS-R to assess color-blindness and White racial identity, and it is possible that items on either instrument might have evoked a social responsibility bias. Items on the instruments might also have influenced student teachers’ responses on the open-ended questions.
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## Appendix

*First Impressions of Fieldwork School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Representative Quotes</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>Statements reflect assumptions and expectations based on race and ethnicity and economic status: passes judgment about students and community without direct experience</td>
<td>“It was very different than my first placement. Due to being a little more urban, I was a little uncomfortable in the beginning because I didn’t grow up in an urban environment.” “I was very leery at first because I know that it was a poorer district and I heard from others that it was incredibly difficult to switch from a private school to a public school. Driving through the neighborhood, it was a little run down, but I wanted to come to a placement with a clear state of mind.”</td>
<td>n = 19 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Discusses whether or not one feels scared or threatened; mentions crime rate or presence of gangs</td>
<td>“I was very skeptical. It was a bad neighborhood, and I have heard about a lot of car break-ins.” “It was very different than my first placement. Due to being a little more urban, I was a little uncomfortable in the beginning because I didn’t grow up in an urban environment.”</td>
<td>n = 12 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Diversity</td>
<td>Discusses the level of diversity in the classroom, school, or community.</td>
<td>“My second placement was in the same district as my first placement. It is a very small population of African Americans and a slightly larger population of English Language Learners.” “My placements were in my hometown. It was how I expected it to be</td>
<td>n = 11 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>The setting/environment is familiarity/congruent with past experiences; experience seems ordinary, common, normal, thus feeling comfortable in the environment.</td>
<td>“My second placement and my first were mostly white. My second placement was pretty suburban.”</td>
<td>“It was very different than my first placement. Due to being a little more urban, I was a little uncomfortable in the beginning because I didn’t grow up in an urban environment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>Mentions the economic conditions of school or community.</td>
<td>“I thought it was middle income based on the houses and overall appearance.”</td>
<td>“It is low income. All apartments with very few houses. Run-down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of Environment</td>
<td>Mentions the physical appearance of the school, classroom, or community.</td>
<td>“First not very clean or nice. Second, suburban, nice area.”</td>
<td>“It was a small town and seemed like a nice place to live and work.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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