Peters et al.

Letter of Reconciliation

Dear Editor Schreiber,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript, “What's Race Got To Do With It?: Preservice teachers and white racial identity.” We have reviewed the concerns and recommendations, and below are the details of our revisions according to the 8 bullet points noted. In addition, we have unblinded the manuscript. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Terri Peters, Ph.D.

**1. “Regarding the study’s theoretical framework, the reviewers requested a**

**clearer statement of and justification for their theoretical framework, as**

**this is essential to examining the constructs of whiteness, race, and/or**

**identity. Sociocultural theory and critical race theory might be useful to**

**guide the authors and the readers' thinking about these big constructs. The**

**reviewers acknowledge that (some of) these constructs were examined in the**

**literature review section, but connecting these ideas to a stronger**

**theoretical foundation would increase the rigor of the manuscript.”**

We added two paragraphs on critical race theory on pages 6-7 as an overarching theory that addresses White racial identity and White privilege. It also has implications for teacher preparation programs.

**2. “Concerning the literature review, the reviewers requested adding more**

**articles on white racial identity and review of white privilege, including a**

**clear definition.”**

Within the discussion of critical race theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate; Fasching-Varner & Siriki; Lynch), additional information is included on White racial identity and privilege.

We also included a definition of White privilege at the beginning of the manuscript, in the first paragraph on page 4.

**3. “Page 7: “Furthermore, we must recognize a unified definition of**

**diversity and convey to all stakeholders what racial diversity means.” The**

**reviewers were wondering what “unified diversity” means here. How is**

**diversity defined for the purposes of the study?”**

We eliminated this statement, as it seemed out of place. As described in the research questions, as well as the “Participants and Context” section, this study is about racial diversity.

**4. “Page 9: As stated, the research questions are yes/no questions and do**

**not appear to capture the qualitative data. They should be revised accordingly.”**

We maintained the first research question (about changes in White racial identify) and added three others. We felt that we needed to include separate research questions for White racial identity (measured by the WRCDS-R) and color-blindness (now research question #2 and measured by the CoBRAS). We also added two questions that better align with the main focus of the survey data we collected from open-ended questions. This also required us to slightly modify the Abstract (adding the word “colorblindness”) and add the word “colorblindness” to the first statement in the Discussion section.

**5. Methodology:**

**“The reviewers suggest deleting the label of a mixed methods study, instead**

**describing it as quantitative. Qualitative methods, as of right now, are not**

**effectively covered or described in the Methods section/chapter and this**

**lack of focus on qualitative methods is evident in the presentation and**

**discussion of the results as well. Alternatively, the manuscript can be**

**revised to make a stronger case for its mixed methods nature.”**

We rewrote the design as a single group pre-post design, thereby reframing this as a quantitative study. This also required rewriting (eliminating the reference to a mixed method design) the Abstract.

**“The reviewers also suggested that, since a t-test was conducted, using**

**more than one school/more than 80 participants would strengthen the validity**

**of the study’s results.”**

Unfortunately, we only have these specific data from one institution of higher education and do not have data from other participants. We addressed this limitation under the new “Limitations” heading we added at the end of the paper.

**“One reviewer also wondered if the CoBRAS instrument can in fact prevent**

**bias in the responses.”**

We added a “Limitations” section at the end of the manuscript and addressed this under that heading.

**6. “Regarding the presentation of the results, the reviewers made two major**

**requests for revisions:**

**“First, on page 16, they found that a more detailed interpretation of the**

**quantitative results is needed. The table presented here was not explained.”**

We added several explanatory statements. For example, the original manuscript stated, “The results indicated no significant changes on any of the WRCDS-R subscales.’ We added, “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.

We also added a statement to explain what the means represent: “As previously noted, higher scores on each subscale represent less awareness of societal factors related to race.” We followed this by explaining what the two significant findings represent. “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.”

**“On page 17, regarding the qualitative results: While the frequencies and**

**percentages of the student teachers’ writing are presented, it was not**

**explained what these percentages really mean. The reviewers requested**

**additional interpretation for the qualitative findings in relation to the**

**theory and literature review. An attempt should be made at explaining why**

**the student teachers did not change their perceptions or what additional**

**things can be done to support the transformation of their thinking and**

**experience while working with students of color.”**

**“Concerning Table 3, the reviewers suggested either moving it to the**

**Appendix or presenting it in a different format.”**

We moved Table 3 to the Appendix. We, therefore, relabeled the other tables (3, 4 rather than 4, 5) for proper sequencing.

**7. “Concerning the discussion, the reviewers suggested providing suggestions**

**for what can be done to lead transformation if placement of student teachers**

**in diverse settings is not enough.”**

This had already been addressed on the bottom of page 31/top of page 32. To clarify this, we added a heading, “Implications for Practice.” In addition, we added a summary paragraph (right before “Limitations”) that lists 3 important steps.

**8. “Finally, regarding the conclusion and recommendations, the reviewers**

**requested providing additional information with examples. For instance, is**

**there scholarship that discusses teacher education programs that have**

**effectively implemented diverse teaching perspectives in their curriculum?**

**If not, what are some steps a teacher education program can take to**

**incorporate these concepts in their courses or learning outcomes? Further,**

**providing suggestions for future research would also strengthen the**

**manuscript.”**

We addressed this in the summary paragraph that outlines 3 steps to enact change, and we discussed the need for future research in the new “Limitations” section.