

Real or Ideal? A Narrative Literature Review Addressing White Privilege in Teacher Education

Urban Education
2019, Vol. 54(7) 891–918
© The Author(s) 2017
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0042085917690205
journals.sagepub.com/home/uex



Jacob S. Bennett¹, Melissa K. Driver²,
and Stanley C. Trent¹

Abstract

A narrative literature review was conducted to examine how researchers address the concept of White privilege in teacher education using critical race theory. A Boolean search revealed 26 articles met criteria for inclusion. Findings show most researchers ($n = 15$, 55%) investigated perceptions of White privilege within individual multicultural education courses and not comprehensively at the teacher education program level. Many White preservice teachers had difficulty connecting race-based privilege with systemic inequities. Implications for future research and training preservice teachers are provided.

Keywords

race, identity, postsecondary education, programs, urban, social, teacher candidates, urban education, teacher development, White students, White teachers, activism

¹University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

²Kennesaw State University, GA, USA

Corresponding Author:

Jacob S. Bennett, University of Virginia, 405 S Emmet St, Charlottesville, VA 22903, USA.
Email: jb6kw@virginia.edu

According to the Council of the Great City Schools (2016) representing 68 urban districts across the United States, of the 7.2 million students who attend urban schools, 78% are students of color (e.g., Hispanic, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Alaskan/Native American; in-group differences notwithstanding). Conversely, current data from the U.S. Department of Education (2016) show 82% of the teacher population in the United States is White. In their study, Frankenberg and Siegel-Hawley (2008) explained the imperativeness of preparing teachers to work in diverse environments to ensure, “demographic transitions do not destabilize schools and that student performance, among all subgroups, reaches increasingly demanding benchmarks” (pp. 5, 9). Unfortunately, teacher education programs have been criticized for failing to reach diversity standards set by accreditation agencies (Howard & Milner, 2014).

Addressing this state of affairs is important for many reasons. First, Frankenberg and Siegel-Hawley (2008) found White teachers were less likely to receive preparation for working in racially diverse classrooms. Next, more than one in three teachers surveyed in the study reported very little or no training in strategies to help English language learners (ELLs). Policy implications included the need for schools of education to give priority to diversity and equity issues with a focus on multicultural education and race relations. Also, some teacher educators attempted to infuse culturally responsive strategies (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Sleeter, 2008) in their programs to help students develop critical consciousness while keeping cultural backgrounds salient. For White teachers to become culturally responsive, however, scholars (Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2008; Matias, 2013) have argued that they must also examine how Whiteness perpetuates racial supremacy in urban schools across the United States.

This focus is needed because many teachers do not understand the complexities related to teaching in urban school districts, which can result in contentious teacher/student interactions (Milner, 2015). As such, Milner (2015) explained a person’s worldview has a direct connection with their personal and professional agendas. Therefore, whether or not preservice teachers connect race-based privilege with systemic inequities could have practical implications for students in their classrooms. Other researchers support Milner’s claims.

Amos (2011), for example, found White preservice teachers blamed minoritized¹ students for a lack of success rather than acknowledging the systemic inequities that limit opportunities for them in the United States. Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera (2010) argued that students in urban neighborhoods often experience adversity in the form of violence and substance abuse that could increase negative behavior in class and the likelihood of being suspended or

expelled. Making connections between White privilege and systemic inequities also relate to Ladson-Billings's (2006) concept of an "education debt." This concept explicates the false narrative of the achievement gap by highlighting how historic inequities hampered education opportunities for minoritized groups. Preservice teachers who fail to understand systemic inequities in relation to White privilege could perpetuate this false narrative rather than acknowledge the true source of academic deficits. Moreover, such teachers might push for reforms based on ideals of equality rather than equitable reforms aimed at countering historic systemic oppression, the effects of which are still present in urban schools (McPherson, 2011).

We believe teacher educators have an important role in developing curricula that address the concepts of White privilege in relation to systemic oppression. As Alsup (2006) explained, teacher education programs are spaces where future educators should begin developing their professional identities. We believe racialized identities should also be included in this argument. Unfortunately, researchers (Mueller & O'Connor, 2007) have found that many teacher candidates have not explored their identities in this manner prior to enrollment in teacher preparation programs. Grappling with this content and applying it during internships under the direction of teacher educators can give preservice teachers additional time to reflect on how their White identities are tied to the systemic oppression of minoritized groups.

Given these realities, our goal in conducting this narrative literature review was to understand if and how preservice teachers are taught about White privilege and systemic inequities in their preparation programs. Specifically, we sought to answer the following question:

- How have researchers in teacher education addressed the concept of White privilege in relation to training prospective White teachers to work in urban schools?

We do not believe all schools within urban environments are the same. For the purposes of this article, we conceptualize "urban" districts as those surrounded by impoverished neighborhoods largely created by federal policies such as redlining and discriminatory mortgage lending. These policies attributed to the perpetuation of poverty in urban zones across the United States when compared with suburban and rural areas (Sugrue, 2008). Students and teachers in high poverty urban schools often work with inadequate materials, outdated textbooks, and a lack of science and computer labs. Moreover, the amount of college preparatory (AP) classes offered lag far behind schools serving more advantaged populations (Freel, 1998; Hudley, 2013).

Theoretical Frame

The definition of the concept of White privilege has shifted throughout U.S. history (Bennett, 2012). Prior to the 20th century, the term was used to address structural advantages given to Whites in the United States, such as rights to citizenship and ownership of property. It was not until the late 20th century that the present-day understanding of the term, popularized by McIntosh (1988), was adopted. Now, many scholars define White privilege as historic structural benefits resulting in psychological advantages that create different lived experiences for Whites and minoritized populations (Bennett, 2012). For example, Whites have the privilege of not thinking about or discussing their race on a daily basis. Rather, Whiteness has become normalized, and privileges associated with this racial classification are often perpetuated subconsciously (McIntosh, 1988). Leonardo (2004) took issue with this understanding of privilege. He exposed that acknowledging White privilege's subconscious perpetuation allowed Whites to claim innocence in the maintenance of systemic oppression. He explained that critical discussions of White privilege must also acknowledge and examine White supremacy to label the oppressor rather than merely acknowledging the oppressed.

The concept of White privilege as discussed above was used to include specific articles in this review, and critical race theory (CRT) provided the theoretical framework for analysis. Scholars (Chapman, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2013) have labeled Derrick Bell as the father of CRT. Bell (1980, 1991, 1992) developed the concept of "racial realism" which showed that traditional messages of meritocratic lessons such as hard work equating to success did not coincide with the actual lived experiences of minoritized populations. CRT scholars understand that concepts such as colorblindness not only perpetuate racial inequity, but do so under the guise of "fairness" (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2010, p. 40). This perception gave us a useful lens to determine how teacher educators addressed the concepts of race-based privilege and systemic inequities in relation to equity.

Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) were the first to apply the work of Bell (1980, 1991, 1992) and other scholars (Crenshaw, 1991) in the field of critical legal studies (CLS) to education. Gillborn and Ladson-Billings (2010) explained how CRT developed into an important strand of educational theory by allowing scholars to focus on the link between social theory and social activism. Specifically, using CRT in education meant placing race/racism at the forefront of critiques about society and educational inequities. In this vein, Delgado and Stefancic (2012) listed the following tenets as hallmarks of CRT: racism is normal and not aberrant in U.S. society, interest convergence or material determinism, race as a social construction, intersectionality

and antiessentialism, and counternarrative. Based on our goal of understanding how White privilege and systemic inequities are being addressed in teacher education, we chose to analyze the articles found in this review using these CRT tenets.

Within CRT, Delgado and Stefancic (2012) explained scholars could be classified into three basic camps: idealist, realist, or middle ground. As basic descriptors, idealists contend racism and discrimination are maintained in a society through language, thinking, and attitudes. To end racism, idealists argue deficit thinking toward minoritized groups in society must end. Idealist teacher educators addressing White privilege would have goals of changing preservice teachers' perceptions of race to allow them to become better at teaching diverse student populations. This type of goal battles the endemic nature of racism at the individual rather than policy or structural level. For example, Marx (2004) stressed the importance of highlighting participants' deficit views toward minoritized groups to develop student comprehension of how Whiteness perpetuated hierarchical racial ordering.

Alternatively, realists acknowledge the importance of personal attitudes toward racism, but contend racial supremacy is maintained systemically through racial hierarchies. People in the majority racial group allocate benefits such as good jobs to others in their group, which perpetuates supremacy. Realists work less on changing individual perceptions and more on strategies aimed at increasing opportunities for minoritized populations through structural reform. For example, Stovall (2006) argued that educators should not merely aim to change a person's perspective but work to create structural reform within urban communities.

Relative to our review, realist teacher educators might emphasize change occurring at the structural level of schools. For example, providing preservice teachers skills to form coalitions with teachers, parents, and administrators to allow more opportunities for minoritized students to take AP classes and to develop the necessary structural and institutional change for retention, high levels of achievement, and graduation (see Boykin & Noguera, 2011, for an example of how this has been accomplished). This is not to say idealists eschew social action. Again, their focus might be at the individual level—pushing for action to change beliefs rather than at a structural, policy level. A “middle ground” occurs when both forces, cultural and structural, are considered important to negate the perpetuation of racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 25). For example, in his transformational resistance model, Solórzano (2013) took a middle ground approach in which critical personal reflection and identity development were coupled with forms of “progressive resistance” (p. 60), implying the importance of both changing personal perceptions and motivating individuals toward social activism.

Method

According to Petticrew and Roberts (2008), a narrative literature review “refers to a systematic review that synthesizes the individual studies . . . systematically extracting, checking, and narratively summarizing information on their methods and results” (p. 39). Moreover, search and inclusion criteria should be explicitly explained. This type of review provides opportunities to address the self-knowledge and shared educational experiences of researchers (Jones, 2004). We believe this definition was pertinent to our review because of the prevalence of qualitative methods used to study White privilege, resulting in the examination of multiple individual experiences. Narrative reviews are beneficial in providing conclusions for researchers who examine topics that do not have one optimal way of measuring outcomes (Baumeister, 2003). The narrative nature of our review allowed us to examine and describe a wide range of outcomes of research designed to address the topic of White privilege in teacher education.

Data Collection

Selection of articles. Based on the definition of White privilege provided above, we used the following criteria to select articles for our review:

- Study content included a focus on White or race-based privilege. Studies focusing on other types of privilege without race were excluded.
- Preparation program of study was located in the United States.
- Participants included preservice teachers, undergraduate or graduate students in teacher education, or faculty members in traditional or alternative preparation programs. Studies where participants were PreK-12 students, faculty, and staff as well as university students in departments other than teacher education were excluded.
- Researchers reported findings from empirical research designs (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, survey, or mixed methods designs).
- The article was published in a peer-reviewed journal.
- Whole books, book chapters, dissertations, and theoretical manuscripts were excluded based on the lack of peer-review in such publications.

The first and second authors completed simultaneous electronic and ancestral searches for peer-reviewed articles using the online database *PsycINFO* and seven databases from The Elton B. Stephens Co. (EBSCO): *Education Research Complete*, *ERIC* (Education Resources Information

Center), *Education Index*, *Education Full Text*, *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, *Academic Search Complete*, and *SPORTDiscus*. Using the Boolean indicators “or,” “and,” and “not,” the following search terms were entered into databases: *White privilege*, *race-based privilege*, *privilege*, *teacher education*, *prospective teacher*, *preservice teacher*, *teacher preparation*, *alternative certification*, *student teacher*, *teacher development*, *professional development*, and *in-service teacher*.

Initial search results yielded 9,446 relevant articles on *EBSCOHost* and 81 on *PsycINFO*. Based on a large number of authors using the term “White” in myriad ways, an “abstract filter” was applied. To widen the search, the first author’s faculty advisor recommended the terms *faculty development* and *professional development* be included to determine whether these terms would identify articles where faculty were not just teaching but were also participants in the studies. This search yielded 522 articles. Both authors individually read all 522 abstracts to determine whether articles met inclusion criteria, and 60 articles were chosen for inclusion. Both the first and second authors independently read these articles and completed a total of three ancestral searches resulting in 33 more articles for possible inclusion. After reading each ($n = 93$), the final list included 26 articles that met inclusion criteria for analysis.

Data Analysis

The first author developed codes both deductively and inductively. Deductive codes were based on the tenets of CRT provided by Delgado and Stefancic’s (2012) description of the tenets of CRT. These included “endemic racism,” “systemic inequities/social injustice,” “institutional racism,” and “social construction of Whiteness.” Based on multiple readings of the selected 26 articles, deductive codes were determined insufficient in capturing the full expanse of results. Therefore, inductive codes were created to strengthen analysis. For example, the deductive code “social construction of Whiteness” was considered too broad and inductively changed to both “Whiteness as property” and “racial positioning” based on a further reading of the articles. If authors used counterstories to operationalize the tenets of CRT, this strategy was coded as well.

To determine whether the research fell into idealist or realist categories, codes were distinguished between idealist and realist “descriptors” or “implications.” For example, if authors only explained that their participants used deficit language, this was coded as an idealist descriptor. However, if the author recommended teacher educators end the use of deficit language, this was coded as an idealist implication. Deductive idealist

descriptor codes were based on Delgado and Stefancic's (2012) examples of idealist goals, such as "deficit language," "changing attitudes," and "understanding Whiteness." The idealist descriptor code "develop anti-White identities" was created inductively after seeing its usage in multiple articles. Deductive idealist implication codes were "ending deficit mindsets," "ending negative language," "building empathy between races," and "understanding Whiteness."

The same rationale was used for realist codes. For example, a realist descriptor of social activism meant a researcher referenced social action in their study. A realist implication of social action meant the author(s) urged future researchers to push participants toward social action. The first and second authors coded all articles independently. Realist or idealist categorizations were validated for 23 of the 26 articles (88.4%). After further discussion, validation was found for all articles (Table 1).

Before providing our findings, we felt it important to explain one limitation of the current work. Many scholars may disagree with being classified in a linear/binary fashion of realist or idealist in their strategies to battle endemic racism. However, analyzing the data in this way provides a glimpse of how teacher educators are preparing preservice teachers for schools. Specifically, this helps us understand where we are and what we need to do to improve current practices.

Findings

General Findings

Four research teams (Adair, 2008; Fasching-Varner, 2013; Knight & Oesterreich, 2011; Settlage, 2011) made explicit references to urban education in relation to building preservice teacher understanding of White privilege. All implemented idealist strategies of changing preservice teachers' perceptions rather than encouraging them to fight for structural reform. Adair (2008) specifically connected the need for White preservice teachers to be exposed to different forms of cultural capital to begin to work with urban youth of color. Fasching-Varner (2013) addressed the need to understand cultural mismatch between White teachers and their students of color based on the heavily White teaching force. Knight and Oesterreich (2011) sought to understand preservice teacher perceptions of Whiteness and privilege in rural compared with urban settings. Settlage (2011) argued teacher educators should be aware of "counterstories" against generalizations made about White preservice teachers' inability to challenge deficit thinking toward youth of color in an urban elementary school.

Table 1. Characteristics of Identified Studies.

	%	n
Difficulty connecting race-based privilege and systemic inequities	46	12
Ability to connect race-based privilege and systemic inequities	23	6
Goals of connecting Whiteness with systemic inequities	23	6
Goals of understanding Whiteness to teach in diverse settings	46	12
Critical race tenants		
Endemic racism	15	4
Systemic inequities/societal injustice	46	12
Institutional racism	54	14
Whiteness as property	8	2
Counternarratives	15	4
Racial positioning	8	2
Realist descriptors		
Social activism	35	9
References to social justice/change	39	10
Idealist descriptors		
Deficit language/thinking	27	7
Changing attitudes	54	14
Goals of empathizing	31	8
Understand Whiteness	54	14
Develop “antiracist” Identity	15	4
Realist implications		
Social action	23	6
Political action	0	0
Increasing opportunities for minoritized populations	15	4
Importance of unions	0	0
Increasing immigrant quotas	0	0
Idealist implications		
End deficit mind-sets	8	2
End negative language	4	1
More empathy between races	42	11
More understanding of Whiteness	50	13

Note. Twenty-six total articles.

Researchers of 12 (46%) articles explicitly stated participants had difficulty connecting systemic inequities with White privilege. Six (23%) researchers (Kaufman & Hines, 2010; Marx, 2004; Page, 2010; Parks, 2006; Settlage, 2011; Souto-Manning, 2011) explained that by the end of their studies, participants were able to make connections between systemic inequities

and White privilege. Of these six, Kaufman and Hines (2010) and Page (2010) specifically explained their goals of having participants connect systemic inequities with race-based privilege in their multicultural education classes. Four (15.4%) other research teams (Brantmeier, Aragon, & Folkestad, 2011; Fierros, 2009; Galman, Pica-Smith, & Rosenberger, 2010; Glenn, 2012) explicitly stated course goals of having students make connections between White privilege and systemic inequities but failed to report whether those connections were made.

Tenets of CRT

Many researchers made references to the endemic nature of racism in their studies, however, did so using different terminology. Four (15.4%) researchers explained racism was endemic by using the term or describing its meaning as the presence of racism in all areas of society. A majority of researchers used the phrase “institutional racism” ($n = 14$, 54%) to describe its presence. Twelve (46%) researchers used either the term “systemic inequity” or “societal injustice.” Based on descriptions provided by the researchers, we interpreted each term to be synonymous with endemic racism.

To operationalize the tenets of CRT, four (15.4%) research teams addressed the social construction of Whiteness using either the term “Whiteness as property” (e.g., Brantmeier et al., 2011; Fasching-Varner, 2013) or “racial positioning” (e.g., Kaufman & Hines, 2010; Marx, 2004). One team (Allan & Estler, 2005) explained their analysis was informed by “the relatively recent body of scholarship related to the social construction of whiteness and identity” (p. 212). Four (15.4%) teams used counternarratives (e.g., Cooney & Akintunde, 1999; Glenn, 2012; Marx, 2004; Settlege, 2011).²

Idealist Studies (Chronologically)

The majority of studies we found ($n = 21$, 80.7%) fell under the idealist camp of CRT (Table 1). Within these studies, researchers showed goals of understanding and/or changing White preservice teachers’ beliefs in relation to race-based privilege. The research/course objectives, however, end there, with no explicit goals provided to motivate and provide students with tools to create social and structural change.

Lawrence and Bunche (1996) used qualitative methods to investigate perceptions of White middle-class female undergraduate preservice teachers ($n = 5$). The authors specifically referenced institutional racism throughout the study, aligning with the tenet of CRT that defines racism as normalized in society. The goal of the study was to examine the effectiveness of a single-semester

multicultural education course (MCE) in developing antiracist identities among White preservice teachers. This goal was coded as an idealist descriptor based on its connection with changing preservice teacher attitudes toward racism. Findings indicated that at the course's culmination, many students acknowledged White privilege but did not recognize the institutionalized nature of power structures that resulted in White privilege.

Lawrence and Bunche (1996) explained students created "action plans" to apply what they learned to changing their future classrooms (p. 534). We coded this as an idealist descriptor because such actions seemed to be predicated on individual (i.e., changing teacher praxis) and not structural change (i.e., changing school or university policy). Idealist implications were coded based on the authors' recommendation for change to occur in teacher education through the development of multiple courses dealing with issues of race-based privilege and power. This change, however, was focused on helping White preservice teachers develop antiracist attitudes rather than addressing structural inequalities in schools. Therefore, we placed this study in the idealist camp of CRT.

Lawrence (1997) followed three preservice teachers from the previous study into their practicum classrooms. The goal was to investigate whether the conscious White identities developed in the previous study transferred to these settings. All three participants chose practicum schools with majority White populations (information was not provided in relation to the demographics of the local school district to determine whether students had options to work in more diverse school settings). The participant who seemed to develop a deeper understanding of White privilege in the MCE selected a site where staff claimed to be committed to addressing multicultural issues seriously through long-term staff development in multiculturalism. Data analysis revealed this preservice teacher talked about issues of race and racism in her classroom more than other participants. These idealist descriptors, centering on the researcher's focus on language and beliefs, situated Lawrence's (1997) work within the idealist camp of CRT.

Cooney and Akintunde (1999) explained that minoritized students on their university campus felt their views were being alienated in class discussions. These students also felt pressure to assimilate to White culture. Using counterstories, the authors planned a symposium during which White students were given opportunities to learn about "economically oppressed students' struggles to succeed" (p. 2). Specific content of the symposium were not provided; however, it was explained that students learned about systemic inequities in relation to mind-sets and beliefs. We coded this as an idealist descriptive goal. For example, in a reflective journal entry about the symposium, one student explained,

Dr. Akintunde gave us his term “EPD” . . . EPD stands for European Paradigm Domination—the promotion, consciously or subconsciously, of the belief that European life and culture are the neutral basis for all of civilization and thus deserve cultural and humanistic dominance over all life forms. (p. 7)

This description was representative of many of the responses reported, and shows the presenter utilized idealist strategies to combat the perpetuation of racism by hoping to change beliefs and language of White attendees.

Findings from a survey circulated to students in attendance revealed the symposium experience had a significant impact on their understanding of social inequities and bolstered their willingness to “take action” (Cooney & Akintunde, 1999, p. 3). No explanations of the type of specific actions were given, making us hesitant to code this finding as a realist descriptor. Qualitative analysis of reaction papers, however, revealed many students understood inequality from personal perspectives rather than making connections with “systemic or institutional manifestations” (p. 4). This finding, centered once again on beliefs, placed this study in the idealist camp. Idealist implications were given for the development of future symposiums to start conversations about race-based privilege on college campuses.

McFalls and Cobb-Roberts (2001) were interested in understanding, and possibly modifying, White preservice teachers’ beliefs. A quasi-experimental design was used to understand potential preservice teachers’ ($n = 124$) perceptions of White privilege in two prerequisite classes for the college of education. The researchers stated, “to ensure academic success for all students, teachers need to understand, appreciate, and respect the differences their students bring to their classrooms” (p. 164). Participants in their study were placed in either experimental or control groups. Those in the experimental group ($n = 60$) received a lecture about cognitive dissonance prior to participating in conversations about McIntosh’s (1989) *White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack* article. Those in the control group only read the McIntosh article. Results showed that during discussions, fewer experimental group participants responded with denial to race-based privilege compared with those in the control group (McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001). This finding aligned with idealist descriptors based on goals of shifting personal perceptions about diversity. Idealist implications were given urging preservice teachers to learn about multiple viewpoints before entering classrooms.

Using CRT and critical White analysis, Marx (2004) examined the beliefs of nine English-only speaking White female preservice teachers. References to the tenet of endemic nature of racism were made throughout her article. Her goal was to create a “holistic representation” of participant beliefs and experiences while they tutored children of color (p. 34). This goal was coded

as an idealist descriptor based on the implication that understanding beliefs was an important element to battle endemic racism.

Using idealist strategies, Marx (2004) stressed the importance of changing deficit language toward minoritized populations. She explained even though students read works that explored sociocultural differences, they were still influenced by racism when they claimed Whiteness was “normal” or “neutral” (p. 35). Furthermore, Marx explained participants in her study did not understand how racism affected minoritized students’ lives. She argued MCEs did not go far enough to prepare White teachers to successfully teach diverse populations in the United States. Among other things, she recommended teacher educators inform students about how their cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds may have limited their ability to work with minoritized students effectively. This implication was coded as idealist descriptor based on the individualized connotation.

Allan and Estler (2005) were the only researchers to investigate university faculty members’ perceptions of White privilege alone. Faculty members in the Educational Leadership (EDL) department created a critical reading group (CRG) to discuss issues of privilege and power in relation to their own experiences. The authors explained that the working group was “stuck” in their practices of not including issues of privilege and power in course syllabi until they were able to confront their own fears of dealing with issues of identity in the classroom (p. 228). These goals of understanding and modifying identity and behavior were coded as idealist descriptors. Although having university faculty members better understand systemic racism was not mentioned, the authors did make specific references to tenets of systemic inequities and structural racism throughout the article. Members of the CRG wanted to change the department’s commitment to including topics dealing with Whiteness within multiple courses. Even though this essentially could change the structure of the EDL program, such a goal was coded as an idealist descriptor based on the hope that multiple courses would inform White preservice teacher beliefs about privilege and power.

Hill-Jackson (2007) examined how White preservice teachers reflected on ideas of privilege and power by analyzing pre and post-survey results of an anonymous set of students. She used identity development theories developed by Helms (1990), Hanvey (1975), and Banks and Banks (2003) to create three stages of shifting perceptions of racial identity. She explained most students fell in the “unconscious” and “responsive” stages of identity development. Such students either did not acknowledge race as a factor in an individual’s daily experience or became aware of cultural traits of others. No students fell in the highest stage of her racial development scale, “critical consciousness.” She explained one class was not enough for students to

critically question racial hierarchies in society. Being that the goal of her study was to understand student perceptions of White privilege, this was coded as an idealist descriptor. Hill-Jackson (2007) made no recommendations to change the structures of teacher education programs or other elements of society to increase opportunities for minoritized populations.

Mueller and O'Connor (2007) investigated how preservice teachers ($n = 15$) rewrote educational autobiographies when personal pasts were compared with someone considered an "other." The goal was to have participants consider larger structural determinants of educational outcomes. An initial course survey revealed students' inability to connect personal positive educational trajectories with structural privilege. One of the researchers' primary goals was to understand and challenge the personal beliefs of students within the course. These authors went further than others, however, by explaining goals of self-realization were not culminating objectives, but a beginning to the development of equitable teaching strategies. Even though this claim was made, course content was presented to change student beliefs. Strategies to change structures of schools and districts were not identified.

Although course readings seem to have affected many students, others continued to resist the concepts taught. The authors questioned whether resistance to multiculturalism by preservice teachers was a function of teacher educators' failure to address explicitly the moral logic that rationalized unearned privileges. Furthermore, they highlighted the limits of multicultural education based on the lack of programmatic emphasis. The first author explained her difficulty in trying to cover too much information over a short period of time. Goals of changing student beliefs to interact differently with minoritized populations placed this study within the idealist camp of CRT.

Adair (2008) investigated how a "minoritized" group of White male and female preservice teachers ($n = 6$) interacted in a multicultural teacher training (MTT) program with a large number of Latina/o students. She termed the shifting racial power dynamics in the course as a "(de)privileging process" that occurred when White students were no longer the racial majority (p. 139). She defined this process by analyzing speech patterns and beliefs of White students toward their Latina/o classmates. For example, in a class discussion, Latina/o students controlled conversations about bilingualism based on their experience with dual-language interactions. White students in the course had to compromise their beliefs in the economic value of bilingualism for the Latina/o students' views of its moral necessity. Latina/o students argued that ethically, Whites should learn more than one language because they had to as a minoritized population. The primary data source of Adair's research design was how students discussed issues of race and power. This design was coded

as an idealist descriptor based on the emphasis on language rather than structural change.

Adair provided idealist implications by calling for more researchers to determine how White preservice teachers developed empathy and awareness of privilege. She explained everyone in teacher education was culpable in perpetuating a system in which White teachers consistently left urban and poor school districts. Rather than recommending the structures of teacher education programs be changed to provide more opportunities to minoritized populations, she recommended more faculty of color be hired in teacher education programs to provide different perspectives from White teacher educators. We coded this recommendation as idealist.

Fierros (2009) was another researcher who used idealist strategies to combat endemic racism. He analyzed a course designed to help students consider multiple perspectives. In the class, students interviewed members of the faculty who experienced life before and after the *Brown* decision. Scripts were written based on these interviews, and students took on the identity of their interviewee for a culminating performance. Fierros called this approach “performance ethnography,” and explained it could be used to move, “beyond the traditional lecture, in-class assignment, or small-group activity” (p. 4).

Although Fierros (2009) referenced performance ethnography as a way to push students toward social change, he never explained that this was a specific goal of the course or his research. He explained that the performance offered students a, “unique perspective about how other university community members *perceived* the *Brown* decision” (emphasis in original, p. 7). We classified Fierros’s goals with the idealist camp based on his desire to change personal beliefs of White preservice teachers to build empathy with minoritized populations. Fierros gave no realist or idealist implications in his article; therefore, all data were coded as descriptors.

Working in a teacher education program that emphasized social justice, Kaufman and Hines’s (2010) primary goal was to reshape students’ views about White privilege and connect privilege and systemic inequities. Again, goals centering on understanding beliefs placed this study within the idealist camp. The researchers analyzed the effectiveness of one pedagogical tool, an in-class viewing Episode 3 of the video *Race: The Power of an Illusion*, in reshaping student views. The video was used to challenge viewers to, “interrogate what they know and potentially build on and alter their knowledge base” (p. 139). This strategy was coded as an idealist descriptor.

Results were mixed. Some students explained the film provided a lens through which their beliefs of systemic inequities were developed, whereas others continued to question the existence of institutional racism and

systemic inequities. Challenging personal beliefs in relation to privilege and systemic inequities placed this article into the idealist camp.

LaDuke (2009) did not provide specific course resources but described the course instructor as having “developed activities which allowed students to consider their own multiple identities, the lived realities of others, and the role of education as a system of social reproduction” (p. 38). She explained students in the class she observed resisted the instructor’s claim that systemic inequities stemmed from race-based privilege. LaDuke referenced the tenet of endemic racism more than any other researcher in this review. She explained many students were able to accept the reality of discrimination and prejudice but could not connect these concepts with institutional power. Moreover, students resisted the need for strategies of social action based on their rejection of the concept of institutional racism. Goals of understanding student perceptions of beliefs were coded as idealist descriptors. Being that the entirety of her study examined student beliefs to understand how many resisted calls for social justice, we placed this study within the idealist camp.

Adler (2011) used idealist strategies as well as an action research project aimed at determining how her own beliefs affected her ability to accept multiple perspectives of student conceptions of diversity. The goal of her MCE was to create a safe space for preservice teachers to use their own cultures as lenses to examine personal biases. Both of these goals were coded as idealist descriptors based on the desire to understand and shift personal perceptions of students in relation to diversity and bias.

Knight and Oesterreich (2011) compared social identity papers between two teacher education courses held within a rural and an urban teacher education program. The goal of the identity papers was to teach students to address “educational and societal injustices” that the authors explained many of their students had experienced themselves (p. 205). The papers were meant to, “facilitate the implementation of equitable culturally relevant practices with . . . K-12 diverse student populations in rural and urban contexts” (p. 205). Even though these researchers had goals of creating equitable teaching praxis, having students analyze personal beliefs and identities placed this work in the idealist camp of CRT. Furthering this classification was idealist descriptors of participants speaking of their “selves” and revealing ways language was, “contested and legitimized for the benefit of some and not others in both rural and urban contexts” (p. 206). The authors explained such language revealed ways people were identified as “deficient” in society, furthering the idealist classification.

Amos (2011) explained that even after being shown statistics of the income disparities between minoritized populations and Whites, student journals revealed many viewed the United States as a meritocracy and blamed

minoritized individuals for playing the “race card.” Amos believed Whiteness did not allow preservice teachers to connect White privilege with anything more than individual acts of discrimination. Idealist implications were given urging teacher educators to place White preservice teachers in racially diverse field experiences to expose them to different perspectives. Although this could change the structure of teacher education programs, this recommendation seemed to have been made to expand the worldviews of White preservice teachers and not increase opportunities for minoritized groups, aligning this study with the idealist camp of CRT.

Brantmeier et al. (2011) investigated online collaborative learning modalities (CLM) used to augment discussions in a MCE. Idealist strategies were used by developing course content that included the examination of current political issues such as affirmative action with objectives of having students introspectively examine their social identity. Brantmeier et al. (2011) found engagement in the CLM forums resulted in participants’ understanding of a “systems reality” in which they realized they were controlled by larger power structures (p. 5). Coded as idealist implications, the authors recommended the use of CLM forums for students to develop ideas of privilege. They also concluded that allowing more time for preservice teachers to think about privilege could improve their abilities to connect racial privilege with systemic inequities.

Settlage (2011) hoped to show how accounts of White preservice teachers becoming antiracist allies could be considered “counter-stories” to the master narrative (p. 812). He assessed student reflections called “3R” (Review–Reflect–Response) papers in a science methods course that, “explicitly emphasized the persistent gaps in achievement between students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds” (p. 814). Furthering the idealist classification based on an emphasis on shifting beliefs, he explained that encouraging White preservice teachers to examine their cultural histories and reject color-blind perspectives was important to becoming effective teachers. Idealist implications were provided that encouraged teacher educators to change their own beliefs and view their White students as future allies who possessed, “assets upon which we can build more culturally responsive dispositions and practices” (p. 812).

Souto-Manning (2011) gave students surveys to investigate attitudes toward racial privilege based on personal cultural identities. Again, an emphasis on beliefs classified this work as idealist. Early survey results showed students did not connect systemic inequities in the United States with race-based privilege. Qualitative findings revealed Boalian theater games such as “The Power Shuffle” and “Columbian Hypnosis” provided a safe space for students to experience how White supremacy was veiled in society. In debriefings,

students explained they were shocked to see how prejudiced the society was. The games allowed White participants to consider other experiences besides their own and exposed how a White majority defined what was “normal” in society. Analysis of initial quantitative survey data revealed many White preservice teachers blamed families of students of colors for academic failures. Such views shifted in post-Boalian survey results, indicating more awareness of racial privilege. Souto-Manning referenced social activism once in her study in relation to individualist goals of creating skills to build caring communities. This was coded as an idealist implication, and emphasis on personal beliefs placed her study within the idealist camp of CRT.

Glenn (2012) utilized the tenet of counternarrative to understand how texts written by and about minoritized populations might allow preservice English teachers to think deeper about race and become better prepared to teach in racially diverse settings. She believed that fictional stories might allow preservice teachers to question “normative depictions” of society and consider the lived experiences of minoritized youth (p. 331). Findings were mixed. Some students built understandings and empathetic feelings for minoritized populations, and others remained unable to make such connections. Glenn described the “normalization” of White culture as inhibiting empathy toward minoritized groups (p. 338). She went on to explain many students maintained deficit mind-sets toward minoritized populations. Goals of changing preservice teacher beliefs and possibly allowing them to make connections between White privilege and systemic inequities were coded as idealist descriptors and aligned her study with this camp of CRT.

Curry (2013) collected data from reflection papers written in two sections of a MCE. Her analysis was based on word frequencies and text search queries to determine what words students used. She triangulated usage with student’s race and gender. She explained, “I wanted to understand how candidates spoke about race, and how these conversations tended to play out along racial and gender lines” (p. 31). This emphasis on language was coded as an idealist descriptor and placed Curry’s work within the idealist camp of CRT.

Fasching-Varner (2013) addressed the need to understand cultural mismatch between White teachers hoping to teach in urban schools. He interviewed White preservice teachers after taking a diversity education course and before entering classrooms as student teachers. Fasching-Varner contended that racialized belief systems in the United States necessitated careful attention to how linguistics served to represent internalized beliefs. He described White racial bonding as a product of linguistic markers that played a major role in perpetuating White privilege. He went on to explain that once it was understood how preservice teachers’ beliefs manifested, commonalities could be identified and used to better understand how Whiteness

operated. Findings included White preservice teachers using the semantic move “Uh . . . you know” when speaking about issues of race and power (pp. 33-34). In his conclusion, Fasching-Varner provided idealist implications by contending that teacher educators must seek to disrupt Whiteness in the teaching force by examining preservice teacher narratives and breaking through the socialization process to develop more equitable teaching strategies. No recommendations were given about changing the structures in which teachers would be developing such equitable praxis.

Approaching Realist or Middle Ground Perspectives (Chronologically)

The following researchers went beyond the previous ones in our review. Similar to those discussed thus far, each of the following explained goals of understanding beliefs and changing attitudes of preservice teachers. However, they also attempted to move preservice teachers toward social action to create structural change.

Hytten and Warren (2003) investigated perceptions of White privilege within a single MCE. Their intent was to examine systems of power and culture, aligning their work with the endemic racism tenet of CRT. The authors indicated, “names like bell hooks, Richard Dyer, and Ruth Frankenberg roll[ed] off their (students) tongues as easy as you please” (p. 65). These researchers, however, questioned the genuineness of students who claimed to understand how race-based privilege and power perpetuated racism. Similar to Amos (2011), Glenn (2010), and Marx (2004), the authors stated, “Whiteness *was* a discourse of power that worked to maintain power imbalances” (emphasis in original, Hytten & Warren, 2003, p. 67). The authors went beyond these researchers, however, by using discourse analysis to develop strategies students used to protect the dominance of Whiteness: Appeals to Self, Appeals to Progress, Appeals to Authenticity, and Appeals to Extremes.

Within the “Appeals to Progress” category, Hytten and Warren examined students who held realist goals of social activism by questioning the authenticity of such views. The researchers explained students who called for the class to “take action” held the belief they already fully understood “theories of Whiteness.” Furthermore, these students’ calls for action were usually accompanied with a “missionary-like zeal” (p. 74).

The authors explained that calls to action were not the problem. Problems arose when calls were set up as binaries to reflection, when the latter was not seen as an integral part of action or considered a barrier. Such instances were coded as realist descriptors and moved Hytten and Warren (2003) closer to

realist perspectives in their goal of understanding how White preservice teachers created discourses of Whiteness that perpetuated power through language and beliefs. The researchers expressed middle ground perspectives by acknowledging how both identity development and calls for social action were important to battle endemic racism.

Bullock and Freedman (2006) made no specific references to the tenets of CRT. Aligning with the idealist camp, students completed a survey to assess their attitudes regarding diverse populations. Realist implications were provided for teacher educators, however, with the authors' claims that, "transformation of systems of oppression must take place on multiple levels, including institutional, societal, interpersonal, and intrapersonal" (p. 148). Realist descriptors of social activist strategies also emerged from their findings. In journal entries, some students expressed desires to become active in educating other Whites about power and privilege. This finding, however, seemed consistent with individualized idealist strategies based on the students' goals to become activists to change the attitudes of Whites rather than work to change societal power structures. Therefore, we placed this study in the middle ground based on the idealist descriptors and realist implications provided above.

Parks (2006) made references to the tenet of endemic racism throughout her article. She analyzed 150 admissions and MCE papers dealing with issues of culture and diversity. She explained that in admission papers (before taking the MCE course), students did not connect systemic inequities with White privilege or Whiteness. After the course, however, students began to show understandings of, "how schools operate in the larger social order and their role as teachers in perpetuating the status quo" (p. 48). Similar to Bullock and Freedman (2006), Parks (2006) approached the realist or middle ground camps in her statement that her article, "substantiates that teacher education can in fact change students' beliefs and help preservice teachers recognize their ability to be and create agents of social change" (p. 46). This quote showed Parks' contention that idealist strategies of affecting personal beliefs were important in creating opportunities for realist strategies of structural reform.

Galman et al. (2010) analyzed White preservice teacher attitudes toward White privilege in single MCEs. Students had difficulty connecting race-based privilege with endemic racism. Unlike other studies found in this review, the researchers focused on their own beliefs toward privilege and power alongside an examination of how preservice teachers experienced race and racism. Silence and desires to not offend each other were seen as possible barriers to deeper conversations between the research team about race-based privilege throughout the study. Idealist goals of understanding how their lives and the lives of their students were shaped by racism to end systems of oppression were explained. Findings from their study emphasized the

Whiteness of the researchers as another possible barrier in motivating their students to become social activists. This finding implied a goal of the course was to motivate students to become said activists, moving these researchers closer toward a realist or middle ground perspective.

Page (2010) investigated how teacher educators used Whiteness and White privilege as tools to train and reshape preservice teachers' perceptions of Whiteness in a 2-year teacher training program. The only researcher whose study was outside of a single class (or reading group) and at the programmatic level, Page explained professors developed activities aimed at linking racism and class inequity to larger systemic oppression. After a semester and a half engaging in coursework dealing with the concept of White privilege, students reflected more on race while completing writing assignments. Many, however, still did not connect privileges with systemic inequities. By the end of the program, interview data showed approximately one third of the cohort connected systemic inequities and power with race. Page identified simulations such as privilege walks to be particularly useful in accomplishing this. Page's research also followed participants into their classrooms as inservice teachers to determine how well the cohort was rated by their principals in their ability to interact with minoritized students. She explained that the program

mirrored the dimensions found in the literature: we taught about identity and knowing oneself; we taught about power, equity, and systemic racism; and we taught about transforming words and actions to create change in the systems in which we work. (p. 9)

Although understanding identity aligned with the idealist camp of CRT, goals of changing words to actions that created structural change situated Page's work closer to the middle ground.

Discussion and Implications

Being that many ($n = 22$, 84.6%) researchers found in our review did not specifically address the need for teacher educators to understand White privilege and systemic inequities in relation to urban students, we contend more needs to be done. Our review showed many researchers held idealist goals of analyzing language and changing personal perceptions of White preservice teachers to combat racism. Our discussion will address possible barriers to moving beyond idealist strategies within teacher education, as well as provide a feasible blueprint for programmatic change. Although idealist strategies are important in attempting to combat oppression in the United States, it

is our contention that such strategies must not be culminating objectives. Teacher educators who strive to give preservice teachers tools to work in urban areas are remiss if they do not address systemic inequities with goals of inspiring systemic reform.

The tendency to address White privilege using idealist perspectives might occur for a variety of reasons. First, as shown by Helms (1990), identity development takes time. In addition, the lack of time afforded teacher educators outside of single MCEs (e.g., field placements) to address systemic inequities in relation to White privilege and identity development could play a role in limiting the type of course and program designs aimed at promoting structural reform. Unfortunately, even with multiple researchers over almost 20 years (Brantmeier et al., 2011; Fasching-Varner, 2013; Lawrence & Bunche, 1996; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007) recommending more than one course be taught to address multicultural issues, the majority of the studies in this review took place within individual courses or single-day multicultural classes ($n = 20$, 76.9%). Multiple courses, however, may still not be enough for students to acknowledge racial privilege and make connections with systemic inequities if these courses are not strategically and developmentally designed. Moreover, for change to occur at the institutional level, efforts must be recursive, longitudinal, collective, and community based. Only one study (Allan & Estler, 2005) gave specifics as to how teacher educators worked collectively to address issues of racial privilege, power, and systemic inequities within their institution.

Multiple researchers (Amos, 2011; Galman et al., 2010; Glenn, 2010; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Marx, 2004; Souto-Manning, 2011) explicitly interpreted Whiteness as a barrier between preservice teacher acknowledgment of race-based privilege and systemic inequities. Of this group, Galman et al. (2010) were the only researchers to address how Whiteness affected their own research efforts. This finding points to a very important issue that goes ignored in many teacher education programs. It appears that teacher educators expend significant energy attempting to prepare preservice teachers to address the needs of minoritized students. However, a missing link might be interrogation of individual and collective beliefs among teacher educators about the role of Whiteness and privilege in perpetuating systemic inequities.

In his seminal work, Scheurich (1993) explained White researchers had a responsibility to make, "White racism a central, self-reflective topic of inquiry within the academy" (p. 9). White privilege manifests in the structures of our daily lives through policies and networks created to benefit those who adhere to the socialization practices of the dominant White racial group in society. Scheurich urged White teacher educators to realize how Whiteness blinded many to the perpetuation of privilege and power in academics through

ideals of individualism. We agree with this assertion; however, we contend more must be done. It is imperative that along with identity development, White educators also provide themselves and preservice teachers with tools such as training in collective action, readings on nonviolent protest strategies, and negotiation techniques to become social agents of change in the fight against structural racism.

Although the majority of researchers included in this review lacked realist goals in their work, we commend them all for taking on important issues such as race-based privilege and systemic inequities in their classrooms and research. Such work is important due to the possibility of contentious interactions between minoritized youth and White teachers who do not understand the reality of systemic inequities in the United States as explained in the outset of this review. Through our own teaching experiences, we understand how difficult and frustrating this work can be.

We conclude by providing an example of how the topic of structural racism might be incorporated into a developmentally designed teacher education program that includes idealist and realist perspectives. Such a program might show preservice teachers that schools are microcosms of a larger society that historically have set up systems to maintain White supremacy. Early foundational courses taken by preservice teachers could be designed with idealist goals of identity development. Upper level courses such as methods and curriculum design could build on foundational knowledge by including discussions of current issues that show how systemic oppression works in the United States. For example, as we write, two African American males, Alton Sterling of Baton Rouge and Philando Castile of St. Paul, were murdered by White police officers, adding their names to a long list of similar tragedies. This time, however, a member of the Black community retaliated against White police officers in Dallas by murdering five. Students could analyze how both the liberal and conservative media reported these killings. Analysis could be centered on addressing what happened to the media coverage about the two Black victims after the White police officers were killed. Such analysis could be connected to other relevant current issues that show these events were not isolated.

Students in math methods courses could study statistical data dealing with racial disparities in police brutality. In literacy methods courses, students could research how the individuals involved in precipitating events were portrayed in both print and televised media. Teacher educators and their students could then learn side-by-side, through reading, research, and letter writing campaigns to law enforcement agencies and state legislators about how to use this careful analysis to generate collective social action to combat injustice (we believe this possibly should be done in a class of students interested in

social justice prior to entering the course being that these students may be more motivated to work toward systemic change). This work at the program level would have to be planned, coordinated, and evaluated recursively by administrators, teacher educators, practitioners, and preservice teachers as they apply these tools during their internship and early career experiences.

Finally, it is unfortunate that most ($n = 22$, 84.6%) of the studies found in this review did not specifically address connecting race-based privilege with systemic inequities in conjunction with preparing preservice teachers to teach in urban settings. This is important because, as we outlined in the beginning of this article, more minoritized students are being served in these settings. Given that misconceptions and misinterpretations of minoritized students are more pervasive in these schools, it is imperative that more teacher educators design programs where urban schooling is a primary, explicitly identified focus because students in these schools are more likely to experience inequities in their daily lives. As Bell (1991) explained, if individuals continue to understand racism as an aberration in American history, it will lead to far more despair and anguish than realizing its permanence. Such a realization does not mean that individuals should resist fighting racism, but rather create more effective strategies to battle its endemic nature. A case in point is the example we provided about police brutality and the *Black Lives Matter* movement. Although this content should be a focus in any program, preparing preservice teachers to acknowledge the connections between Whiteness and endemic racism and giving them tools to address this issue in urban classrooms can equip them and their students to oppose injustice collectively and within the context of their lived experiences.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. This term was chosen based on Apple's (2013) usage to highlight the contextual dependency of labels such as minority or majority.
2. This researcher used counternarratives of White preservice teachers who acknowledged race-based privilege as counterstories for researchers who claim this group is incapable of doing so.

References

- Adair, J. (2008). White pre-service teachers and “de-privileged spaces.” *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34, 189-206.
- Adler, S. M. (2011). Teacher epistemology and collective narratives: Interrogating teaching and diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 609-618. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.10.015
- Allan, E. J., & Estler, S. E. (2005). Diversity, privilege, and us: Collaborative curriculum transformation among educational leadership faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 29, 209-232.
- Alsop, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Amos, Y. T. (2011). Teacher dispositions for cultural competence: How should we prepare white teacher candidates for moral responsibility? *Action in Teacher Education*, 33, 481-492.
- Apple, M. W. (2013). *Can education change society?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2003). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Writing a literature review. In M. Prinstein & M. Patterson (Eds.), *The portable mentor: Expert guide to a successful career in psychology* (pp. 57-71). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518-533.
- Bell, D. A. (1991). Racial realism. *Connecticut Law Review*, 24, 363-379.
- Bell, D. A. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bennett, J. (2012). *White privilege: A history of the concept* (Unpublished master's thesis). Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- Boykin, A. W., & Noguera, P. (2011). *Creating the opportunity to learn*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brantmeier, E. J., Aragon, A., & Folkestad, J. (2011). Examining collaborative learning modalities (CLM): Critical multicultural education online? *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 5, 5-18.
- Bullock, P. L., & Freedman, D. M. (2006). (Re) visions to a secondary teacher education course: Trials and triumphs in attempting to disrupt hegemonic understandings and performances of education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 135-149.
- Chapman, T. K. (2013). Origins of and connections to social justice in critical race theory in education. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 101-112). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chubbuck, S. M., & Zembylas, M. (2008). The emotional ambivalence of socially just teaching: A case study of a novice urban schoolteacher. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45, 274-318.
- Cooney, M. H., & Akintunde, O. (1999). Confronting white privilege and the “color blind” paradigm in a teacher education program. *Multicultural Education*, 7(2), 9-14.

- Council of the Great City Schools. (2016). *Fact sheet and statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.cgcs.org/Page/72>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241-1299.
- Curry, K. (2013). The silenced dialogue and pre-service teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 20(2), 27-32.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Fasching-Varner, K. J. (2013). "Uhh, you know," don't you? White racial bonding in the narrative of white pre-service teachers. *Educational Foundations*, 27(3-4), 21-41.
- Fierros, E. G. (2009). Using performance ethnography to confront issues of privilege, race, and institutional racism: An account of an arts-based teacher education project. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11, 3-11.
- Frankenberg, E., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2008). *Are teachers prepared for racially changing schools? Teachers describe their preparation, resources and practices for racially diverse schools*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Freel, A. (1998). Achievement in urban schools: What makes the difference? *Education Digest*, 64(1), 17-22.
- Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2010). Aggressive and tender navigations: Teacher educators confront whiteness in their practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 225-236.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 106-116.
- Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2010). Education and critical race theory. In M. Apple, S. Ball, & L.A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 37-47). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Glenn, W. J. (2012). Developing understandings of race: Preservice teachers' counter-narrative (re)constructions of people of color in young adult literature. *English Education*, 44, 326-353.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39, 59-68.
- Hanvey, R. (1975). *An attainable global perspective*. New York, NY: Center for War/Peace Studies.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hill-Jackson, V. (2007). Wrestling whiteness: Three stages of shifting multicultural perspectives among white pre-service teachers. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 9(2), 29-35.
- Howard, T. C., & Milner, H. R. (2014). Teacher preparation for urban schools. In R. Milner & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *Handbook of urban education* (pp. 199-216). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hudley, C. (2013, May). *Education and urban schools: The American mythology continues to insist that education is the path to the middle class for those strug-*

- gling to escape the grip of poverty. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/indicator/2013/05/urban-schools.aspx>
- Hytten, K., & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16, 65-89.
- Jones, K. (2004). Mission drift in qualitative research, or moving toward a systematic review of qualitative studies, moving back to a more systematic narrative review. *Qualitative Report*, 9, 95-112.
- Kaufman, J. S., & Hines, S. M. (2010). Cultivating an understanding of privilege among teacher candidates. *Race, Gender & Class*, 17, 135-147.
- Knight, M. G., & Oesterreich, H. A. (2011). Opening our eyes, changing our practices: Learning through the transnational lifeworlds of teachers. *Intercultural Education*, 22, 203-215. doi:10.1080/14675986.2011.592035
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 206-214.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Critical race theory—What it is not! In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 34-47). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- LaDuke, A. E. (2009). Resistance and renegotiation: Preservice teacher interactions with and reactions to multicultural education course content. *Multicultural Education*, 16(3), 37-44.
- Lawrence, S. M. (1997). Beyond race awareness: White racial identity and multicultural teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, 108-118.
- Lawrence, S. M., & Bunche, T. (1996). Feeling and dealing: Teaching White students about racial privilege. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12, 531-542.
- Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy beyond the discourse of “white privilege.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36, 137-152.
- Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 37, 31-43.
- Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo’self before you wreck yo’self and our kids: Counterstories from culturally responsive white teachers? . . . To culturally responsive white teachers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 68-81.
- McFalls, E. L., & Cobb-Roberts, D. (2001). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 164-172.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *A Personal Account of Coming to see Correspondences through work in Womens Studies*. Working Paper 189, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, Mass: Wellesley College.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 49(4), 10-12.

- McPherson, E. (2011). Moving from separate, to equal, to equitable schooling: Revisiting school desegregation policies. *Urban Education, 46*, 465-483.
- Milner, H. R., IV. (2015). *Rac(e)ing to class: Confronting poverty and race in schools and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Mueller, J., & O'Connor, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and "others": How pre-service teachers (re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 840-856. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.01.011
- Page, M. (2010). Pedagogy of privilege: White preservice teachers learn about whiteness. *Teaching & Learning, 24*, 3-21.
- Parks, M. W. (2006). I am from a very small town: Social reconstructionism and multicultural education. *Multicultural Perspectives, 8*(2), 46-50.
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2008). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1993). Toward a white discourse on white racism. *Educational Researcher, 22*(8), 5-10.
- Settlage, J. (2011). Counterstories from white mainstream preservice teachers: Resisting the master narrative of deficit by default. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6*, 803-836. doi:10.1007/s11422-011-9324-8
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feimen-Nemser, J. D. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (Vol. 3, pp. 559-582). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Solórzano, D. G. (2013). Critical race theory's intellectual roots: My email epistolary with Derrick Bell. In M. Lynn & A. Dixson (Eds.), *Handbook of critical race theory in education* (pp. 48-68). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2011). Playing with power and privilege: Theatre games in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 997-1007.
- Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*, 243-259. doi:10.1080/13613320600807550
- Sugrue, T. J. (2008). *Sweet land of liberty: The forgotten struggle for civil rights in the north*. New York, NY: Random House.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *The State of Racial Diversity in the Educator Workforce*. Retrieved January 14, 2017 from: <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/report-state-racial-diversity-educator-workforce>.

Author Biographies

Jacob S. Bennett is a doctoral candidate at the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia.

Melissa K. Driver is an assistant professor at the Bagwell College of Education at Kennesaw State University.

Stanley C. Trent is an associate professor at the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia.