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ABSTRACT

This research study examined constructs and beliefs essential to culturally responsive teachers for the purpose of understanding corps members’ needs and promoting culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) in the Colorado region of Teach for America (TFA). This study employed a transformative, sequential mixed methods design with a theoretical lens of CRP and a corresponding framework for preparing culturally responsive educators described by Villegas and Lucas (2002). First, a quantitative phase assessed participants’ levels of intercultural competence, colorblind racial attitudes, and White racial identity attitudes at two times—upon entering TFA (n = 139) and after one year of teaching and training (n = 78). The quantitative data were used to describe corps members and to determine change over time. Next, a qualitative phase employed stratified sampling with replacement based on Time 2 levels of intercultural competence as measured by the IDI (Hammer, 2009). A total of seven corps members were grouped into three levels of intercultural competence—low (n = 3), mid (n = 3), and high (n = 1)—and were individually interviewed about beliefs regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning. The qualitative data were analyzed for emerging beliefs within
groups and themes across groups. The qualitative data added richness to the quantitative profiles and furthered the understanding of corps members’ needs.

Results of this mixed methods research study indicated that TFA’s current program, selection, and training processes may result in colorblind corps members who minimize cultural differences, including the strengths and experiences of students of color, and negate the importance of CRP. Because Colorado TFA is seeking to adopt a culturally responsive approach, Colorado TFA must intentionally and explicitly shift: (1) its outcomes for students; (2) its desired teacher actions; (3) its professional development and training. Educational theory on CRP and preparing culturally responsive educators suggests that the development of intercultural competence, color-consciousness and White racial identity will produce culturally responsive educators and will ultimately result in positive and transformational outcomes for students.
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Chapter 1: Overview of Research Study

The disparity in educational experiences between low-income students, who are often from communities of color, and their more affluent White peers is well documented (Ayers, 2001; Kozol, 1991, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2006). So, too, are the education gaps that result from this disparity (Ayers, 2001; Chapman, Laird, Ifill, & Kewal Ramani, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). As an example, the National Center for Education Statistics published that in 2009, “The event dropout rate was 4.8 percent for Blacks and 5.8 percent for Hispanics, compared to 2.4 percent for Whites” (Chapman et al., 2011, p. 5). The gap also exists when one compares “relative numbers of students who take advanced placement examinations; enroll in honors classes; . . . and are admitted to colleges and graduate and professional programs” (Ladson-Billing, 2006, p. 4).

Teach for America (TFA) is an organization that has committed itself to eliminating educational inequity and closing the above education gaps (Kopp, 2001). TFA believes educational inequity leads to an unlevel playing field where low-income students do not have the adequate skills and knowledge needed to compete and achieve success in society (Farr, 2010). Farr of TFA explained:
Education can and should be a great equalizer . . . [but] our system of education undermines, suppresses, and denies the potential of millions of children living in poverty . . . Living up to our ideal as land of opportunity means we all have a level playing field, regardless of our race, socio-economic status, and background. (p. 227)

Therefore, TFA recruits with a poster that reads: “Teach for leveling the playing field.”

TFA is “highly selective” (Farr, 2010, p. 273) and enlists recent top college graduates to commit to teaching for two years in America’s poorest rural and urban school districts (Farr, 2010; Kopp, 2001). Farr explained, “We recruit individuals who have the skills and commitment to make an impact on the academic prospects of students growing up in low-income communities and to exert long-term leadership in the effort to eliminate educational inequity” (p. 273). Although TFA makes a “particular effort to recruit members who share the racial and socioeconomic background of the students” (Farr, 2010, p. 274) they serve, the teachers—called corps members (CMs)—are predominantly (60-70%) White (Farr, 2010; Teach for America, 2010b). These CMs provide a “quality” education for poor students who are mostly (90%) of color (Farr, 2010; Teach for America, 2010b).

A quality education means that CMs ensure their students master academic skills and content, without excuses (Farr, 2010; Kopp, 2001). Farr explained, “We do not have to accept that children of color and children from low-income communities lag behind students in other communities” (p. 228). By equipping low-income students with the

---

1 Observed in Colorado and Oklahoma TFA Offices in 2011
same academic skills and content as their more affluent and White counterparts, TFA believes it is leveling the playing field (Farr, 2010); it is giving low-income students the chance to acquire the academic content and skills they need to compete with higher-income individuals and succeed in life.

If educational equity is merely a level field where all students have mastered academic standards, then TFA’s approach is sufficient. Leading scholars in the field of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP), however, believe that academic achievement is not enough; scholars assert that leveling the field by ensuring mastery of academic standards can equate to assimilation (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). CRP theorists, including Gloria Ladson-Billings, Geneva Gay, Sonia Nieto, and Maria Salazar, show how educational inequity is much more than a disparity in resources and rigor. Educational inequity is also a difference in what is believed to be “normal,” “right,” and “relevant” and often results in devaluing low-income students’ cultures, languages, and identities (Delpit, 1994; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 2006; Nieto, 1999; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). Therefore, giving low-income and minority students access to the same rigorous academic opportunities and resources is not enough and is not true equity. Instead of leveling the field, CRP theorists believe in changing the game through the practice of CRP.

Culturally responsive pedagogy is defined by Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994) as a: . . . pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Such cultural referents are not merely vehicles for bridging or explaining the dominant culture; they are aspects of the curriculum in their own right. (pp. 17-18)
CRP is validating, transformative, and empowering for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Gay, 2000). CRP ensures that students accomplish the following: (1) academic mastery (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995); (2) a positive personal and cultural identity (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1999); and (3) a critical, sociocultural consciousness (Banks, 1991, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001). To realize these objectives, educators must intentionally employ culturally congruent curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Salazar, 2008). Additionally, educators must consciously practice critical pedagogy and purposefully teach dominant culture tools such as Standard English in an additive, neutral, and transparent way (Delpit, 1995; Giroux, 1985; Nieto, 1999; Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001). Lastly, educators must actively build a supportive, collaborative, multicultural environment rooted in relationships where they know students—including their cultures—well (Ayers, 2001; Gay, 2000; Lipman, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999).

Statement of Problem

Situated in the context of the larger problem of educational inequity is CO TFA’s desire to effectively and sincerely employ CRP (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010; Teach for America Colorado, 2011). Although CO TFA knows generally that it wants to adopt a culturally responsive approach, it does not have a clear, conceptual definition of CRP, including fundamental outcomes/aims and teacher actions; nor does CO TFA have a definitive framework of culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC) or, in other words, a description of the necessary underlying
mindsets, knowledge, and skills of culturally responsive educators (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010; Yu, 2011).

To effectively employ CRP in the CO region, CO TFA also needs CMs who possess CRTC. CRTC, in part, is made up of three essential constructs: intercultural competence, color (racial/racism) “awareness,” and a positive, racial (White) identity (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). CRP educators must also believe that culture matters in teaching and learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 2006; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). These three essential constructs and this belief do not represent the whole of CRTC, but they are fundamental and establish a solid foundation for culturally responsive pedagogy to be employed.

CO TFA is unsure how to facilitate the development of these three essential constructs and the belief that culture matters in its CMs (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010; Yu, 2011). Therefore, CO TFA needs recommendations for the design of its professional development programming—including curriculum, instruction, and assessment—to develop culturally responsive educators. (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010; Yu, 2011).

**Purpose of Study**

The main purpose of this research study is to conduct a baseline/needs assessment providing data on the three constructs (intercultural competence, colorblind racial attitudes, and White racial identity attitudes) and the belief that culture matters in teaching and learning. These constructs and belief emerge out of the literature on CRP as essential for culturally responsive educators. This baseline/needs assessment has three main goals: (1) to provide quantitative profiles of intercultural competence,
colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes of incoming CMs (Time 1) and CMs after one year of training and teaching (Time 2); (2) to describe changes in those profiles over time and determine statistical significance of that change; and (3) to qualitatively explore participants’ beliefs regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning. The results from this research study aid in making recommendations for professional development aimed at preparing culturally responsive CMs. All of these recommendations taken together can result in CO TFA promoting CRP and achieving student outcomes beyond academic achievement and “leveling” the field.

**Research Questions**

This transformational, sequential mixed-methods research study answers three main questions:

1. What is the profile of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes for Teach for America corps members upon entrance and after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in corps members’ levels of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region?

3. What are the beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning of corps members of differing levels of intercultural competence?
Rationale for Research Questions

Research question one explores and describes profiles of CMs for each construct—intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes—incoming and after one year, to understand needs for first-year programming and second-year programming. Profiles will inform which areas and concepts are in need of improvement and development. Furthermore, given that intercultural development and White racial identity development are process models, evaluating CMs also provides information on developmental readiness of CMs and, therefore, how to structure (sequence) professional development (McAllister & Irvine, 2000).

Research question two evaluates and describes changes in each construct—intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes—over one year’s time in order to see if there is growth, stability, or regression. TFA has never conducted any pre/post assessments or formally explored the impact of the first year experience and training in terms of diversity, cultural competence, and racial attitude development. Determining change over time begins the process of formally evaluating effectiveness of current and future culturally responsive professional development programming.

Research question three explores beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning of participants of differing levels of intercultural competence. Question three adds richness to the quantitative examination of research question one, specifically at Time 2. It also explores how the non-education-specific construct of intercultural competence translates into beliefs about culture in the specific context of teaching and
learning. The results of this exploration can be used to design the most targeted and
effective professional development programming.

The rationale for choosing Hammer’s (2009) construct of intercultural
competence for stratification is two-fold. First, intercultural competence and its
corresponding measure were deemed most valuable, reliable and valid by the managing
staff of CO TFA (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010). Second, unlike
colorblindness and its corresponding measure, intercultural competence is a
developmental process, and its measure places respondents on the developmental
continuum in one of five stages (Hammer, 2009). Therefore, understanding levels of
intercultural competence is visual, more intuitive, and conceptually more clear.

**Significance of Study**

Overall, this study has the potential to directly impact the training and
professional development experience of TFA CMs in the CO region. According to Will
Seamans, the senior managing director of programming for CO TFA, there are currently
235 CMs in the CO region, of whom approximately 69% identify as White (personal
communication, June 8, 2011). The CO region, however, aims to grow to 800 CMs by
the 2013/2014 academic year, more than tripling the potential impact (W. Seamans,
personal communication, June 8, 2011). Furthermore, what is found to be relevant and
effective in one region may be applied to other regions. TFA has a total of 39 regions
with more than 8,200 CMs, with 68% of those CMs identifying as “White” (Teach for
America, 2010b, “Regions” & “Diversity in the Corps”). TFA’s website reported,
“Roughly 80 percent of the students we reach qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch,
and more than 90 percent are African American or Latino” (Teach for America, 2010b,
“Regions”). Therefore, this research study has the potential to impact all CMs (in classrooms and as alumni) and their students. Additionally, what is learned in this line of research need not be limited to TFA professional training and development; it can also be relevant to general teacher preparation and educators who work with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

**About the Researcher and the Partnership with Teach for America**

My partnership with TFA began in the summer of 2001 when I joined the TFA Atlanta region. Because I had been a high school English teacher for three years and had earned a Master of Arts degree in instructional strategies, I was not a traditional TFA CM. As Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman (2004) reported, “Most TFA recruits do not have education-related majors in college and, therefore, have not received the same training that traditional teachers are expected to have” (p. xi). Even with my teaching experience, I found my two-year commitment challenging.

I was assigned to teach science and language arts in a middle school in a very segregated and poor African-American community near the Georgia Dome. I experienced dysfunctional systems and school structure, witnessed systemic low expectations, and was forced to utilize quick fixes and “teacher-proof” programs that I felt were ineffective and unjust. As a part of TFA, I was pushed to take responsibility for my students’ learning, to hold high expectations, and to help students realize significant academic gains. I was not, however, pushed or taught to be culturally responsive, to use critical pedagogy, or to question the curricular and instructional methods handed down by the district. I finished my two-year commitment disillusioned with urban public
education and confused about the impact TFA has on truly eliminating educational inequity.

In 2003, I left Atlanta and moved to Denver to be on a team opening a progressive charter school for urban youth. One year after my move, I also enrolled at the University of Denver to pursue a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with a focus on Urban Education. It is then that I met my advisor, Dr. Maria Salazar, and was exposed for the first time to CRP. I embraced the theory and began reflecting, researching, and practicing.

In 2007, CO TFA sought volunteers to help with professional development sessions. At this time, I had mixed feelings toward TFA. As a progressive educator committed to CRP, I felt that TFA was working to close the achievement gap, but its methodology had a cost to students: cultural identity. Furthermore, I did not feel that TFA CMs were being trained to facilitate transformation; instead, in my opinion, they were trained to facilitate assimilation. After some key discussion with CO regional staff, I learned that key CO regional leadership and staff had the desire to become culturally responsive and work toward an expanded, culturally responsive definition of an excellent education; therefore, I committed to leading lunch discussions around issues of diversity, equity, power, privilege, and access.

These lunch discussions eventually led to a formal partnership with the CO region and a mutual commitment to creating and implementing substantial and intentional
professional development programming aimed at developing “diversity” competencies called Diversity, Community, and Achievement (DCA) programming. For the 2010/2011 academic school year, after two years of planning, acting, reflecting, and refining DCA programming, CO TFA and I decided to employ research methodology to better inform our work (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010).

Defining Key Terms

1. **Critical, Sociocultural Consciousness**: An awareness that power is unevenly distributed in society and that “social institutions . . . are generally organized to advantage the more powerful groups” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). It also includes an ability to see, analyze, and redress inequality and oppression in social institutions, interpersonal interactions, and one’s own thoughts and behavior.

2. **Critical Pedagogy**: Curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices whose objective is to “encourage students to develop their own ability to critically analyze the social structures that surround them in order to redress inequality and ultimately transform society” (Kwock Ho, 2009, p. 37).

3. **Culture**: “. . . the ever-changing values, traditions, social and political relationships, and worldview created, shared, and transformed by a group

---

2 The two academic years include 2008/2009 and 2009/2010.
of people bound together by a combination of factors that can include a common history, geographic location, language, social class, and religion” (Nieto, 1999, p. 48).

4. **Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP):** an educational theory and practice that is inherently additive and transformational for low-income and culturally and linguistically diverse students and results in the acquisition of dominant culture academic content and skills, development of a positive personal and cultural identity, a critical lens, and the skills needed to change society. Culturally responsive pedagogy also refers to the methods used to bring about these ends and includes culturally congruent curriculum and practices, the use of critical pedagogy, and the establishment of a supportive, collaborative, and multicultural environment based on relationships and knowing students and their cultures well.

5. **Culturally Responsive Teaching Competence:** The ability of an individual teacher to enact the theory of culturally responsive pedagogy sincerely and effectively. This ability is a combination of a number of necessary mindsets, knowledge, and skills and can either be perceived and self-reported by an individual teacher (expressed in an interview or assessed by a measure) or observed (evaluated by another using a rubric or observation protocol).
6. **Colorblindness (CB):** A racial perspective where one denies the existence of racism and the impact race has on people’s lives (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000).

7. **Intercultural Competence (IC):** The “capability toward observing cultural differences and commonalities and modifying behavior to cultural context” (Hammer, 2011).

8. **Intercultural Development (ICD):** The progressive and ordered process of gaining intercultural competence.

9. **Transformative:** Long-lasting and pervasive change including the development and acquisition of skills, content, and mindsets needed to become socially critical and to define and achieve success in life, including positive, cultural identity development.

10. **Transformative Education:** Helping “students to develop the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become social critics who can make reflective decisions and implement their decisions in effective personal, social, political, and economic action” (Banks, 1991, p. 131).

11. **Transformational Resistance:** “refers to student behavior that illustrates both a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice. In other words, the student holds some level of awareness and critique of her or his oppressive conditions and structures of domination and must be at least somewhat motivated by a sense of social justice” (Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001, p. 319).
12. **White Racial Identity Attitudes (WRIA):** Self-conceptions and beliefs of White people with respect to membership in their own (White) racial group in comparison to what they believe about and how they react to people of other racial groups (Helms & Carter, 1990).


**Chapter Summary**

This chapter presented an overview of this research study and described the problem it addresses: CO TFA needs help shifting to a culturally responsive pedagogical approach and, subsequently, designing and implementing culturally responsive teacher training and development. This research study examines the intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes, as well as beliefs about the role of culture in education to assess, in part, CMs’ culturally responsive teaching competence upon entrance into the CO region and after one year of teaching and training. This research study is significant because results can be used to inform training and professional development of CO TFA corps members and promote culturally responsive pedagogy in the region. Additionally, this research study’s conclusions and implications may be useful to other TFA regions across the nation and to the field of teacher education. The next chapter provides a review of the literature on TFA, CRP (and culturally responsive teaching competence), and the essential constructs evaluated in this study—intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity development.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The segregation of low-income students who are also typically students of color is still rampant in America (Kozol, 2005). So, too, is the educational inequity that comes with segregation (Ayers, 2001; Kozol, 1991, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Educational inequity most apparently manifests itself as schools with low expectations, intolerable and unhealthy environments, unqualified teachers, inadequate resources, and purchased “teacher-proof” curriculums and management programs (Kozol, 1991, 2005). This disparity in education results in achievement gaps, namely significant differences on standardized achievement tests as well as disproportionate graduation rates and incarceration statistics (Ayers, 2001; Chapman et al., 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Teach for America Colorado, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

This review of literature shows that Teach for America (TFA) is committed to ending educational inequity and closing the gaps by providing the opportunity for low-income students to attain an excellent, academically rigorous education (Kopp, 2001; Teach for America Colorado, 2011; Yu, 2011). However, this review of literature also shows that TFA’s approach may not be wholly on track or sufficient. Additionally, this review of literature presents an alternative theoretical approach—culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP)—and Villegas and Lucas’s (2002) framework as a valuable framework of culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC) that can be used for preparing teachers. Lastly, this review of literature shows how examining intercultural competence,
colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes—and the belief that culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning—represents assessing a significant portion of CRTC. To achieve the above aims, this review of literature is divided into five main sections.

The first section is about TFA, including a description of its history, program design, and training and professional development. The second section is a critique of TFA’s definition of an “excellent education,” its approach to solving inequity, and, subsequently, its teacher preparation and professional development. The third section presents an alternative theory of an excellent education—culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP). This section defines CRP, presenting it as a series of attributes, aims, and actions.

The fourth section posits that to enact CRP as described in the third section, educators must possess culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC). The fourth section of this literature review articulates a framework for CRTC using Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) work on preparing culturally responsive educators. In this fourth section, Villegas and Lucas’ work is narrowed and their three fundamental orientations become the focus. These three fundamental orientations are reconfigured into three essential characteristics and an essential belief and are then matched to three measurable constructs—intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity development. The fifth and final section defines each essential construct and provides a review of relevant literature.

Section 1: Teach for America

**Historical and programmatic context.** Teach for America’s tagline reads, “One day all children will have the opportunity to attain an excellent education.” Teach for
America (TFA), an organization founded by Wendy Kopp in 1990, attempts to eliminate educational inequity and break the cycle of poverty (Kopp, 2001). Educational inequity occurs when the quality of education (including, but not limited to, material resources, instructional space, school leadership, and teaching staff) differs greatly for certain groups of people, usually groups defined in terms of race and class (Ayers, 2001; Kopp, 2001; Kozol, 1991, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Sonia Nieto (1999), a leading multicultural theorist, explained, “In this way, education differs little from society in general, which regularly has distributed rewards and privileges along lines of race, class, and gender, among other differences” (p. 23). Educational inequity leads to a great achievement gap between low-income communities and more affluent communities (Farr, 2010; Kopp, 2001; Kozol, 2005). The achievement gap in this case is best understood in terms of the difference in outcomes, including great disparities in proficiency on state standardized assessments, graduate high school, and go to college (Ayers, 2001; Chapman et al., 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Teach for America Colorado, 2011; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Additionally, because of institutional racism and discrimination, many students in low-income schools are students of color; therefore, the achievement gap extends to a gap between students of color and White students (Chapman et al., 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Teach for America Colorado, 2011).

TFA firmly believes there is a cycle of poverty and discrimination that sustains educational inequity and the achievement gap (Teach for America, 2010b, “The Challenge”). Succinctly put, TFA believes that low-income students have greater needs because of the challenges of poverty and discrimination. Schools in low-income communities do not have the resources to meet the extra needs of their students because
of institutional discrimination and prevailing ideologies. Therefore, students in low-income communities struggle to achieve academically, which seemingly confirms the negative stereotypes and prevailing ideologies and prevents the investment of new resources into low-income community schools and districts. The achievement gap is therefore created and sustained indefinitely (Teach for America, 2010b, “The Challenge”).

Kopp (2001) wanted to close this achievement gap for students immediately and permanently. This was translated into a short-term mission of corps members (CMs) having an immediate impact in their classrooms and a long-term mission of CMs creating systemic change (Kopp, 2001). TFA’s Theory of Change states: “In succeeding with their students, corps members gain added conviction that educational inequity is a solvable problem, a still stronger sense of personal responsibility for solving it, and a grounded understanding of the problem in all its complexity and of the solutions” (Teach for America, 2010b, “Diversity”). Therefore, TFA’s approach to solving the problems of educational inequity and the achievement gap is also cyclical.

TFA believes that the solution cycle begins with CMs working relentlessly to have an immediate impact in their classrooms, closing the achievement gap for their current students, and facilitating enduring academic growth (Farr, 2010; Kopp, 2001; Teach for America Colorado, 2011). In doing this, CMs realize that the achievement gap is a solvable problem, one that can be fixed with a system that invests resources into low-income communities, holds high expectations, and employs committed and capable staff (Kopp, 2001). CMs develop the above disposition and the desire to help realize this systemic change. CMs, therefore, as professionals in the fields of medicine, law,
business, and education, work to bring about this systemic change (Teach for America, 2010b, “Our Approach”). Kopp (2001) explained this long-term and societal impact:

. . . a national teacher corps could produce a change in the very consciousness of our country. The corps members’ teaching experiences were bound to strengthen their commitment to children in low-income communities and spur their outrage at the circumstances preventing these children from fulfilling their potential. Many corps members would decide to stay in the field of education. And those who would become doctors and lawyers and business people would remain advocates for social change and education reform. They would become school board members. They would become mayors, state legislators, U.S. senators and Supreme Court justices. And they would make better decisions because of their experiences teaching in public schools. (p. 6)

Since its inception, TFA has grown tremendously, becoming a dominant presence in American low-income public schools. In their own words, “We have become one of the nation's largest providers of teachers for low-income communities, and we have been recognized for building a pipeline of leaders committed to educational equity and excellence” (Teach for America, 2010b, “History”). Currently, TFA serves 39 different rural and urban regions. There are over 8,200 CMs teaching in low-income schools with more than 500,000 students impacted annually (Teach for America, 2010b, “Our Current Reach 2010/2011”). Additionally, TFA has more than 20,000 alumni, 67% of whom are still directly involved in education.\(^3\).

**Professional development of corps members.** TFA accomplishes its immediate academic impact of significant and enduring academic achievement through intense

\(^3\) Percent is an average from the 2009 and 2010 TFA Alumni Survey, unpublished.
professional development of CMs who primarily are not trained teachers (Sawchuk, 2009). The summer CMs matriculate they attend a rigorous five-week institute where they take classes and teach summer school (Sawchuk, 2009). Once placed in their regions, they receive on-going professional development for the entire two years (Sawchuk, 2009). The professional development includes seminar days, professional learning communities, and one-on-one support (Farr, 2010; Sawchuk, 2009). CMs are assigned a program director (PD)—recently renamed manager, teacher leadership development (MTLD)\(^4\)—who supports and evaluates their professional growth and academic impact (Farr, 2010; Sawchuk, 2009). Additionally, CMs have access to web-based support where they can access lesson ideas, view exemplar lessons, and find student resources (Farr, 2010; Sawchuk, 2009).

**Teach for America Academic Impact Model (AIM).** TFA believes students’ academic achievement stems from teachers’ mindsets, knowledge, and skills (Farr, 2010). This is called the Academic Impact Model. Simply put, teachers’ underlying mindsets (beliefs), knowledge (content area and knowledge of education theory), and skills lead to teachers’ actions. Teachers’ actions impact students’ actions that, in turn, lead to student outcomes. In theory, if teachers have the “right” underlying mindsets, knowledge, and skills they will then have the “right” actions; therefore, students will complete tasks and act in ways that will lead to academic achievement and growth (Farr, 2010).

\(^4\) This name was changed for the 2011/2012 school year and forward.
**Teaching as Leadership Framework.** For TFA the “right actions” are defined by the Teaching as Leadership (TAL) framework (Farr, 2009). In an interview with EdWeekly, Wendy Kopp said, “We have spent years trying to understand what the most successful teachers in under-resourced communities do to obtain great results” (Sawchuk, 2009, p. 3). Farr (2010) explained further:

> Through observations, interviews, and surveys, we have literally and figuratively stood in thousands of halls between teachers who are getting merely good results from their students and teachers who are making dramatic, life-changing [academic] progress. (p. 4)

The book *Teaching as Leadership* (Farr, 2010) describes what they learned: there are six general principals that distinguish the actions of “highly effective” teachers (p. 4). They include: (1) set big goals; (2) invest in students and their families; (3) plan purposefully; (4) execute effectively; (5) continuously increase effectiveness; and (6) work relentlessly (Farr, 2010, p. 5). These six traits make up “Teaching as Leadership” (TAL)—“a framework of principles and teachers’ actions distinguishing teachers whose students, despite starting behind and facing huge challenges” demonstrate significant academic gains (Farr, 2010, p. 5).

The TAL framework has been translated into a set of professional standards and more specified teacher actions, called the TAL rubric. This rubric is used to assess TFA CMs and guided their professional development; in the end, though, CMs’ performance are not judged on their own behaviors or their scores on the TAL rubric; rather, CMs’ performance are determined by how their students perform (Farr, 2010; Sawchuk, 2009). It is expected that CMs’ students will achieve significant academic gains. This is defined as moving student learning forward by 1.5 grade levels, closing achievement gaps by 20
percent, or ensuring that 80 percent of grade-level standards are mastered within one academic year (Farr, 2010, p. 286). Additionally, it is expected that CMs will ensure *enduring* academic growth.

For TFA, enduring academic growth has been referred to as “transformational” and is described as the extent to which “students emerge from classrooms on a path of extended opportunities due to major academic and personal growth” (Teach for America, 2011). TFA believes that to achieve enduring and transformational change, students must be on a mission toward a destination that matters to them and engaged deeply with content and skills needed not only for proficiency in a course, but also for success beyond the current course (Teach for America, 2011). Therefore, TFA provides professional development aimed at preparing CMs to facilitate significant academic gains and enduring change (Teach for America, 2011; Teach for America Colorado, 2011).

**Diversity, community, and achievement.** Part of the professional development described above includes specific diversity training called Diversity, Community, and Achievement (DCA) that aims to develop competencies and dismantle stereotypical mindsets. The term “diversity” in diversity training is defined by TFA as:

> The differences that exist between people across lines of race and ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, gender, age, religion, political opinion, language, ability, etc. . . We also pay special attention to race and class because these identity markers are highly correlated with widespread patterns of low academic achievement in our schools. (Teach for America, 2010, p. 6)

TFA created DCA programming in response to two realities: (a) CMs mostly serve communities that are culturally, linguistically, and socio-economically diverse and often different than the racial and socio-economic backgrounds of CMs (Teach for America, 2011).
America, 2010), and (b) the achievement gap is linked to issues of racial and socio-economic discrimination (Teach for America, 2010; Teach for America Colorado, 2011).

First, it is well known that over 90 percent of the students that TFA CMs serve identify as African-American or Latino (Farr, 2009, p. 8). Diversity training helps CMs collaborate and communicate with people who are different from CMs (Teach for America, 2010). Second, the achievement gap is linked to issues of racial and socio-economic discrimination (Teach for America, 2010; Teach for America Colorado, 2011). Understanding the strength, complexity, and depth of this link allows CMs to formulate better solutions to close the achievement gap. Additionally, TFA believes that because this link is pervasive, it allows CMs the chance to work against any previously internalized negative messages about specific groups of students and communities before entering classrooms (Teach for America, 2010).

DCA programming follows TFA’s standard academic impact model with a few modifications; namely, TFA broadens “students’” actions to “others’” actions because diversity training allows teachers to plan and initially work more effectively with students and others—including colleagues, leadership, families, and community members—to produce positive outcomes for students (Teach for America, 2010). Also, there is a focus on how diversity training enables CMs to more accurately interpret the actions and outcomes of others that lead to “better” mindsets, knowledge, and skills. TFA believes this developed “diversity foundation” leads to more appropriate actions and reactions, which lead to better student outcomes (Teach for America, 2010).

Colorado regional diversity training. In Colorado, the regional leadership has made an effort to emphasize DCA programming, making it more substantial and
intentional (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010). For the 2010/2011 academic year, every CM was required to complete 12 hours of DCA programming. Three of the 12 hours was time set aside for writing reflections at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The protocol that guided this written reflection can be found in Appendix A. To complete the other nine hours, CMs had several options. They could attend one-hour DCA workshops on professional development days throughout the year. Alternatively, CMs could join an on-going small group that met several times throughout the semester to read a book or explore, in depth, a topic like “White Privilege.” Another option was attending a DCA dinner night at which people gather to discuss a topic for an evening. There were usually pre-readings associated with this option. Other choices to complete the requirement were developing an independent study, attending a conference and workshops in the community, or attending community/cultural events and reflecting on those events through a written response (Teach for America Colorado, 2010).

Section 2: Leveling the Field is Not Enough

Through its mission statement, TFA defines educational inequity as low-income students not having access to an excellent education (Kopp, 2001). TFA’s solution, then, to education inequity lies in it’s definition of excellent. If excellence is merely defined as educational experiences, curriculum, and physical resources that will ensure mastery of dominant culture content and skills, then TFA’s approach is enough. An excellent and just education, however, is more. An excellent and just education includes relevant
curriculum and instruction, truly transformative\textsuperscript{5} educational experiences, and, most importantly, it comes without a cultural cost (Banks, 1991, 1994; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela; 1999).

Dr. Maria Salazar, an education researcher, professor, and Latina, explained the devastating results of her own experience with education geared toward the acquisition of dominant culture content and skills. Dr. Salazar was educated in a low-income Denver Public School. Dr. Salazar’s teachers had the best of intentions and provided her with access to content and skills prized by the dominant culture. Dr. Salazar wrote of her education:

My teachers taught me the essentials: reading, writing, and math. However, I never saw myself reflected in the content or context of my schooling. As a consequence, my teachers inadvertently taught me that people who looked like me had little value. I remember wishing my skin away in the third grade, wishing I could be white. I had come to associate whiteness with success and brownness with failure. I was overwhelmed with feelings of shame over the most essential elements of my humanity: my culture, my heritage, my language, and my parents. I learned to read, write, and do math … it came at a heavy cost. (Salazar, Lowenstein, & Brill, 2010, p. 27)

Dr. Salazar’s experience shows that leveling the field and ensuring low-income and culturally and linguistically diverse students’ mastery of academic content and skills (no matter how enduring) is not enough and is definitely not eliminating educational inequity

\textsuperscript{5} Transformative here means long-lasting and pervasive change, including the development and acquisition of skills, content, and mindsets needed to become socially critical and to define and achieve success in life, including positive, cultural identity development.
if these students leave classrooms and schools hating who they are, ashamed of their families, and rejecting their native languages.

Along with the idea of subtractive schooling is the critique that TFA’s approach trains students to fit into an unjust society rather than to become social critics who work to right social injustice. Geneva Gay (2002), one of the leading culturally responsive theorists, explained, “The cultural affiliation and understanding, knowledge, and skills needed to challenge existing social orders and power structures are desirable goals to be taught in schools” (p. 30). In the opinion of this researcher, TFA (national organization), however, has not adopted this stance and works solely to improve enduring academic achievement.

Additional critiques of TFA’s approach to preparing teachers for diversity come from leading education theorists, including Linda Darling-Hammond. In Darling-Hammond’s 1994 article she charged through interviews and a review of literature that TFA CMs are racially insensitive and unable to understand and identify with the children and communities they serve. She posited that TFA’s training and philosophy position children of color and low socio-economic status as “others” and outside normal. However, there is one research study that confirms high levels of racial insensitivity in CMs.

The one study that explored content similar to Darling-Hammond’s critique and the constructs of this research study is Kwock Hu’s (2009) dissertation. Kwock Hu employed a case study qualitative design to determine the extent to which the learning experiences and curriculum constructed and planned by one second year CM reflected equity pedagogy. In this study, equity pedagogy is defined by four key components: (1)
tools of power and access; (2) culturally relevant instructional practices; (3) supportive classroom environments; and (4) critical pedagogy. Kwock Hu's study also identified school-site factors that inhibited the teacher from enacting equity pedagogy. Kwock Hu reported that:

[TFA CM studied] did not consistently apply the principles of equity pedagogy and the goals of critical pedagogy were not apparent in her classroom. Instead, [the corps member] vacillated between a student-centered and a teacher-directed participation structure in the classroom, was inconsistent in the use of culturally-based examples to facilitate conceptual understanding, favored Eurocentric patterns of social discourse, and felt constrained by the traditional curriculum and the time needed to cover required content . . . Furthermore, [the corps member] did not question certain classroom practices that appeared to promote a classroom based on conformity and order, nor did she question the implications of expecting students to unquestionably comply. (pp. 92-93)

Although this was only a study of one corps member, and hence a limitation, the results showed that even in a corps member who expressed a desire for educational equity and a belief in culturally responsive pedagogy, this was not reflected in their instructional practice. Kwock Hu believed that mentorship, peer collaboration, and developing knowledge about students (and their cultures) would help turn intentions into practice.

Kwock Hu also found that many TFA CMs enter TFA articulating a commitment to social justice, but she questions their definitions and understandings of social justice and if and how they link societal injustice to school practices. Additionally she questioned how CMs make sense of the connection between home cultures, classroom practices, and learning outcomes. She called for further research to explore these concepts in a larger number of CMs.

The last critique comes from within the organization itself. In the fall of 2011, TFA published an entire alumni magazine issue dedicated to issues of diversity, race, and
class. One article written by Ting Yu, “The Evolution of DCA,” reported that corps members and staff have complained about the current diversity (DCA) programming, calling the approach “too sanitized and too pragmatic” (p. 37). High-ranking TFA staff members were sympathetic to this criticism. Annie Lewis, the vice president of design, said, “We need much more than just DCA” (p. 38). The article reported that Lewis believes other critical components are needed and include “… helping corps members understand the historical context of the achievement gap in their regions, fostering a deeper self-awareness about the role of identity in building relationships with students, colleagues and communities, and affirming students’ identity through culturally responsive pedagogy” (Yu, 2011, p. 38). As Yu’s article shows, there are voices within the organization itself expressing that leveling the field is not enough; instead, they want to change the game. CRP is a game-changer.

**Section 3: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy**

Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994), a founding theorist of culturally responsive pedagogy, wrote, “Specifically, culturally relevant teaching is a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These cultural referents are not merely vehicles for bridging or explaining the dominant culture; they are aspects of the curriculum in their own right” (pp. 17-18). This definition reveals and encompasses the three facets of CRP that will be the organizing structures for this section: (1) attributes, (2) aims, and (3) actions. Although these three facets will be described separately, there is definite overlap. Taken together they provide a clear and specific definition of CRP and a theoretical frame for this research study, as displayed in Figure 1.
Attributes of culturally responsive pedagogy. CRP has several defining attributes and they all must be present for true CRP to be in practice. Geneva Gay (2000), a leading CRP theorist, outlined a list of attributes. What follows is a modified list and description of each attribute based on her writing and the writing of other CRP theorists.

Comprehensive. CRP addresses the needs of the whole child—cognitive, emotional, personal, social, political, and spiritual needs are all taken into account (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Additionally, it addresses the transformation of students, teachers, schools, systems, and institutions (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). Comprehensive can also refer to the integration of dispositions, knowledge, and skills as well as the intersection of individual and community (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Multidimensional. CRP refers to curriculum, instruction, assessment, learning environment, relationships, classroom culture, and management (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 1999). It also describes attitudes, values, beliefs, knowledge, and skills (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 1999).

Additive. Learning about other cultures, including the dominant culture, is additive in CRP, not subtractive. The new cultural tools do not replace students’ home cultural tools and languages (Nieto, 1999; Valenzuela, 1999). Delpit (1995) concurred and stated that we should “teach students to passively adopt an alternate code. They must be encouraged to understand the value of the code they already possess as well as understand the power realities in this country” (p. 40). Therefore, students need to maintain and build their cultural knowledge and skills in addition to mastering the knowledge and skills specific to the dominant culture.
Emancipatory. CRP liberates the student from a traditional definition of success (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999), liberates the curriculum from the traditional canon (Gay, 2000), and liberates the teacher and school from traditional methods and roles (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). Gay (2000) explained, “[CRP] releases the intellect of students of color from the constraining manacles of mainstream canons of knowledge and ways of knowing” (p. 35).

Empowering. “Empowerment translates into academic competence, personal confidence, courage, and the will to act” (Gay, 2000). CRP enables students to choose their own definition of success (in life and learning) and achieve it. Nieto (1999) described empowerment, through the philosophy of Freire, as “the feeling of being changed,” and links it inextricably to transformation (p. 106; Ruiz, 1991; Shor & Freire, 1987).

Transformative. CRP seeks to transform society through the transformation of students and teachers. Gay (2000) explained, “The cultural affiliation and understanding, knowledge, and skills needed to challenge existing social orders and power structures are desirable goals to be taught in schools” (p. 30). CRP explicitly transforms students into social critics who facilitate the transformation of society and bring about equity (Gay, 2000; McGee-Banks & Banks, 1995; Nieto, 1999).

Aims of CRP. For TFA the desired outcome is “significant academic gains” and “enduring growth,” in other words, academic achievement (Farr, 2010; Teach for America, 2011). While academic achievement is a required student outcome of CRP (Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000), it is not the only student outcome. CRP demands that students simultaneously develop a positive racial/cultural identity and a critical, sociocultural
consciousness. As a result, they embody Solorzano and Delgado Bernal’s (2001) framework of transformative resistance in which student behavior “illustrates both a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice” (p. 319). These outcomes are not an exhaustive list and are in addition to the development of personal qualities needed for success like confidence, creativity, resilience, courage, and critical thinking. Described below, though, are the aims that are within the scope of this research study and fundamental to CRP.

**Academic achievement including acquisition of dominant culture tools.** Too often educators of low-income and culturally and linguistically diverse students do not hold students to high academic standards (Kozol, 1991; Warren, 2002). This lowering of expectations occurs for a variety of reasons such as the belief that students of color cannot learn. Furthermore, low expectations may come from the belief that they should not have to learn dominant culture standards (Delpit, 1995; Kozol, 1991). Lastly, it can stem from the pobrecieto (poor little one) mindset where educators pity the hard lives of low-income students (Parades Scribner, 1995). Either way, the results of low expectations are the same: a lack of academic mastery and acquisition of dominant culture tools needed for success in dominant culture (Delpit, 1995; Warren, 2002).

CRP theory is “empowering” and, therefore, fundamentally requires that students achieve academically. This includes learning tools of the dominant culture, like Standard English, discourse patterns, and significant cultural referents (Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Delpit (1995) explained this concept further:

> To imply to children and adults . . . that it doesn’t matter how you talk or how you write is to ensure their ultimate failure. I prefer to be honest with my students. I tell them their language and cultural style is unique and wonderful but there is a
political power game that is also being played, and if they want to be in on that
game there are certain games that they too must play. (pp. 39-40)

But academic achievement is not limited to mastering dominant culture tools; it also
includes demonstrating proficiency in one’s home language and intercultural content and
skills.

**Positive cultural and racial identity.** The maintenance and development of a
positive cultural/racial identity is one of the aims essential to CRP (Gay, 2000; Ladson-
Billings, 1994). It demands that academic achievement is additive and that students’
cultural identities and first languages are affirmed and developed. Ladson-Billings (1994)
explained positive identity development specifically for African-American students: “The
primary aim of culturally relevant teaching is to assist in the development of a `relevant
black personality’ that allows African American students to choose academic excellence
yet still identify with African and African American culture” (p. 17). Gay (2000) further
added, “. . . positive self-concepts, knowledge of and pride in one’s own ethnic identity,
and improved academic achievement are interactional” (p. 30). In other words, each one
alone—academic achievement or positive cultural/racial identity—is not enough;
students need both for success.

**Critical consciousness and desire for social justice.** Ruiz (1991) asked the
important question, “Would empowered students become critical, or merely successful?”
(p. 222). Some researchers believe CRP is a theory that only encompasses the first two
aims: achievement and positive cultural identity development. Prominent multicultural
education researcher, Sonia Nieto (1999) asserted that CRP must include *at its center* the
aim of preparing students to critique and change societal inequity. She claimed, using the
work of McGee-Banks and Banks (1995), that true CRP does not prepare students to “merely to fit into an unjust society;” rather it prepares them “to challenge the injustices that undergird that society” (Nieto, 1999, pp. 105-106). Similarly, Ladson-Billings (1995) wrote that in culturally relevant teaching, “Students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order” (p. 96). Therefore, an aim central to CRP is developing a critical consciousness and a desire for social justice in each and every student.

Theorists refer to the above preparation as transformative education (Banks, 1991; Nieto, 1999). Solorzano and Delgado-Bernal (2001) called it promoting transformational resistance. Transformational resistance refers to students’ behavior that illustrates both a critique of oppression and a desire for social justice. In other words, the student holds some level of awareness and critique of her or his oppressive conditions and structures of domination and must be at least somewhat motivated by a sense of social justice. With a deeper level of understanding, and a social justice orientation, transformational resistance offers the greatest possibility for social change. (p. 319)

While scholars describe the development of students’ critical sociocultural consciousness using various terms, the argument can be made that empowered students are not just academically successful; they are also critical. As Banks (1991) described, they have “. . . the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become social critics who can make reflective decisions and implement their decisions in effective personal, social, political, and economic action” (Banks, 1991, p. 131). CRP must develop a critical sociocultural consciousness and a desire for social justice in its students so that they can facilitate transformation of society and bring about equity. This can be accomplished through
culturally responsive pedagogy and the specific implementation of critical pedagogy (discussed in the next section).

**CRP teacher actions.** To achieve the aims of CRP, teachers need to adjust their curriculum and instructional methods and implement a variety of actions; however, CRP is not just a “bag of tricks” or a series of steps that one can follow (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 26). CRP requires the profound transformation of teachers so that, in their hearts, they hold high expectations and meet students where they are, and they provide intense and culturally responsive support and scaffolding to help students get to where they need to be (Brown, 2002; Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2002; Hernandez Sheets, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Most importantly, culturally responsive educators:

1. Use culturally congruent curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.
2. Implement critical pedagogy.
3. Build reciprocal relationships and demonstrate care.
4. Establish welcoming, supportive, and collaborative environments.

**Culturally congruent curriculum and instruction.** Being culturally congruent means that the teacher matches her curriculum, instructional methods, and assessment practices to the cultures represented in her classroom (Nieto, 1999). Gay (2000) explains, “Culturally responsive teaching can be defined as using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them. It teaches to and through the strengths of these students” (p. 29). It is important to point out, however, that “. . . These cultural referents are not merely vehicles for bridging or explaining the dominant culture; they are aspects of the curriculum in their own right” (Ladson-Billings,
1994, pp. 17-18). Maria Salazar (2008) said it a little differently and focused on language when she wrote that culturally responsive educators “communicate the message that students’ heritage languages have tremendous value in social and academic contexts” (p. 353). Therefore, the use of students’ heritage culture is not a gimmick or relegated to “street” usefulness; it is truly respected and deemed as valuable as the dominant culture (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995).

The infusion of the heritage culture and language of students must also go beyond the surface features, what Salazar (2008) called the “Fun, Food, and Fiesta approach” (p. 348). By only focusing on cultural heroes and holidays, teachers miss the power of students’ cultural experiences and strengths and can appear patronizing. One example of deep-culture, culturally congruent practice is the use of cooperative team peer tutoring instead of competitive team peer tutoring or traditional teacher-led instruction in a classroom that serves Hispanic, bilingual children (Madrid, Canas, & Ortega-Medina, 2007, p. 155). “Hispanic bilingual children appear to have a more cooperative social orientation than do White non-Hispanic children; [however,] the structure of the traditional classroom tends to focus on individually orientated competition” (Madrid et al., 2007, p. 159). A culturally responsive teacher, therefore, critiques her curriculum and instructional methods, communication style, and assessments for hidden cultural preferences and surface features; then she transforms it.

Critical pedagogy. No matter how much a teacher changes her curriculum and instructional strategies, making them culturally congruent or multicultural, her classroom and definition of CRP is not enough if it does not include “an approach that values critique and transformation” (Nieto, p. 129). Critical pedagogy is simply an approach
that seeks to develop critical, sociocultural consciousness and a desire for social justice in its students; it is an approach that values critique and transformation. Kwok Hu (2009), the researcher who studied critical pedagogy in a TFA CM, defined critical pedagogy as curriculum and instruction whose objective is to “encourage students to develop their own ability to critically analyze the social structures that surround them in order to redress inequality and ultimately transform society” (p. 37). Teach for America Colorado (2011) described critical (transformative) pedagogy as a practice that develops in each student an “awareness of and a critique of one’s oppressive condition, and a desire for social justice” (p. 3).

Critical pedagogy is comprised of a variety of teacher, teacher/student, teacher/family, and teacher/community actions. For example, in the classroom it can involve students critiquing their history texts and lessons to see whose perspective is missing, and challenging students to seek out and report the missing perspective. It includes looking through math textbooks to find pictures of students who reflect their own cultural features, reporting the percentage of pictures of students of color, writing the publisher, and sending the publisher pictures of themselves engaged in mathematics. Another example of critical pedagogy is teachers including real-world projects where students find problems in their communities and work to solve them, practicing their abilities to address inequity and injustices.

Knowing that students need to master the culture of power, culturally responsive teachers (implementing critical pedagogy) explicitly and without value teach dominant culture skills and content (Delpit, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). It does not belittle the
dominant culture tools and knowledge, but it does not teach them as “good,” as in Standard English is “right,” “proper,” or “better” (Delpit, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

**Build reciprocal relationships and demonstrate care.** Culturally responsive teachers build sincere, reciprocal relationships and demonstrate care (Brown, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Salazar, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). In order to truly care for students, teachers must get to know students well by visiting their homes, asking questions, observing students in the community, attending cultural and community functions, and cultivating sincere relationships with people who are close to the students (Ayers, 2001; Lipman, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). To develop reciprocal relationships, teachers, too, must allow students and their families to get to know them, sharing meaningful parts of their lives in the classroom (Valenzuela, 1999).

**Establish welcoming, supportive, and collaborative environment.** To get to know students and their families well, teachers must create and maintain a welcoming environment where cultures and languages are valued and respected (Salazar, 2008). To achieve a welcoming, supportive, and collaborative environment teachers must provide opportunities to co-construct curriculum with students and families (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999), encourage collaboration and cooperation in the classroom (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999), and use cultural competence and communication strategies to honor and respect students’ and families’ ways of receiving and expressing information (Gay 2000; Ladson-Billings 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Valenzuela, 1999). Additionally, classroom expectations for behavior must be high and require students to respect differences, to listen to classmates, and to work together to solve problems (Ladson-Billings 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Weinstein et al., 2004). Lastly, educators
need to teach how to critique ideas rather than to criticize people (Ladson-Billings 1994,
1995; Nieto, 1999). Together, these actions create a safe environment for students to
bring their whole-selves into the classroom, including their cultural strengths and
experiences.

Section 4: Establishing a Conceptual Framework

According to the TFA Academic Impact Model, to impact student outcomes and
teacher actions, one needs to develop particular underlying mindsets, knowledge, and
skills of teachers (Teach for America, 2010). Therefore, in order to enact culturally
responsive pedagogy and have CMs use culturally responsive teacher actions, they need
underlying culturally responsive mindsets, knowledge, and skills. The entire set of
mindsets, knowledge, and skills needed to be a culturally responsive educator is referred
to by this researcher as culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC). CRTC in
this research study is defined as the ability of an individual teacher to enact the theory of
culturally responsive pedagogy sincerely and effectively.

Currently there is not one definitive and universally accepted framework of
CRTC; in other words, the required mindsets, knowledge, and skills of a culturally
responsive educator are still somewhat undefined, and perhaps need to remain as such.
Villegas and Lucas (2002) explained, “It would be unwieldy to discuss each attitude,
each type of knowledge, and each skill needed by culturally responsive teachers. Such an
approach would quickly deteriorate into a list that would inevitably be construed as a
rigid prescription for program development” (p. 25). There are, though, the six
curriculum strands proposed by Villegas and Lucas (2002), leading authors on the
preparation of culturally and linguistically responsive educators. Their six strands, “blend dispositions, knowledge, and skills” (p. 26).

This research study posits that Villegas and Lucas’ curriculum framework is a framework of CRTC and can be used to design and assess teacher training and professional development. Importantly, their strands also serve as the foundation of the conceptual framework for this research study and as the rationale for evaluating the three essential constructs and belief that culture matters in education.

The following section on CRTC summarizes Villegas and Lucas’ six strands, but then it narrows to focus on Villegas and Lucas’ first three strands—the fundamental orientations of culturally responsive educators. Finally, the section distills three essential characteristics and one essential belief from the fundamental orientations. This reconfiguration from fundamental orientations to essential characteristics (and belief) is the transitional step needed to study the essential constructs of intercultural competence, colorblindness and White racial identity attitudes and the belief that culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning (See Figure 2).

**Culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC)**

Maria Villegas and Tamara Lucas’ (2002) book, *Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers*, proposed six curriculum strands that “lay out the essential dispositions, knowledge, and skills for teaching the changing student population” (p. 26). The six strands in total, according to this researcher, represent culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC), and can be used as outcomes for preparing culturally responsive teachers and for creating assessments to evaluate CRTC.
Villegas and Lucas’ first three strands are referred to as the fundamental orientations needed for teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. Villegas and Lucas explained the fundamental orientations:

This aspect of our curriculum proposal aims to engage prospective teachers in an examination of assumptions they have about schools and their relationship to society, about students who are poor and of color, and about the work of teachers. (p. 26)

The fundamental orientations are: (1) gaining sociocultural consciousness; (2) developing an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds; and (3) developing the commitment and skills to act as agents of change (p. 26). Each fundamental orientation presents on a continuum and hence has an opposite: (1) sociocultural dysconsciousness (p. 33); (2) a deficit attitude toward culturally diverse students (p. 36); and (3) a concept of “teachers as technicians” (p. 54), respectively. Each strand, and its opposite is described below.

The first curriculum strand proposed by Villegas and Lucas (2002) is “gaining sociocultural consciousness” (p. 27) and involves two major developments. First is the development of a pluralistic worldview where the teacher knows there are multiple perspectives and that an individual’s perspective is shaped by his/her cultural. Second is the development of a critical lens where the teacher is able to see how power is inequitably distributed in society. Social cultural dysconsciousness, its opposite, is marked by a worldview that is unreflective and unaware (p. 33). Teachers who have not developed sociocultural consciousness believe that their worldview is universal, and they are unaware of how their experiences—and the experiences of others—are “mediated by factors such as social class, race/ethnicity, and gender” (p. 33).
The second curriculum strand proposed by Villegas and Lucas (2002) is “developing an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds” (p. 35). This strand of curriculum teaches teachers: (a) that the dominant culture is a valid culture, but not superior; (b) that ways of thinking, talking, and behaving that are different from the dominant culture are valid and need to be valued and respected; and (c) culturally and linguistically diverse students have valuable skills, knowledge, and experiences that need to be utilized to help them learn (p. 36). The opposite of this strand is a deficit perspective of culturally and linguistically diverse learners (p. 36). Teachers who have not yet developed an affirming attitude toward culturally diverse students, may believe that the dominant culture (i.e. the culture of the White, middle class) is inherently superior and, subsequently, the ways of thinking, talking and behaving that differ from the dominant culture are inherently inferior and not useful to the context of schools (p. 36).

The third curriculum strand proposed by Villegas and Lucas (2002) is “developing the commitment and skills to act as agents of change” (p. 53). Teachers are taught to confront obstacles to change and are trained to engage stakeholders and collaborate with others in order to produce positive change. Teachers are developed to deal with chaos appropriately and taught to focus on what they have the ability to change, not wasting time on factors they cannot impact. The opposite of this strand is the concept of “teachers as technicians” where schools are viewed by teachers as “neutral settings that function separately from the struggle for power in society and are not affected by this struggle” (p. 54). Teachers that view themselves as technicians, rather than change agents, uncritically implement school curriculum and apply “clearly defined instructional
procedures” with the goal of providing all of their students with an equal opportunity to prove their merit.

Once the fundamental orientations are developed in teachers, Villegas and Lucas propose three more curriculum strands for fostering culturally responsive teaching. Villegas and Lucas (2002) explain that the last three curriculum strands “focus more sharply on aspects of teaching and learning” (p. 65). Strand 4 is “understanding the constructivist foundations of culturally responsive teaching” (p. 65). Teachers are taught that children are not blank-slates. They are shown how knowledge is constructed and that learning is personal (Nieto, 1999). Strand 5 focuses on the importance of teachers learning about their students and students’ communities (p. 79). Strand 6 specifically cultivates culturally responsive teaching practices. In this sixth and final strand, Villegas and Lucas challenge teachers to bring together all of the orientations, knowledge, and skills learned from the other curriculum strands into a vision of culturally responsive teaching.

While all six of Villegas and Lucas’ strands need to be developed in educators, the first three orientations—those dealing with the fundamental orientations needed before practice can be fully developed and implemented—become the initial focus for the scope of this research study.

**Essential characteristics of CRTC.** Upon an analysis of Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) first three strands, the fundamental orientations, three essential characteristics of culturally responsive teachers emerge. Culturally responsive educators are people who are: (1) culturally competent and possesses a multicultural mindset/worldview; (2) aware of and responsive to race, discrimination, and issues of power and privilege; and (3)
consistently undergoing personal analysis and positive cultural/racial identity development. These three characteristics merge mindsets, knowledge, and skills into characteristics. For example, to be culturally competent (essential characteristic one) a teacher needs to have an affirming attitude to cultural difference, possess knowledge of other cultures, and have the ability to shift thoughts and behavior.

In addition to these three essential characteristics, it is evident from Villegas and Lucas’ work that culturally responsive educators not only embody the three essential characteristics above, but they also apply each characteristic to the context of education, resulting in the essential belief that culture matters in teaching and learning. Figure 4 graphically displays how the essential characteristics are distilled from Villegas’ and Lucas’ first strands, the fundamental orientations. Below is a description of each essential characteristic and how it relates to the work of Villegas and Lucas (2002). The majority of the explanation is dedicated to describing how the characteristic applies and why it matters to the context of education, therefore establishing that culturally responsive teachers believe that culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning.

**Essential Characteristic 1: Culturally responsive educators have multicultural worldviews and are culturally competent.** Culturally responsive educators know culture plays a major role in people’s thoughts, communication, and behavior, and they can make cultural shifts in their own thoughts and actions (Nieto, 1996, 1999). Essential characteristic one is found in Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) work regarding gaining sociocultural consciousness. To become aware that “one’s worldview is not universal but is profoundly shaped by one’s life experiences, as mediated by a variety of factors, chief among them race/ethnicity, social class, and gender” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 27), it is
fundamental that one sees culture first. One must learn the difference between surface and deep culture and recognize cultural differences and similarities. In the context of education, teachers must understand that “The individuality of students is deeply entwined with [students’] ethnic identity and cultural socialization” (Gay, 2000, p. 23). Therefore, knowing and attending to personal differences involves knowing and attending to cultural differences.

**Essential Characteristic 2: Culturally responsive teachers are aware of and responsive to race, discrimination, and issues of power and privilege.** Culturally responsive educators see and understand the impact of race/class on individuals and society. Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) work requires culturally responsive educators to critically examine the inequities in schools and society that maintain a privileged society based on social class and skin color. In the specific context of teaching and learning, teachers see color in their classrooms. Ladson-Billings (1994) explained,

> Given the significance of race and color in American society, it is impossible to believe that a classroom teacher does not notice the race and ethnicity of the children she is teaching. Further, by claiming not to notice, the teacher is saying she is dismissing one of the most salient features of the child’s identity and that she does not account for it in her curricular planning and instruction. (p. 33)

Furthermore, culturally responsive educators navigate issues of power, privilege, and access. They do not believe or act as if power does not exist because, “to act as if power does not exist is to ensure that the power status quo remains the same” (Delpit, 1995, p. 39). Dominant culture tools are taught, but they are explicitly taught as tools for success in the dominant culture, not as being inherently “good” or “right.”
Essential Characteristic 3: Culturally responsive educators are consistently undergoing personal analysis and positive cultural/racial identity development.

Culturally responsive teachers have developed healthy cultural and anti-racist identities and understand how their own culture plays into the ways they communicate, think, and behave (Banks, 1994; Carter & Goodwin, 1994; Rose, 1996; Smith, 1994; Vavrus, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Essential characteristic three can be found in Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) work where they wrote that a sociocultural conscious educator has “clear insight into one’s perspective and how it has been shaped by one’s biography” and culture (p. 33). In the context of teaching and learning it is critical that teachers examine their cultural and racial identities in order to be additive versus subtractive, to be effective, and to demonstrate care. Gay (2000) explained further, “Educators also need to analyze their own cultural attitudes, assumptions, mechanisms, rules, and regulations that have made it difficult for them to teach these children successfully” (p. 26). Furthermore, according to Helms (1990) “he or she must accept his or her own Whiteness, the cultural implications of being White, and define a view of Self as a racial being that does not depend on the perceived superiority of one racial group over another” (p. 49). If a White educator is not aware or comfortable with her “Whiteness,” she may inadvertently privilege White cultural ways of learning, knowing, writing, telling, and doing.

The three essential characteristics—and the belief that these essentials matter in the context of schooling—represent a significant portion of culturally responsive teaching competence. To measure these characteristics it is necessary to first equate them to established constructs with reliable and valid measures.
Section 5: Research Study Constructs

This section of the literature review explains the three constructs being studied—intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes—and how they relate to the essential characteristics identified in the previous section (see Figure 2). Each construct section provides a theoretical description and reviews relevant studies. The quantitative measurement of these constructs (and qualitative assessment of the essential belief that culture matters in teaching and learning), then, represents the measurement of a portion of CRTC and will be used to inform intervention design and facilitate culturally responsive attributes, actions, and aims.

**Intercultural competence.** Essential characteristic one posits that culturally responsive educators are multicultural beings with a “pluralistic worldview which acknowledges that reality may be viewed from a number of different, yet equally valid, perspectives” (Langelier, 1996, p. 5). This is in contrast to having a monocultural worldview that is comprised of a singular view of reality, a lack of cultural sensitivity, negative attitudes towards diversity, and limited multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (Langelier, 1996, p. 5). Being multicultural includes the ability to define culture and articulate its impact on individuals and the way they communicate, learn, express understanding, view time, and demonstrate care. Gay (2000) reported that culturally responsive educators have “thorough knowledge about cultural values, learning styles, historical legacies, contributions, and achievements of different ethnic groups,” (p. 44) instead of surface knowledge like associated cultural holidays, foods, and dress. In sum, essential characteristic one requires that culturally responsive educators possess intercultural competence.
McAllister and Irvine (2000) agreed that a cultural difference approach requires teachers to continuously learn about students’ cultures and adapt their pedagogy, classroom environments, and behaviors to meet students’ cultural needs (p. 18). They stated that Bennett’s (1986) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (the model that intercultural competence is based on) “supports the desired goals of this approach because of its focus on cultural differences and increased understanding of cultural nuances” (p.18).

Intercultural competence in this study is defined as “The capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural difference and commonality” and uses Hammer’s (2009) Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC). The IDC, based on Bennett’s (1986) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), posits that intercultural competence is an ability that can be learned. Furthermore, it is developmental, meaning it has ordered orientations that one must work through sequentially (Hammer, 2009, 2011). Intercultural development seeks to accomplish two main things: (1) Eliminate thoughts, interpretations, and actions based on stereotypes; and (2) “Increase thoughts, interpretations, and actions based on cultural generalization/frameworks” (Hammer, 2009). Hammer claims that intercultural development leads to intercultural competence; it is progressive. On one end of the IDC is a monocultural mindset and on the other is an intercultural/global mindset. The more one works on intercultural development, moving through the five orientations in the direction of “intercultural/global mindset,” the more interculturally competent one becomes. Progression on the continuum—or intercultural development—is accomplished by recognizing and integrating complex understanding of cultural
similarities and differences. Intercultural competence and placement on the IDC is measured by the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), version 3 (Hammer, 2009).

The monocultural mindset is present in the first two orientations. The first, Denial, is explained as having “little recognition of more complex cultural difference” (Hammer, In press). When a person is in Denial, it implies that he/she is disinterested or avoids cultural difference. People in this orientation often view the world through their own cultural lens, not even knowing they have a cultural lens; their worldview is their reality.

Polarization is the next orientation; it is a judgmental orientation characterized by an “us versus them” mentality. There are two types of Polarization—Defense and Reversal. Defense/Polarization orientation is overly critical of other cultures and, at the same time, it is uncritical toward its own culture. People in Defense Polarization often have a negative evaluation and overemphasize cultural differences. People in Reversal Polarization, on the other hand, often have a positive evaluation of other cultural groups but still overemphasize cultural differences. They are often very critical of their own culture and uncritical of others’ cultures (Hammer, 2009).

The Minimization orientation is a transitional orientation between the monocultural orientations and intercultural orientations (Hammer, 2011). Hammer (2009) explained, “A minimization perspective is able to recognize some patterns of cultural difference; but the orientation emphasizes dealing with these identified differences through a commonality lens that can mask underlying differences” (p. 208). Therefore, Minimization is an orientation of commonality and fails to recognize and/or fully attend to differences. People of the dominant culture who have a Minimization
orientation may lack deeper cultural awareness and focus on cultural similarities in order to solve problems.

The last two orientations—Acceptance and Adaptation—are situated in an intercultural/global mindset. Acceptance is an orientation where cultural commonalities and differences are both acknowledged; however, one with this orientation may not know how to shift (behaviorally or cognitively) in response to cultural difference. Adaptation, though, is characterized by the ability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural context (Hammer, 2009). People with an Adaptation orientation, recognize and respond to deep cultural similarities and differences.

Currently there are not many studies profiling urban teachers’ levels of intercultural competence. Bayles (2009) assessed the intercultural competence of 233 elementary teachers in bilingual schools in a Texas school district and found that the average developmental orientation was Minimization. She wrote, “This suggests that while the group of teachers may have familiarity with different cultures and be aware of differences in cultural patterns such as values, beliefs, and communication styles, they may minimize student cultural differences and apply universal values and principles to their educational practice” (abstract).

There have also been relatively few studies that show a connection between intercultural competence and forms of culturally responsive teaching competence. Roat (2010) studied the cultural adjustment of White teachers who teach in a diverse, urban school district. He measured cultural adjustment using the construct of intercultural competence and the Intercultural Development Inventory, version 3, (Hammer, 2009) as part of a mixed methods study. Roat found that several factors lead to and are
qualitatively associated with successful cultural adjustment (partly determined by higher levels of intercultural competence). They were: (a) a willingness to engage in the lives of students and families; (b) an acknowledgment of the need to learn the culture of students; and (c) the valuing the cultural differences of students as a strength. This study implied that cultural competence / cultural adjustment in urban educators may be determined by the above factors, but the direction of this relationship is not empirically established. Instead, increased levels of cultural competence or cultural adjustment, particularly in urban educators, are related to these factors, meaning that as intercultural competence levels rise, so do these self-reported attributes, and vice versa. Simply put, this study showed that there is some connection between the intercultural competence as measured by the IDI and the underlying mindsets, knowledge, and skills of a culturally responsive teacher.

**Colorblindness.** Essential characteristic two is that culturally responsive educators see color and racism; in other words, it requires educators to not be colorblind. Gay (2000) charged that if educators only see “individuals” and not color and culture they increase the risk that they “will impose their notions on ethnically different students, insult their cultural heritages, or ignore them entirely in the instructional process. In reality ethnicity and culture are significant filters through which one’s individuality is made manifest” (p. 23). At first glance, “seeing color” may seem the same as developing intercultural competence and going beyond the developmental orientation of Minimization. While Minimization and colorblindness are similar (they both focus on cultural similarities and not cultural differences), for this study, the ability
to see color is about more than seeing cultural difference; it is also about seeing injustice based on that difference.

Colorblindness (also referred to as colorblind racial attitudes) is about seeing that racism exists, that it impacts individuals, and that it operates in institutions (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). While seeing differences is a start, Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, and Browne (2000) quoted a pamphlet on colorblind racial attitudes written by the American Psychological Association (1997; as cited in Neville et al., 2000). The pamphlet critiques a colorblind approach that “ignores research showing that, even among well-intentioned people, skin color . . . figures prominently in everyday attitudes and behavior. Thus, to get beyond racism . . . we must first take the differences between people into account” (p. 60). This quote implies that if educators are simply aware of cultural difference and respond appropriately, armed with cultural knowledge, then all is well. But this is not the case, especially with educational inequity and the achievement gap, as Villegas and Lucas (2002) explained:

Teachers need to recognize that it is simplistic to claim that cultural differences between home and school are the root of the widespread academic problems of poor racial/ethnic minority children, while leaving unexamined why some differences are accorded greater status in schools and society than others. (p. 44)

Colorblindness defined as only seeing race is too simple and does not require educators to acknowledge *racism* and its impact.

Neville et al. (2000) defined a construct of colorblindness that is more comprehensive and based on the following assumptions: racism exists on several levels; it creates privilege and advantages for Whites in addition to disadvantages for minorities; colorblindness is a denial of these realities; and people of all racial groups can be
colorblind. Moreover, “color-blind racial attitudes are cognitive in nature; they are part of a cognitive schema used to interpret racial stimuli” (p. 61). Neville et al. developed a measure, the Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS), to assess the three dimensions of colorblindness: (1) Unawareness of racial privilege, (2) Unawareness of institutional discrimination, and (3) Unawareness of blatant racial issues. It is important to note that although colorblindness and racism have a significant positive correlation (Neville et al., 2000) they are different. Racism is a belief that one race is superior. Colorblindness “refers to the denial of racial dynamics . . . thus, color-blind racial attitudes do not necessarily reflect a belief in racial superiority, just an unawareness of the existence of racism” (Neville et al., 2000, p. 61).

Currently there is little empirical evidence that ties color-blind racial attitudes directly to culturally responsive teaching competence. However, there is one relevant study. Siwatu (2005) created two measures to explore the factors that influence Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy (CRTSE) and Outcome Expectancy Beliefs (CRTOE). The first measure, CRTSE, evaluated a teacher’s self-reported confidence in his/her ability to teach in a culturally responsive manner. The second measure, CRTOE, assessed a teacher’s belief that culturally responsive teaching practices will result in a positive classroom and student outcomes.

Using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, Siwatu (2005) found that colorblindness as measured by the CoBRAS “has an influence” on CRTSE beliefs. Furthermore, using multiple regression, Siwatu found that Colorblindness (as measured by the CoBRAS) predicts CRTOE beliefs. Siwatu explained, “It is possible that the formation of preservice teachers’ CRTOE beliefs is influenced in part by their level of
color-blindness. Color-blind teachers may not see or value the importance of engaging in the practice of culturally responsive teaching” (pp. 106-107). A major limitation of this study, though, is set of the measures themselves, as they were not rigorously tested for evidence of reliability or validity.

In the related field of multicultural counseling, though, there are widely accepted measures of multicultural counseling competence. Studies have been conducted, and there is evidence that colorblindness is negatively correlated with multicultural knowledge (Spanierman, Poteat, Wang, & Oh, 2008) and that it has small to medium direct effects on multicultural knowledge (Neville, Spanierman, & Doan, 2006). Both of these studies showed that counselors in training who had high levels of colorblindness had lower scores in self-reported multicultural knowledge (Neville et al., 2006; Spanierman et al., 2008). Gushue (2004) reported that those counselors with higher levels of colorblindness potentially distorted diagnosis of ethnic minority clients. Burkard and Knox (2004) found that counselors-in-training with higher levels of colorblindness may fail to show culturally appropriate empathy or put their clients’ concerns in context, both of which contribute to a low level of multicultural counseling competency.

**White racial identity development.** Essential characteristic three states that culturally responsive educators consistently undergo personal analysis and positive cultural/racial identity development. Smith (1994) explained, “In order for teachers to be able to help others clarify their identities, they must first understand their own personal and cultural values and identities” (abstract). Vavrus (2002) connected teacher identity formation to culturally responsive teaching. He believed that “teachers should develop the capacity to maintain an oppositional, anti-racist identity” (p. 2). Several models of
White identity exist, including Hardiman’s (1979; as cited in Helms & Carter, 1990) model of White Identity Development; La Fleur, Rowe, and Leach’s (2002) model of White Racial Consciousness; and the Sabini, Ponterotto, and Borodovsky (1991) White Racial Identity Model. This study utilizes Helms’ (1984; as cited in Helms & Carter, 1990) original model of White Racial Identity Development primarily because it has a corresponding valid measure and is widely used and accepted in the field.

Helms’ model is developmental; it is a “linear process of attitudinal development in which the White person potentially progresses through a series of stages differing in the extent to which they involve acknowledgement of racism and consciousness of Whiteness” (Helms, 1990, p. 53). The White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale developed by Helms and Carter (1990) measures the White racial identity attitudes (WRIA) of individuals and tells where they are in the White racial identity development process. The development of a healthy White identity is the goal and it includes the “abandonment of individual racism as well as the recognition of and active oppression to institutional and cultural racism,” including White privilege (Helms, 1990, p. 55). Thus, it is a two-phase process with a total of five stages, as illustrated in Figure 3. Phase 1 is the abandonment of racism, beginning with the Contact stage and ending with the Reintegration stage. Phase 2 is defining a positive White identity and begins with the Pseudo-Independent stage and ends with the Autonomy stage (Helms, 1990, p. 55).

The first stage in Phase 1—the abandonment of racism—is Contact and is described as a lack of awareness of the socio-cultural and socio-political significance of race, particularly one’s own race. The second stage of Phase 1 is Disintegration and is characterized by confusion about one’s own Whiteness as well as ambivalence about the
significance of race for people of color. Helms (1990) explained, “Entry into the Disintegration stage implies conscious, though, conflicted, acknowledgement of one’s Whiteness . . . Accompanying the conflicted White identification is a questioning of the racial realities the person has been taught to believe” (p. 58). The last stage of Phase 1 is Reintegration. A person in Reintegration consciously acknowledges a White identity, but it is not an anti-racist identity; instead, “the Reintegration person accepts the belief in White racial superiority and Black inferiority” (Helms, 1990, p. 60). Reintegration is characterized by feelings of fear and anger toward people of color, and these feelings may be actively or passively expressed.

Phase 2—defining a positive White racial identity—begins with the Pseudo-Independent stage. “In this stage, the person begins actively to question the proposition that Blacks are innately inferior to Whites” (Helms, 1990, p. 61). The Pseudo-Independent person is no longer comfortable with a racist identity, and begins to recognize the socio-cultural and socio-political implications of race for others. Helms and Carter (1990) explained Pseudo-Independence as the “internalization of Whiteness and capacity to recognize personal responsibility to ameliorate the consequences of racism. The person has an intellectual understanding of black culture and the unfair benefits of growing up White in the United States” (p. 68). The last stage, Autonomy, is characterized by a positive, White, anti-racist perspective. A person in Autonomy has a bi-cultural or multicultural worldview, values cultural similarities and differences, and works to eliminate racial oppression and discrimination (Helms & Carter, 1990). Although this is the last stage, Helms (1990) believed positive White identity is best thought of as an on-going process. “It is a process wherein the person is continually open
to new information and new ways of thinking about racial and cultural variables” (Helms, 1990, p. 66).

There have been several studies conducted in the field of counseling that empirically link WRIAs and multicultural counseling competency. Three quantitative studies report that higher stages of WRIAs were related to increasing multicultural competencies (Neville, Heppner, Louie, & Thompson, 1996; Ottavi, Pope, & Davis, 1994; Taylor, 1994). McAllister and Irvine (2000) conducted a comprehensive review of the literature of cross-cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. In the area of “Research Studies on Helms’s Racial Identity Model” they reported that although researchers found “a correlation between certain variables and White Racial Identity Development, none of the researchers actually observed changes in people or people at different stages” (p. 12). This included qualitative studies of educators and teachers-in-training who self-reported changes in professional behavior (Lawrence & Tatum, 1996, 1997; Sleeter, 1992). Therefore, while the connection between WRIAs and self-reported culturally responsive competency has support, the connection between WRIAs and culturally responsive practice has not been firmly established.

Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature, providing context, a theoretical framework, and a conceptual framework for this research study. It was established that TFA is committed to solving the problem of educational inequity in this country, but that its approach may not be enough. CRP, which requires the training and development of culturally responsive teachers, was presented as an alternative approach that will more wholly rectify the educational inequity present in society. The constructs of intercultural
competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity development—along with the belief that culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning—were equated to the fundamental orientations of Villegas and Lucas (2002) and described as essential to culturally responsive teaching competence (See Figure 2). A review of literature for each construct was presented as it pertains to the context of education. The next chapter articulates the mixed methodology used in this research study to explore the three essential constructs and belief in CO TFA CMs. It describes how the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods provides the data needed to promote culturally responsive pedagogy in the CO region.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

This research study employed a transformative sequential mixed methods design. Transformative mixed methods designs situate both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis in an overarching theoretical lens. Creswell (2009) wrote, “This lens provides a framework for topics of interest, methods for collecting data, and outcomes anticipated by the study” (p. 15). This study started with the overarching theoretical lens of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) and culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC) that provided the framework for studying the constructs of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes in Teach for America (TFA) Colorado region corps members (CMs).

This research study employed a mixed methods approach because when solving a real-world problem, the researcher needs to use all approaches available and appropriate to understanding the problem (Creswell, 2009, p.10; Rossman & Wilson, 1985). As such, it was important to use both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analyses to make the most meaningful and effective recommendations that will eventually impact students of color and with low socio-economic status.

Quantitative methods were used first and then qualitative methods; hence, the study was a sequential design (see Figure 4). The quantitative phase identified ranges of three essential constructs and determined change over time. Additionally the quantitative
results, specifically results of the IDI, were used to identify participants to interview for the qualitative portion of the research study. The qualitative phase expanded on the results of the quantitative study. The quantitative phase indicates where CMs are positioned on developmental continuums and within constructs; the qualitative phase enhances the quantitative data and shows how these quantitative profiles translate into beliefs about culture in the specific field of education and teaching and learning. Qualitative data collection has the ability to provide a richness that quantitative data cannot provide because it allows for purposeful sampling, open-ended questions and detailed responses, and emerging themes.

**Quantitative Methodology**

**Participants and sampling.** At the Colorado (CO) TFA regional orientation in July of 2010, there was a data collection session for all incoming CMs. The session was offered twice. There was a main session with the majority (n = 129) of incoming 2011 CMs and one session prior to the main session for a small number (n = 27) of CMs who could not attend the main session due to conflicts with district professional development requirements. All CO TFA CMs (n = 156) were asked to complete the two-part survey for the purpose of informing Colorado regional professional development programming; however, before CMs were asked to complete the two-part survey, the researcher explained the research study and passed out informed consent forms (Appendix B) to gain permission to use the data as part of a research study. Only the data of the CMs who signed the forms and agreed to be part of the study (n = 134) were used in this research study.
All 134 participants had college degrees and were incoming 2011 CMs who were placed in schools in and around Denver and Colorado Springs. Table 1 displays participants at Time 1 in terms of race, gender, age, level of college education, and time lived abroad. By Time 2 the sample size decreased to 78 participants. Although attrition at 42% was significant, participant demographics at Time 2 were explored and found to be similar to the participant demographics at Time 1.

**Measures.** Each participant was asked to complete a two-part survey comprised of three self-report measures and a brief demographic section. Except for the demographic section, all instruments had been tested for reliability and validity.

**Intercultural Development Inventory, version 3 (IDI v. 3).** The IDI, v. 3 (Hammer, 2009) measures Hammer’s construct of intercultural competence. The IDI is a fifty question online assessment in which participants respond to statements using a five-point scale with responses including: (1) *Disagree*, (2) *Disagree somewhat more than agree*, (3) *Disagree some and agree some*, (4) *Agree somewhat more than disagree*, (5) *Agree*. The IDI v. 3 provides two main scores: a perceived orientation (PO) score and a developmental orientation (DO) score. The PO score tells where an individual thinks s/he is on the intercultural development continuum (IDC). The DO score tells one where s/he actually is on the IDC. An orientation gap (OG) score is also provided which is the difference between the PO and the DO. A confirmatory factor analysis had been employed and yielded six unidimensional subscales. These include Denial, Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance, and Adaptation. The internal consistency coefficients ranged from .66 to .83 (Hammer, 2007). The IDI v. 3 is a proprietary instrument; therefore, sample items are not included in an appendix.
There is evidence to support content validity and construct validity for the IDI. To establish content validity the creators of the original IDI—Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003)—conducted in-depth interviews with people from a variety of cultures. Additionally, they had a panel of experts review the item pool. To establish convergent validity, subscales of the original IDI were correlated with two theoretically related variables, Worldmindedness and Intercultural Anxiety (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

**Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).** The CoBRAS (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000) measures colorblindness or the extent to which someone denies racism and the impact racism has on peoples’ lives and society. Samples of items are “Racism is a major problem in the U.S.” and “It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.” The CoBRAS is a 20-item instrument where participants respond using a 5-point scale ranging from (1) *Strongly Disagree* to (5) *Strongly Agree*. A higher total score on the CoBRAS reflects a higher level of colorblindness. The CoBRAS has three factors and provides three scale scores for the following: (a) Unawareness of racial privilege, (b) Unawareness of institutional discrimination, (c) Unawareness to blatant racial issues (Neville et al., 2000). Neville et al. (2000) reported internal consistency coefficients of .86 to .91 for the total score.

There is evidence of construct validity. The CoBRAS was positively correlated to other measures of racial attitudes as well as two different measures of a belief in a just world. Simply put, higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes are positively related to
greater levels of racial prejudice and the belief that society and institutions are just and fair (Neville et al., 2000).

**White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS).** The WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) is a 50 item measure where participants respond using a 5-point scale. Responses include: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Uncertain, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree. Samples of items are, “Society may have been unjust to Blacks, but it has also been unjust to Whites” and “I am not embarrassed to admit that I am White.” The WRIAS measures White participants’ attitudes in relation to the five stages of Helms’ (1984; as cited in Helms & Carter, 1990) model of White Racial Identity Development. Therefore, the WRIAS provides a scale score for each of the following five stages: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy. Several studies have been conducted to evaluate the internal consistency reliability of the WRIAS (Carter, 1994; Carter, Fretz, & Mahalik, 1986; Helms & Carter, 1990; Helms & Carter, 1987; Westbrook, 1986;). Overall, each scale has repeatedly been found to exceed .54, ranging from .55 to .82.

There is evidence to support content and construct validity for the WRIAS. Content validity is supported by the fact that items on the WRIAS reflect identity issues reported by White identity theorists to be important aspects of White identity development (Helms & Carter, 1990). The strategies for establishing support for construct validity included examining correlations among the WRIAS subscales and completing a factor analysis. The resulting correlations were not high enough to imply redundancy, but they do suggest two styles of White racial identity attitudes: first a negative style of reactivity and discomfort with racial issues, and second a positive style
of intellectual and emotional comfort with racial issues (Helms & Carter, 1990). To establish support for convergent validity, Helms and Carter correlated subscales (e.g., with other measures of personality constructs and found patterns of associations in the directions hypothesized by identity theory (Carter, 1987; Helms & Carter, 1987; McCaine, 1986; Westbrook, 1986)

**Data collection.** The first (Time 1) administration of the two-part survey occurred in July of 2010 at a data collection session during the CO TFA Summer Orientation 2010. Part 1 consisted of the online version of the IDI v. 3, including the education organization demographic questions. It is a total of 60 items and took approximately 25 minutes to complete. Part 2 consisted of three demographic/personal questions and the 20-item CoBRAS. This portion of Part 2 took approximately 10 minutes to finish. For CMs who determined that they are “considered White,” they were asked to complete the 50-question WRIAS as another portion of Part 2. In total, for CMs who identified as White (n = 123), Part 2 was a 73 item survey that took approximately 30 minutes to complete (see Appendix C).

Since Part 1 was the online version of the IDI, CMs needed usernames, passwords, and the website address. This information was emailed to all CO region 2010 incoming CMs. Email addresses were obtained and information needed to access the survey was sent to CMs several days before the data collection session. CMs were asked to wait to access the site and complete the survey until the session. All but two CMs complied.

At the data collection session, the study was first explained and informed consent was obtained. CMs then completed both parts of the two-part survey. Part 1 was a
computerized version taken online using their laptops. Part 2 was a paper version completed at CMs’ seats. Part 2 was handed to each CM upon completion of the Part 1. (CMs either raised their hands and were handed the second part, or they came up to the researcher and asked for the second part). Once Part 2 was completed, each CM handed the researcher his/her completed survey and exited. For the two people who had already taken Part 1 prior to the session, they just completed Part 2.

It is important to note that at the main (larger) data collection session—as part of the explanation of the study, informed consent, and measures—CMs were told that items on one of the measures on the Part 2 paper version might seem confusing, strange, and/or offensive and that they should just do their best and feel free to skip items that make them too uncomfortable. This was done because many CMs at the first (smaller) data collection session came up during the WRIAS portion of Part 2 to express that they were confused and/or offended by the items. Some were so angered by the items that they refused to complete Part 2. In an attempt to retain participants and data for the first administration—as well as the second—participants were prepared with the above statement and direction. Although comments were written in the margin of the survey, participants did not come up and express feelings of confusion, frustration, or anger during the main data collection session in July 2010.

The second administration (Time 2) of the two-part survey took place in April of 2011, at the close of CMs’ first teaching year in CO TFA. At the start of the research study, the second administration was planned to replicate the first. It was to be an in-person session(s) with Part 1 as an online version and Part 2 as a paper version. However, as April approached, the researcher was informed by TFA CO regional
leadership that there would be no “in-person” sessions and that both parts would have to be completed electronically. Therefore, a five-contact system described by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) was implemented.

First, an email was sent to all 2010 CMs preparing them for the upcoming second (post) administration of the two-part survey. CMs were notified that this administration would be completed entirely online and that they would each be receiving an email that would provide survey links, usernames, and passwords. CMs were reminded that Colorado regional leadership requested that all CMs take both surveys; however, only those CMs who signed the informed consent in August would be included in the research study. This email was written by the principal researcher, but sent out by a TFA managing director.

One week later, all 2010 CMs were emailed the link for Part 1 (the IDI v. 3) and the link for Part 2 (demographic questions, CoBRAS, and WRIAS). An additional email with usernames and passwords for the IDI v. 3 was sent at this time, too, directly from the IDI website. CMs were asked to complete the two parts in numerical order. They were given one week to complete the two parts.

One week later, emails were sent to all 2010 CMs thanking them for their time and also reminding them that, if they had not taken the surveys, to please do so now. The two survey links were included in this email. If participants needed their usernames/passwords for the IDI, they were directed to contact the principal researcher by email or phone.

One week later, emails were sent to 2010 CMs who had not completed both parts of the survey. This email included survey links and urged participants to respond.
Finally, one week later, the last contact was made. CMs who had not completed both surveys were called, regardless of participant status, by the managing director and asked to complete the survey.

**Data analysis.** Data were cleaned and composite scores were computed. Predictors of missing data were explored—including demographic variables and construct scores—and nothing was related to “missingness” and/or attrition from Time 1 to Time 2. The first research question was answered using descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and frequencies. The second research question was answered using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). Statistical assumptions were assessed and found to be met.

**Qualitative Methodology**

**Participants and sampling.** A total of seven corps members were individually interviewed in the qualitative phase. Each CM was from one of three groups based on level of intercultural competence (IC) at Time 2: low, mid, and high. Intercultural competence was used to stratify participants and form groups partly because it was the theoretical construct and measure deemed most valuable by the managing staff of CO TFA (W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010) but also because unlike colorblindness, intercultural competence is a process and the IDI v. 3 places individuals on the developmental continuum so grouping is more visual and intuitive. Furthermore, the IDI v. 3 that was used to determine levels of intercultural competence had the highest number of participant completion at both Times 1 and 2.

The first two groups, low and mid, each had the targeted number of participants (n = 3). The high group had one participant. All participants identified themselves as
racially and culturally different from their students. One participant, however, noted being from a low-income background and one participant identified as male.

Stratified sampling with replacement was used based on quantitative results from the second administration of the IDI v. 3 in May of 2011 (Plano, Clark & Creswell, 2008). The first step in the stratified sampling process was to list all quantitative participants from lowest DO to highest DO and to form the three subgroups. The three strata were: (1) Low intercultural competence, comprised of participants with developmental orientations (DOs) in Denial and Polarization; (2) Mid intercultural competence, comprised of participants with DOs in Minimization; and (3) High intercultural competence, comprised of participants with DOs in Acceptance and Adaptation. Three names from each group were strategically targeted using the procedure described below to maximize variability, for a total of nine desired participants for the qualitative phase.

For the formation of the low group, three participants with the lowest DO scores were originally selected and contacted. If a CM in the original three low names did not agree to be a participant, the next highest scorer was contacted. This was repeated until three low CMs agreed to participate (see Table 2 for quantitative profiles of low group participants).

____________________

6 No participants in the second, April 2011 administration of the IDI v.3 had a Developmental Orientation of Adaptation.
For the formulation of the mid group, the participant with the score closest to the mean \((m = 100)\) was selected as well as the next lowest and highest scorer. If any of these three mid CMs did not agree to participate, the next lowest or highest scorer was then contacted, in an alternating fashion until three mid CMs agreed to participate (see Table 3 for quantitative profiles of mid group participants).

The high group was formed in a similar fashion to the low group; the three highest scorers were asked to participate in the qualitative portion. If one of these high CMs did not agree to be a participant, the person with the next lowest score was then contacted. However, only one person from the high subgroup \((n = 7)\) agreed to participate. The choice to interview and analyze this one participant’s data to represent the high intercultural competence group has its roots in Mitchell’s (1984) notion of a “telling case.” Mitchell explained that a “telling case” is a case “in which the particular circumstances surrounding the case, serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationship suddenly apparent” (p. 239). The quantitative profile of the high group participant can be seen in Table 4.

An email was sent to contact the above participants (see Appendix D). The email explained the purpose of the qualitative study and asked for participation and permission to interview. When a participant responded in the affirmative, a day, time, and place for the interview was set.

**Data collection.** The main source of data was semi-structured interviews using an interview protocol with open-ended questions (see Appendix E). The interview protocol was created in conjunction with a CRP content expert, Dr. Maria Salazar. Copies of participants’ DCA reflections that were written at the beginning, middle, and
end of the academic year and that were a requirement for most CMs’ teacher certifications were also requested but were not used in the data analysis since not all participants had/gave them. Upon meeting the participant at the designated location, the purpose of the qualitative study was explained and informed consent along with permission to audio-tape was obtained (see Appendix F). Upon the completion of the interview, qualitative participants received a $20 gift certificate as compensation for their time. All interviews were transcribed using a transcription service. Transcripts were then sent to participants for member checking and only analyzed after they were returned.

**Data analysis.** To answer the third research question two levels of thematic analysis were conducted. The first level of analysis was determining beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning for each group. This was conducted to add to the quantitative exploration of CMs’ competencies and attitudes, and qualitatively explore what CMs believe about the role of culture in education. To begin this level of analysis, a cover sheet with participants’ post-test scores and group membership were added to each participant’s transcribed interview. Next, all qualitative data were read through to get a general sense of what participants were saying (Creswell, 2009). Then, using the process outlined by Creswell (2009) and Rossman and Rallis (1998), the data were coded for emergent themes. The coding process included reading data and determining topics, abbreviating topics as codes, writing codes next to segments in transcribed interviews, looking for new categories and codes, finalizing categories and codes, and recoding transcribed interviews (Creswell, 2009).

Once coding was completed, all codes found in each interview were listed in a column. Columns of participants in the same group were placed next to each other and
compared to find within group commonalities\(^7\). These commonalities were reviewed, re-organized, and condensed as appropriate, and labeled “beliefs.” (See Appendix G for Beliefs Code Book.)

The next level of analysis was finding themes across groups to illuminate how the beliefs compare across groups of CMs with differing levels of intercultural competence. To conduct this analysis group beliefs from the first analysis were coded for emergent themes. The coding process outlines by Cresswell (2009) began by listing the beliefs for each group (low, mid, and high) in columns. Next the beliefs were re-read, topics were determined, topics were abbreviated as codes, and codes were written next to corresponding beliefs. Beliefs were then re-read for new topics, categories, and codes and codes were finalized. The finalized codes were named “themes” and the beliefs were organized into a table by these themes. (See Appendix G for Themes Code Book.)

**Chapter Summary**

This research study used a transformative, sequential mixed methods design to study 134 CO TFA CMs upon entrance (Time 1) and after one year of teaching and training in the region (Time 2). This research study began with a quantitative phase that assessed the three constructs essential to culturally responsive educators: intercultural

\(^7\) There were three participant columns to compare for the low and mid groups; the high group, however, only had one participant and, therefore, only had one column. The themes that emerged in that interview were subsequently labeled as the “beliefs” of that group.
competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes. Descriptive statistics were used to illustrate the levels of the three essential constructs of CMs at Time 1 and Time 2. Repeated measures ANOVA was used to explore the difference in the levels of each construct over time. Phase two was a qualitative phase where seven participants, grouped by level of intercultural competence, were interviewed about their beliefs regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning. Qualitative data were initially coded and analyzed for group beliefs. Group beliefs were then coded and analyzed to find themes across groups. The next chapter presents the results of these analyses.
Chapter 4: Results

Research Question One

Research question one asked, What is the profile of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes for Teach for America corps members upon entrance and after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region? To answer this research question Colorado (CO) TFA corps members (CMs) were surveyed at two points in time: upon entrance into the Colorado region and after teaching in their placements for one school year. Surveys were comprised of three measures: the Intercultural Development Inventory, version 3 (Hammer, 2009), the Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000) and the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms and Carter, 1990). These established measures evaluate intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes, respectively. At Time 1, there were 134 participants. At Time 2 the sample size decreased to 78 participants. For the construct of intercultural competence, descriptive statistics were used to calculate the percentage of CMs in each stage of intercultural development at both Times 1 and 2 (see Table 5). Additionally, descriptive statistics were used to calculate mean scores and standard deviations for each measure and its subscales or developmental stages at Times 1 and 2 (see Tables 6, 7, and 8).

The vast majority of CMs had a developmental orientation (as determined by the IDI v. 3) of Minimization at Time 1 (70.7%) and Time 2 (71.6%), (see Table 5). Table 6
supports that finding where the mean IDI v.3 developmental orientation (DO) score for the sample fell within the minimization category as well at Time 1 (103.07) and Time 2 (96.51). Table 6 also reports that the mean perceived orientation (PO) score for the sample fell within Acceptance at both times, T1 (125.02) and T2 (122.30). The gap between the DO and the PO is the orientation gap (OG) and measures the degree to which participant over or underestimate their intercultural competence (Hammer, 2009). The mean OG exceeded 21 points at both times T1(21.95) and T2 (25.80). A OG of seven points or higher is considered to be a meaningful gap and indicates an overestimation of intercultural competence (Hammer, 2009). As can be seen in Table 6, the OG at both Time 1 and Time 2 is three times this “meaningful” amount.

The construct of colorblindness is broken down into three factors: unawareness of racial privilege, of institutional discrimination, and of blatant racial issues. Means and standard deviations for each factor and the total colorblindness score can be found in Table 7. CoBRAS scores range from a score of 20 (completely aware) to a score of 120 (completely “blind” or unaware). Table 7 reports that on average, the sample was in the middle of this range, T1 (47.95) and T2 (53.17). This means that they were neither completely aware nor blind to race, privilege, and discrimination. Furthermore, Table 7 displays that the sample, at both times, reported higher means for the first factor, unawareness of racial privilege, T1 (19.25) and T2 (22.92), then the other two factors. In fact, these means for Factor 1 were almost twice the means for Factor 3—unawareness of blatant racial issues—that were 10.02 and 11.56, respectively.

Results of the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) are displayed in Table 8. The WRIAS gives a score for each development stage of White racial identity
development (WRID). All five scores must be looked at together and the areas with the highest scores indicate an individual’s or group’s White racial identity attitudes. At both times, the sample’s highest scores were in the final two stages: Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy. The third highest score, at both times, was in the first stage, Contact.

**Research Question Two**

Research question two asked, Is there a statistically significant difference in corps members’ levels of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region? To answer this research question, only participants who completed surveys at both times were used (n = 78). Change over time was calculated using repeated measures ANOVA and tested for statistical significance (p < .05). Results are displayed by construct (see Tables 6, 7, and 8).

Results for the change in intercultural competence as measured by the IDI v. 3 are displayed in Table 6. The sample’s developmental (actual) orientations and perceived orientations decreased over time, and in both cases the decrease was statistically significant at the p < 0.001 level. Even though CMs’ POs decreased, their DOs decreased even more which resulted in OG scores widening from 21.95 to 25.80 (F = 27.39; p < .001). This widening of the OG indicates that at the end of CMs’ first year of teaching, the sample of CMs is overestimating their intercultural competence even more than they were at the beginning of the school year.

As can be seen in Table 7, CMs’ overall colorblindness increased from 47.95 to 53.17 from Time 1 to Time 2, (F = 27.39; p < .001). While all three factors increased
over time, only the changes in Unawareness of Racial Privilege (F = 39.25) and of Blatant Racial Issues (F = 20.77) were statistically significant (p < 0.001).

CMs’ changes in White racial identity attitudes were varied and statistically significant change only occurred at the ends of the developmental continuum (see Table 8). The mean score for the first stage of WRID, Contact, decreased over time (F = 9.93; p < 0.05), meaning less CMs were in the first stage of White racial identity development. Conversely, the mean score for the last stage of WRID, Autonomy, decreased over time (F = 9.93; p < 0.05), meaning less CMs were in the final stage of White racial identity development.

Research Question Three

Research question three asked, What are the beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning of corps members of differing levels of intercultural competence? To answer research question three, qualitative participants were grouped into three levels of intercultural competence, low (n = 3), mid (n = 3), and high (n = 1).

Two levels of thematic analysis were used to make meaning of the qualitative data. First, emergent beliefs were determined for each group regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning (see columns in Table 9). This level of analysis helped add richness to the quantitative profiles of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes at Time 2. Second, emergent themes across groups were found and described (see rows in Table 9). This level of analysis illuminates how the beliefs compare across CMs with differing levels of intercultural competence.

Themes. The beliefs for each group resulting from the first level on qualitative analysis are listed in columns in Table 9. The results of the second level of analysis are
five themes that span across all three groups’ beliefs. The themes are: (1) Student/parent apathy and resistance; (2) Culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and communication; (3) Teachers’ cultural and racial identities; (4) CRP professional development; and (5) The roles of culture and care in achieving goals. These five themes are the organizing structures for presenting, explaining, and comparing the beliefs of each group.

**Theme 1: Student/parent apathy and resistance.** The first theme found to span all three groups is the idea that CMs’ students and families who are from low socio-economic backgrounds and are culturally and linguistically diverse (and different from the participants) exhibit apathy and resistance and lack involvement. Described below are the beliefs of each group as they relate to this theme.

The low group expressed the belief that culture matters in teaching and learning because if a culture does not value education, then the students of that culture will not value education. One low group participant said:

> I think their culture often leads to some of their mindsets about the value of education or about what they are doing when they are in school. So, like, if you come from a culture that sees high school as something that you have to complete just so that you can just like check a box then you are not going to come into the classroom driven to understand the material and to really dive into it.

Another low group participant said, “. . . I have some students whose family are in gangs, who don’t see a whole lot of value in education and that makes it difficult for me to motivate them . . ..” Additionally, the low group expressed the belief that when cultures do not value education, parental support is low or parents are not “on board” and this inhibits academic achievement. Low group participants gave brief reasons for why their students’ cultures do not value education or parents are not involved. These reason
include, “the education system has failed generation before them,” “parents are busy,” and “they have had different experiences with institutions.”

Similarly, the mid group communicated that culture matters in teaching and learning because some cultures are “apathetic” about education and lack parental involvement. The mid group, though, attempted to adequately explain the roots of this apathy. Their explanations include the challenges of being undocumented and the idea that “a lot of parents have had bad experiences in schools.”

The participant in the high group said that students of color and low socio-economic status can be resistant but explained that it is not necessarily “. . . direct resistance, [but] much more passive forms like not doing homework . . . or playing around in class.” This participant said that this behavior, “exists at a very deep layer that [the students] don’t recognize it [as resistance] . . . I think they are bucking the system.” This participant explained the reason for this resistance saying students feel like they are being stripped of their culture and students recognize that the administration and staff are White and they are a different color. They see and struggle with this difference and that leads to their resistance.

**Theme 2: Culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and communication.**

The second theme found to span all three groups is the notion that culturally responsive teaching and communication are imperative in working with culturally and linguistically diverse students and families. Described below are the beliefs of each group as they relate to this theme.

The low and mid groups shared the same belief that culturally congruent curriculum, instruction, and communication are valuable to engage students and,
ultimately, to increase academic achievement. A low group participant explained her idea of cultural communication that leads to success in the classroom. She said, “What I’ve noticed is my Black students tend to really respond to like, direct communication . . . like they want me to tell them how it is and come down hard.” This low group participant also said that she tries to incorporate culturally relevant curriculum. She wants them to “see themselves in like the books we read.” One participant in the mid group agreed with this and stated that, “incorporating their culture . . . makes educational experiences far more powerful.” Another mid group participant explained, “It’s important for me to actively connect to all of my students and to represent who they are in what we are learning.” Finally, a mid-level participant revealed:

Well I think making the content relevant is a huge way that culture influences their learning because . . . in math it’s mostly word problems, but there can be word problems that are just completely out of my students’ realm of understanding. Like, if they’ve never been skiing and there is a question about the rate of change of the ski lift or something, then they won’t know what it is . . . they can’t visualize it and it is going to be a lot harder for them to access the content or to feel like it is relevant to their life.

The mid-level group talked about how incorporating and valuing students’ heritage cultures decreases apathy and increases motivation to learn and do work.

Both groups (low and mid) also explained that they understood how to modify or add to their district-provided curriculum to include culturally relevant curriculum, particularly in language arts and social studies. The low group alone, however, expressed a lack of confidence regarding their ability to modify instructional practices and communication to be culturally congruent. The low group reported not knowing exactly how culture impacts learning and communicating. The questions and uncertainty posed by the low group revealed that they believe culture matters, but struggle with how to be
culturally responsive beyond including curriculum and stories that have characters, places, and experiences that are relevant to students.

The high group participant agreed that CRP is important, but was unique in focusing on the point that CRP is not formulaic, easily achieved by including diverse authors or merely incorporating cooperative learning. This participant explained, “Simply using Hispanic authors or Black authors isn’t going to make you multicultural.”

This high-level participant went on to share and wonder:

Whether you can really be transformational and change someone’s life by making sure you have certain ‘x’ number of Hispanic, ‘x’ number of African-American, or ‘x’ number of Asian-American authors . . . or having [students] do a multimedia project on the Aztecs because that’s something that’s going to appeal to them and therefore, I can get them more engaged and interested and then I can feel better about myself.

Because it is not easily achieved, the high group participant distinctively questioned if CRP can be employed by teachers who identify as White and upper-class.

Theme 3: Teachers’ cultural and racial identities. All groups reported that teachers’ cultural identities—including race, heritage languages, and socio-economic status—play a significant role in the classroom when it comes to teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. Described first are the beliefs regarding the advantages and disadvantages of being different than/similar to one’s students. Presented second are beliefs related to the implications of being a White educator.

The low group expressed the belief that White teachers face mistrust of and being called “racist” by students and parents who are racially and culturally different. One low group participant reported, “Kids call me racist because they think it’s funny.” Another low group participant recalled a parent-teacher conference with an African-American
mother who questions, “Well how do I know you’re not just another young White teacher coming in and leaving after a year?” This participant said her race was an additional hurdle that she had to overcome.

The mid and high groups did not express the above belief; rather, these groups expressed the shared belief that teachers who share the same cultural, racial, linguistic background as their students have the potential to have an increased positive impact. A mid-level participant said, “I think that commonality is very powerful . . . if I was a Hispanic female . . . that would be wonderful because they would have someone who looks like them to look up to.” The high group participant agreed with the above statement and questioned, “Is there something about my [White] race that will keep me from being a transformational leader?” This participant struggles with if it is necessary for a teacher to share the same cultural background with students because race/culture is so important in education.

All three groups also discussed the implications of being White educators. The low and the high groups both reported the belief that White teachers need to be comfortable with their “Whiteness” and bring who they are, including their cultural strengths, into the classroom. The high group participant explained at length the belief that White teachers should be careful not to “mimic” students and their cultures. This participant described the danger of mimicking or masquerading: “Masquerading to me is a loss of self, an inability to appreciate your own culture and strengths . . . with masquerading goes embarrassment or sort of, something is owed . . . that breeds this messy ‘savior’ complex as well.”
The mid group expressed a unique perspective related to this theme; they reported an unease with being different from students and, therefore, trying to hide “Whiteness” and pretending to know more language or share more racial background with students. One mid-level participant revealed, “. . . I have brown skin so my kids all think I’m Hispanic and I speak Spanish and I definitely play that all the time.” Another mid group participant said, “My dad is a lawyer. I grew up with money. Like, I never bring that up because it makes me uncomfortable. And I feel like . . . I’m masking my real culture.” Participants in the mid group discussed being uncomfortable on home visits and with the language barrier. One said, “I try to portray more Spanish knowledge than I have . . .” This expression of discomfort and “masking” was unique to the mid-level group.

**Theme 4: CRP professional development.** All groups discussed the necessary role of professional development in preparing culturally responsive educators. Described below are the beliefs of each group as they relate to this theme.

The low group participants believed that professional development is necessary to explore the role of culture in teaching and learning, but that culturally responsive professional development needs to happen after teachers learn to teach. This belief is explained by one low group participant; she said, [CRP professional development] “needs to come later in the year and not like, first thing, you know because I think that people are less willing to dive into this stuff when they’re still trying to figure out like, classroom management and like, protocol stuff and this stuff [culturally responsive pedagogy] comes later.” For the low group, culturally responsive pedagogy seems to be separate, not something that is integrated into classroom management and instruction.
This belief of “CRP later” is in contrast to the belief expressed by the participant in the high group who believes culture is very important but questions if teachers can learn to become bicultural. This high-level participant said, “I just don’t know how successful people can actually be bicultural. I just am very skeptical . . . I think the [idea of becoming bicultural] is noble and wonderful, but for the majority of TFA CMs who are on a much higher socio-economic standard, I don’t know how they are going to do it.” This participant believed that culture is a lived experience and one cannot “pop in” and learn the culture in order to be culturally responsive. This high group participant explained, “Poverty is a lived experience. You can’t just hop in and understand . . . until you have heard your parents fight over the grocery bill . . . you can’t know what that’s like, you just can’t.”

The low and mid-level groups both had beliefs about the goals of professional development. The low group said that professional development should prepare teachers to have difficult conversation regarding race and culture with students and families. One low group participant explains, “I just didn’t at all feel prepared for conversations with parents in which they talked about those heavy subject of race . . .” In contrast, the mid group said professional development should help teachers teach students to develop a critical, sociocultural consciousness and become less racist. One mid-level participant stated that instead of just talking about her own race and privilege in professional development sessions, she wanted to “talk about how to get our kids to value each other’s culture and race.” Another mid-level participant said she wants to learn how to facilitate critical conversations with her students and “make them look at the world around them . . .
. be critical of society and the way cultures are treated. You don’t just want [teachers] to know that, you actually want your kids to know that.”

**Theme 5: The roles of culture and care in achieving goals.** Each group discussed their goals for students revealing beliefs about the roles culture and care play in helping students achieve those goals. Low group participants communicated that developing “good” students and “good” writers was their goal. It was also important to have students know “a stable adult cares” and to understand “the value of time” and be ready to learn when they walk in the door. To achieve these educational goals, the low group revealed the belief that culture matters, but care matters more. One low group participant illustrated this belief when she said:

> I think for as much as we talk about the culture, students’ cultures versus teachers’ cultures, the most important thing for the relationships with my students is that I care about them and they care about me. And like I don’t know what I’ve done actively to get across to them that I care about them and I think some of it is just having those sort of conversations like, ‘Hey, how was baseball practice yesterday?’ and like, being a real human being. That matters so much more than, I think, any cultural factor would.

Another low group participant said, “. . . the best teachers show that they care about their students. And the way that I care about my students is going to be just the same as any teacher of any race cares about their students.”

Participants in the mid group communicated goals of educational ownership and academic growth/proficiency. They said they wanted their students “to care about school,” “to know they can be whatever they want to be,” and “to control their educations; to know what they want and to go after it and have the ability to do so.” Furthermore, they reported that culture is important in achieving the above goals particularly because cultural congruence (cultural similarity in terms of students and
teachers and/or students and curriculum) helps improve engagement and establish a connection resulting in improved effectiveness. They also noted, though, that commonality matters, meaning the shared desire to support or be supported.

For the high-level group participant, this thread of care was addressed but the perspective was unique. This participant stated, “I appreciate that a lot of people care. I just think that care is sometimes misguided, and not fake but just misguided. [I question] whether it really has the purpose it should.” This questioning of care directly related to this participant’s goals for his students. In other words, the other groups have clear goals for student achievement and using culture, commonality, and care to help students achieve. In contrast, the high group participant clearly and consistently questioned, “Whose culture am I trying to spread?” and “What am I teaching my kids to do? Whose culture should they pick up if they want success?” The high-level participant questioned assimilating students into White culture, but states “I don’t know any other way to do it and so I wonder am I teaching them to ape [sic] me, to copy me, to mimic me?” This is a struggle for this participant because he knows that students of color “end up losing themselves and they don’t gain much . . . because the system is set up to benefit White people.” This questioning of the purpose of education and the role of care in this purpose was unique to the high-level group.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results for both the quantitative phase, research questions one and two, and the qualitative phase, research question three. The quantitative results described CMs’ levels of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity development. CM’s reported having a mean developmental
orientation of Minimization and having mid-range colorblind racial attitudes at both Time 1 and Time 2. Additionally, White racial identity attitudes (at both times) were conflicting, with the highest two subscale scores at the high end of the continuum and the third highest subscale score being at the low end. The change over time for each of these constructs was calculated and tested. Mean scores for intercultural competence decreased over time, while colorblindness increased, both as a statistically significant level (p < .001). For the qualitative phase, beliefs were reported for each group of intercultural competence (low, mid, and high), and then themes that spanned across groups were reported. Although some groups shared certain beliefs, each group had a list of beliefs unique to that particular group (see Table 9). The quantitative, qualitative, and combined results are discussed in the next chapter along with the limitations of these results. Furthermore, implications of these results for CO TFA and general teacher preparation are addressed. Lastly, the researcher presents recommendations for future research.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

This sequential, mixed methods research study was conducted to understand the intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes of Colorado (CO) Teach for America (TFA) corps members (CMs). It also examined beliefs regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning. As stated in previous chapters, this study focused on answering the following three research questions:

1. What is the profile of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes for Teach for America corps members upon entrance and after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in corps members’ levels of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes after one academic year of training and teaching in the Colorado region?

3. What are the beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning of corps members of differing levels of intercultural competence?

The ultimate goal of this research study was to better understand CMs' underlying constructs and beliefs essential to culturally responsive teaching to inform professional development design and promote culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) in the CO region of TFA. The implementation of CRP in the CO region would potentially go beyond
“leveling the field” for low-income students and help ensure that students of color and low socio economic status not only achieve academically, but also develop positive cultural/racial identities and gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to transform society.

Discussion of Results

Research question one. Research question one was descriptive and sought to provide profiles of participants for each construct (intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity development) at two points in time: upon entrance into the region and after one academic year of teaching and training. This research study found that about 71 percent of participants at both Time 1 and Time 2 had a developmental orientation of Minimization, indicating that CMs tend to focus on cultural similarities and minimize cultural differences. This is similar to Bayles’ (2009) finding where the average developmental orientation of 233 elementary teachers in bilingual schools in a Texas school district was also in Minimization. The results for intercultural competence were supported by the results of the Colorblind Racial Attitude Scale (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000). Key mean CoBRAS subscale scores were in the middle of the possible range, suggesting that CMs are somewhat colorblind and unaware of racial privilege and institutional discrimination. The two highest mean subscale scores (out of five) on the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale were Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy—the highest stages of White racial identity development. These results suggest that many CMs have a healthy, positive anti-racist White identity that is imperative for CRP (Banks, 1994; Carter & Goodwin, 1994; Rose, 1996; Smith, 1994; Vavrus, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). However, the third highest mean subscale
score was Contact. Contact is the lowest stage of White racial identity development and is described as a lack of awareness of the sociocultural significance of race, particularly one’s own White race (Helms, 1990). This result indicates that CMs who generally have a positive, anti-racist White identity still struggle with issues present in the Contact stage; namely, they struggle to see their own racial privilege.

The above conclusions are important for students because CMs who are colorblind may minimize student and parental cultural differences and over-emphasize cultural similarities. While trying to focus on similarities, CMs may use colorblind strategies and “apply universal values and principles to their educational practice” (Bayles, 2009, abstract). Gay (2000) explained that colorblind educators fail to understand that “the individuality of students is deeply entwined with [students’] ethnic identity and cultural socialization” (p. 23). She goes on to warn that if teachers only see individuals and similarities rather than culture/race and differences, the teachers increase the risk that they “will impose their notions on ethnically different students, insult their cultural heritages, or ignore them entirely in the instructional process” (p. 23). Finally, as Siwatu (2005) suggested, “Color-blind teachers may not see or value the importance of engaging in the practice of culturally responsive teaching” (pp. 106-107).

Additionally, the conclusions for question one are important because they suggest that TFA’s highly selective standards for CM selection (Farr, 2010) do not necessarily translate into selecting CMs with high levels of intercultural competence and White racial identity development and low levels of colorblindness. Instead, TFA’s selection criteria result in recruiting CMs who, on average, are in the middle of intercultural competence and the colorblindness constructs.
Farr (2010) described TFA’s selection criteria: “We recruit individuals who have the skills and commitment to make an impact on the academic prospects of students growing up in low-income communities and to exert long-term leadership in the effort to eliminate educational inequity” (p. 273). Farr also specified that the CM selection criteria include “Respect for students and families in low-income communities” (p. 273). However, these selection criteria—and others—do not include “respect for culturally and linguistically diverse students and families,” which would honor TFA’s stated position on the importance of race in addition to socio economic status when it comes to addressing the issue of educational inequity. TFA explained the strong link between race and class: “Because race and socio economic status, and the dynamics of difference they generate, are so integral to the quest for education equity, these issues are fundamental to the Teaching As Leadership framework” (Farr, 2010, p. 9). This research study reveals that this “integral” connection between race and educational equity—and the fact that CMs are not selected intentionally on this basis—represents a significant challenge to TFA’s implementation of CRP.

**Research question two.** Research question two evaluated and described changes in each construct over one academic year’s time. In sum, at Time 2 the mean score for intercultural competence decreased (see Table 6). Similarly, the mean score for colorblindness increased over time (see Table 7). Lastly, the gap between the sample’s actual level and perceived level of intercultural competence widened from Time 1 to Time 2 (see Table 6). These changes over time were statistically significant (p < .001). These results indicate that the corps experience does not increase intercultural competence or lessen colorblindness; in fact, at the end of the first year of the corps
experience participants in this research study were less culturally competent and more colorblind (see Tables 6 and 7).

The conclusion that CMs regress in the three essential constructs is important because this means CMs are entering their second year of teaching with a greater tendency to minimize differences and ignore color/race that, in turn, means a subtractive schooling experience for students (Bayles, 2009; Gay, 2000) and resistance to culturally responsive pedagogy (Siwatu, 2005). Furthermore, if this regression stays the same or continues throughout the second year, CMs exit the corps significantly less interculturally competent and more colorblind than when they entered.

This conclusion is in contrast with what TFA believes results from completing the entire corps experience (two years). According to the founder of TFA, Wendy Kopp, “The corps members’ teaching experiences were bound to strengthen their commitment to children in low-income communities and spur their outrage at the circumstances preventing these children from fulfilling their potential” (p. 6). Although Kopp is not explicitly stating that CMs will be more culturally competent and aware of racism and racial privilege, she does purport that CMs would be more “outraged” at the circumstances preventing children from fulfilling their potential, which, according to Villegas and Lucas (2002), includes institutional racism and racial privilege. Furthermore, TFA’s Theory of Change states: “In succeeding with their students, corps members gain . . . a grounded understanding of the problem [of educational inequity] in all its complexity and of the solutions” (Teach for America, 2010b, “Diversity”). The results of research question two, however, suggest that this was not the case, at least not by the end of the first year of the TFA corps experience.
TFA states that they are in the business of developing “leaders” who will end educational inequity and provide all students with the opportunity to attain an excellent education (Kopp, 2001). Farr (2010) described TFA alumni leadership:

As of 2009, more than 380 alumni lead schools across the country, and more than 20 have founded and continue to lead some of the country’s most innovative nonprofits. In addition, a growing number of [TFA] alumni are pursuing careers in public service, including more than 500 who work in government, politics, or advocacy and over 25 who serve as elected officials. (p. 270)

According to the statistics above, there is little doubt that TFA is producing leaders in the movement for educational equity; however, if the corps experience results in alumni leaders who are less culturally competent and aware of racism and privilege—and how racism and privilege operate in institutions like education—they are leaders who merely “level the field,” ensuring that students of color and low socioeconomic status master dominant culture skills and content. This is not the kind of leadership that challenges the status quo and truly transforms society, including the institution of education (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Instead, we need leaders with cultural competence and critical consciousnesses. We need leaders who have the orientations that will fuel them to fight not only for academic excellence for our culturally and linguistically diverse students, but also, for educational experiences that will affirm and build their positive cultural identities and prepare them to see and redress bias and injustice.

**Research question three.** The goal of research question three was to explore beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning, thus adding richness to the quantitative profiles of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial
identity attitudes at Time 2. Second, it sought to compare the beliefs about culture and education across groups of participants with different levels of intercultural competence. While all CMs interviewed, regardless of level of intercultural competence, espoused a general belief that “culture matters” in teaching and learning, each group had unique beliefs, and there were notable differences in beliefs when groups were compared.

These differences in beliefs were consistent with Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) framework for preparing culturally responsive teachers. Villegas and Lucas’ framework, as explained in previous chapters, begins with three fundamental orientations necessary for culturally responsive teachers: sociocultural consciousness, affirming perspectives toward culturally different students, and a concept of teachers as change agents. These three fundamental orientations each present on a spectrum, with the opposing orientations being social cultural dysconsciousness, deficit perspectives toward culturally different students, and a concept of teachers as technicians. The research study reveals that a participant’s level of intercultural competence is related to his/her placement on Villegas and Lucas’ fundamental orientation spectrums.

Overall, the low intercultural competence group stated that culture is important in education; however, the low group’s responses were characterized by sociocultural dysconsciousness, which is the opposite of Villegas and Lucas’ first fundamental orientation “sociocultural consciousness” required for culturally responsive teaching. Villegas and Lucas described sociocultural dysconsciousness as an “Unreflective way of thinking that takes one’s worldview as universal” (p. 33). The low group displayed this dysconsciousness in their unawareness (or uncertainty) of how culture (including their own) impacts learning and teaching. This is exemplified by one low group comment: “I
struggle with CRP in the math classroom because properties of exponents are properties of exponents, you know?” This participant believes “math” (and the learning of exponents) is devoid of culture. Villegas and Lucas also described sociocultural dysconsciousness as an “unquestioned adherence to a meritocracy view of American society, which supports the justification of existing inequities” (p. 33). This aspect is exemplified in one low group participant’s comment about the value of education. She said:

in my background education was like, not up for discussion . . . I was very invested and worked really hard . . . and then to get to schools like this where some of the students [are not] invested in their own education, that was a shock for me. So that has definitely impacted my teaching.

A deficit perspective also characterized the low group’s beliefs. Again this is the opposite of Villegas and Lucas’ second fundamental orientation, “Affirming perspective,” required for culturally responsive teaching. Villegas and Lucas described a deficit attitude toward culturally different students as one where “students who don’t conform to the dominant culture are ‘deficient’ and in need of ‘fixing.’ Emphasis is placed on what students are lacking” (p. 36). A low group participant exemplified this deficit perspective when she stated, “it’s hard to fight against what parents think and what parents value.” This comment implies that parents do not value the “right” thing. Furthermore, another low group participant said, “I think more important for me . . . is showing my students that there is an adult who loves them and cares about them and is a positive role model,” which implies that this participant believes her students do not have adults in their families who love them and are positive role models.
Another characteristic of the low group’s beliefs was an emphasis on care and “good” teaching, not on culture. This emphasis on “good” teaching is consistent with “Teacher as technicians” which is on the opposite end of the spectrum of Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) third fundamental orientation, “Teacher as agent of change.” “Teachers as technicians,” as described by Villegas and Lucas, includes believing that “teaching is principally a technical activity that involves the application of clearly defined instructional procedures or methods” (p. 54). A low group statement that exemplifies this characteristic was stated in response to the question, “What matters in teaching and learning?” The low group participant said, “I think what makes me a good teacher is I care about language arts so much and I care about my students’ abilities to get it like more than anything and they know that; and they know that I will do anything to have them get it, you know?” This characteristic is also revealed in the low group theme that professional development around culture and teaching/learning is only important after one learns to teach.

The mid intercultural competence group was the only group that expressed the importance of commonality in helping students become successful. In other words, they expressed the importance of focusing on and utilizing what students and teachers have in common to help student achieve. They were also the only group that expressed that they were uncomfortable with their “difference” and trying to “mask” their racial, linguistic, and socio-economic identities. For example, one mid-group participant said, “My dad is a lawyer. I grew up with money. Like, I never bring that up because it makes me uncomfortable. And I feel like . . . I’m masking my real culture.” This mid group belief is at neither end of Villegas and Lucas’ “Affirming perspective” continuum. It is neither
believing that the dominant, White, culture is superior, nor is it feeling comfortable in one’s Whiteness and believing “The culture of the white middle class is valid” (2002, p. 36).

Another unique characteristic of the mid group’s beliefs was the concern for developing students’ critical, sociocultural consciousness. The mid group was the only group that asked for professional development for themselves (as individuals and teachers) and to help themselves develop their students’ critical lenses because, as a mid-level participant said, “You [as a teacher] don’t just want to know [about issues of power, privilege, and access], you want your [students] to know that.” This mid group belief shows that not only are the participants striving for the high end of the sociocultural consciousness continuum proposed by Villegas and Lucas, but they want to move their students along that continuum too.

The one participant in the high intercultural group’s responses were uniquely characterized by questioning, not providing answers. The high group participant asked a series of thought-provoking questions:

- What qualifications matter then [for being an excellent teacher]? Is race the most important qualification?
- Whose culture am I trying to spread?
- What am I teaching my kids to do? Whose culture should they pick up if they want success?

This questioning represents sociocultural consciousness which is described by Villegas and Lucas as a “Heightened awareness that there are multiple perspectives” and a “Profound understanding that power is differentially distributed in society” (p. 33). The questions he asked are also evidence of an affirming perspective, described as believing “the culture of the White middle class is valid, as are the cultures of other groups”
(Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 36). Finally, his questioning is evidence that he is not accepting standard school practices and curriculum uncritically, which is what “Teachers as technicians” do; instead, he is becoming a “change agent” by developing a personal vision of why he is a teacher and what is important in education (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 54).

**Overall conclusion.** This mixed methods research study reveals that TFA’s current selection and CO TFA’s corps experience and training result in colorblind CMs who minimize cultural differences and struggle with being aware of (and comfortable with their own) racial privilege. The qualitative results support and illuminate the quantitative findings. They reveal that while the majority of CMs believe that culture matters in the context of education, they also believe that finding “commonality” is important in teaching and learning and that they must overcome student and parent apathy. These mixed methods findings are important because teachers who are in minimization and colorblind may ignore, insult, and disregard culturally and linguistically diverse students’ heritages and resist culturally responsive practices (Bayles, 2009; Gay, 2000; Siwatu, 2005). This means that culturally and linguistically diverse students—who make up 85% of the students that TFA CMs teach—may experience an education that is subtractive and seeks to assimilate them into dominant culture (W. Seamans, personal communication, June 8, 2011). Because CO TFA is seeking CRP and the outcomes it offers beyond academic achievement alone (Teach for America Colorado, 2011; W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010), CO TFA must revise its main outcomes/aims for students and its frameworks for evaluating
and training CMs. Furthermore, it must redesign its professional development programming for CMs.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study may be limited based on the fact that the principal researcher was also a volunteer and paid consultant for CO Teach for America. This conflict of interest was revealed at the introduction to this research study. Although empirical research methods were used to limit bias, participants may have known the principal researcher as the “Diversity Consultant” who fervently believes culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning. This perception of the principal researcher may have biased participants’ quantitative and qualitative responses.

The next limitation of this study is the use of the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990). As mentioned in previous chapters, the WRIAS, during the very first administration (Time 1, small group), produced a negative reaction in CMs. CMs felt the measure was offensive and exclusionary because it only asked questions about “Blacks” and “Whites.” CMs also reported (in the margins) that items were confusing. Two items in particular were highlighted as particularly offensive and confusing: “I think it’s okay for Black people and White people to date each other as long as they don’t marry each other” and “I wish I had a Black friend.” Participants reported not knowing how to respond to these items, and many chose to skip these items or quit the survey completely. Skipping these items (and/or quitting the survey) impacted the sample size and, therefore, the statistical power.

Because of this negative perception of the WRIAS, the researcher chose to give different directions to the larger group at Time 1. This change in protocol between the
two data collection sessions at Time 1 could have impacted the way participants responded and is a limitation. Similarly, the administration of the survey changed from Time 1 to Time 2. At Time 1 the data collection happened in person. At Time 2, data collection happened over email. The change in format could not be avoided and possibly led to the amount of attrition at Time 2, another limitation in and of itself.

A major limitation of the qualitative phase is that the qualitative themes are based on only one source of data, an interview with each participant. DCA reflections for most participants were collected, but due to the fact that not all participants submitted DCA reflections, they were not included in the analysis. Qualitative themes, however, are supported by the quantitative results. Additionally, although a coding process outlined by Creswell (2009) was used to determine emerging beliefs and themes, the researcher is the only one who coded and analyzed the qualitative data.

The last limitation is the fact that the high intercultural competence group was comprised of only one participant. Every effort was made to recruit three participants (of the seven eligible) for the high-level group; however, in the end, only one participant agreed. The choice to interview and analyze this one participant’s data to represent the high intercultural competence group has its roots in Mitchell’s (1984) notion of a “telling case.” Mitchell explained that a “telling case” is a case “in which the particular circumstances surrounding the case, serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationship suddenly apparent” (p. 239).

**Significance of the Research**

This study contributes to the current literature on TFA, its corps members (CMs), and their cultural competence, racial attitudes, and beliefs regarding culture that are
essential to culturally responsive teaching competence. The results of this research study demonstrate that the majority of participants begin their teaching trying to minimize cultural differences. The quantitative results combined with the qualitative results show that after one year, the sample of CO CMs are still minimizing differences and hiding their own cultural, racial, and socio-economic backgrounds.

This study also adds to the TFA literature, specifically the impact of their professional development and the first year corps experience, on CMs’ intercultural competence, colorblindness, White racial identity attitudes, and beliefs about the role of culture in teaching and learning. The results at Time 2 demonstrate that teaching in a culture different than one’s own does not necessarily develop intercultural competence and the fundamental orientations needed for culturally responsive teaching proposed by Villegas and Lucas (2002). Given that CO TFA has expressed a desire to be culturally responsive (Teach for America Colorado, 2011; W. Seamans, personal communication, May 10, 2010), that 68 percent of CO TFA CMs identify as White, and that about 85 percent of the students they serve are of color (W. Seamans, personal communication, June 8, 2011; Teach for America, 2010b, “Regions”), both of these findings are important. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate the need for a change in professional development, among other aspects, if CO TFA wants to implement culturally responsive pedagogy. These findings may be applicable to other TFA regions or urban teacher residencies with similar demographics and aims.

**Implications for Colorado TFA**

This research study provides insight into the intercultural competence, racial attitudes, and beliefs regarding culture and education of CO TFA CMs that can be used to
promote culturally responsive pedagogy. Based on the findings, there are several implications for CO TFA and similar urban teacher preparation programs. One of the major implications for TFA (the national organization) is that it should revise its selection process to eliminate the selection of individuals who are of a monocultural mindset, completely colorblind, or in the initial stages of White racial identity development. However, selection is outside of Colorado TFA’s control and, therefore, outside the scope of the implications for this research study. Therefore, the remaining implications are targeted specifically for CO TFA and advocates for CO TFA: to revise its aims, its Teaching As Leadership (TAL) framework/rubric, and its training and professional development of CMs.

First and most importantly, if CO TFA wants to promote CRP it needs to explicitly and transparently revise its main aim and strive for three outcomes/aims: (1) enduring academic achievement; (2) the development of a positive cultural identity; and (3) the development of a critical, sociocultural lens. Currently TFA’s aim is for students to “achieve dramatic academic success” or “tremendous academic gains” (Farr, 2010, pp. 4-5). For TFA, these academic gains level the field by equipping low-income students (who are primarily of color) with the dominant culture academic content and skills (Farr, 2010; Kopp, 2001). This aim, though, is not enough if TFA hopes to truly impact the societal problem of educational inequity (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995; Nieto, 1999). Ladson-Billings (1995) concurred:

Culturally relevant pedagogy rests on three criteria or propositions: (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence; and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order. (p. 96)
Once these three aims become the focus of CO TFA, the “Teacher Actions” in the TAL framework/rubric need to be revised to include the teacher actions described in Chapter 2 (see Figure 1). The current TAL framework/rubric does not—intentionally and explicitly—include culturally responsive teaching actions. Instead, “diversity” is said to “undergrid” the TAL framework. Farr (2010) of Teach for America explained:

[Issues of race and class, and the dynamics of difference they generate] undergrid discussions of maintaining high expectations and investing students and families in working hard to achieve academic success. They arise as we build relationships and collaborate . . . At the same time, our own awareness of how we experience and respond to issues of race and socioeconomic status can have implications for our continuous improvement and persistence in the face of obstacles and failures. For all of these reasons, issues related to race and socioeconomic status are inextricable from the Teaching As Leadership framework and are discussed in this book [Teaching As Leadership]. (p. 9)

While the discussion of race and its interaction with class is critical, discussion alone is not enough. The exclusion or omission of explicit, culturally responsive teacher actions inadvertently communicates to CMs that culturally responsive teaching actions are not necessary or valuable.

To create a culturally responsive TAL framework/rubric that articulates specific and intentional culturally responsive teacher actions, the revision must be guided by the three CRP student aims of academic achievement, positive cultural identity development, and a critical sociocultural consciousness. Next, keeping these aims at the center of the work, the four general CRP actions discussed in Chapter 2—(1) the use of culturally congruent curriculum and instruction; (2) the implementation of critical pedagogy; (3) the building of reciprocal relationships with students and their families; and (4) the establishment of a welcoming and collaborative environment—need to be broken down into more specific and scaffolded teacher actions. These specific actions can then be
embedded into the current TAL rubric under the appropriate TAL principle (see Figure 5). The process of revising the current TAL rubric and creating a culturally responsive TAL framework/rubric needs to be done by current CO TFA staff members to ensure congruence with TFA terminology, scope, and structure; however, the following is an example of the recommended process and is illustrated in Table 10.

To achieve the CRP aims, a critical teacher action described in Chapter 2 is the use of culturally congruent curriculum and instruction and assessment practices. “Cultural congruence,” here, means that a teacher adapts her/his curriculum, practice, and communication to utilize the (cultural) experiences, skills, and knowledge that students bring to the classroom (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 1999). Implicit in this general teacher action are several more specific actions.

First, for teachers to know how to design or modify curriculum, practices, and communication, culturally responsive teachers must initially and continuously learn students’ deep cultural backgrounds (Salazar, 2008). They can do this by spending time in the communities they serve and asking questions to learn about students’ family backgrounds, educational experiences, and cultural norms and values (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, and Curran (2004) agreed and wrote that teachers must “begin to appreciate the importance of conducting home visits and consulting with parents and community members” (p. 30). Carger (1997) agreed and recommended, “Listen, observe, visit, read, reflect, and write. All these activities can broaden [one’s] understanding of [one’s] culturally diverse students” (p. 39). These actions can be listed under the TAL principle of “Invest students and their families.”
Next, teachers need to “Plan Purposefully” (Farr, 2010, p. 107) for what they learned on their home visits and from their formal/informal cultural inquiries and readings. The current TAL rubric has six teacher actions under the “Plan Purposefully” principle, none of which require CMs to consider and plan for students’ cultural experiences, skills, and knowledge. To create culturally congruent classroom and instructional “plans,” CMs need to research and find curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and classroom management practices that are culturally relevant for the cultures represented in their classrooms.

After CMs plan purposefully, they must “Execute Effectively” (Farr, 2010, p. 143). Culturally responsive educators actively and intentionally “acknowledge and capitalize on students’ cultural and linguistic resources” (Salazar, 2008, p. 346); in other words, they apply what they learned about students and families, and they use their culturally responsive plans. This can be accomplished by using cooperative learning, writing math word problems with cultural referents, or providing opportunities for “parental involvement” that are culturally congruent (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Madrid et al., 2007). Salazar (2008) also stated that teachers must “communicate the message that students’ heritage languages have tremendous value in social and academic contexts” (p. 353). The above teacher action looks like a teacher encouraging a student to include pieces written in his heritage language in his writing portfolio. It also looks like the inclusion and literary analysis of African-American literature written in dialect in an American literature or language arts class.

A culturally responsive teacher also critiques her existing curriculum and instructional methods, communication style, and assessments for hidden cultural
preferences and responsiveness to “surface” cultural features that may insult students’ cultural heritages and/or be stereotypical (Nieto, 1999; Salazar, 2008). For example, upon reflection and critique, a teacher may notice that she is over-utilizing math board races, a competitive strategy she loved when she was a student, instead of a collaborative approach that is more culturally congruent. Another example is when a teacher critiques his curriculum and finds that he focuses on using rap in his poetry class (that is primarily made up of Black students) because he believes Black students really like rap music. This teacher action of critique can be listed under the TAL principle, “Continuously Increase Effectiveness.”

The example illustrated above and in Table 10 represents the process to be undertaken by CO TFA for all four general CRP teacher actions presented in Chapter 2 (see Figure 1). This process can be guided by an expert in the field of culturally responsive pedagogy, but must be done in conjunction with leaders in the region and/or in the TFA organization for ownership and alignment with TFA language and values.

Upon the completion of a culturally responsive TAL framework/rubric, the next implication for CO TFA is the need to adopt Villegas and Lucas’s (2002) curriculum strands as its framework of underlying mindsets, knowledge, and skills for culturally responsive CMs. The data from the research study shows that the participants need work in developing intercultural competence, in overcoming colorblindness, in developing and/or maintaining White racial identity, and in understanding the significant role culture plays in teaching and learning. This is consistent with the first three strands of Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) teacher education curriculum, the fundamental orientations (see Figure 2). In focusing on and developing the three fundamental orientations of Villegas and
Lucas (2002), the three essential constructs of intercultural competence, color awareness, and anti-racist identity are subsequently developed along with the belief that culture plays a significant role in teaching and learning (see Figure 2).

Beyond the fundamental orientations, Villegas and Lucas (2002) also proposed three more strands of mindsets, knowledge, and skills needed for culturally responsive teaching. The final three curriculum strands more sharply focus on aspects of teaching and learning (p. 65). Villegas and Lucas explained:

> Strand four addresses the conceptions of knowledge, teaching, and learning that support our vision of culturally responsive teaching. In strand five, we argue that to successfully teach students from nonmainstream backgrounds, teachers need to learn about them and their communities . . . In strand six we explain how teachers can use their insight into lives of students to make their teaching culturally responsive. (p. 65)

The implications of this research study is that all six of Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) curriculum strands be used to articulate the combined mindsets, knowledge, and skills needed to foster culturally responsive teaching actions in the CO region of TFA.

When CO TFA adopts Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) six strands as a base for training CMs, then it must redesign its training and professional development programming that spans the two-year corps commitment. The recommendation is that the professional development programming be differentiated and developmentally appropriate so that CMs are not too fearful or frustrated and abandon the development of culturally responsive mindsets, knowledge, skills (Bennett, 1986; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Paige, 1993).

To achieve this differentiation and developmental appropriate training, a needs assessment must be administered at the beginning of each corps year. McAllister and
Irvine (2000) explained, “If teacher educators are aware of their students’ readiness then they can make appropriate decisions about how to instruct them in the area of diversity” (p. 19). Recommendations for assessments include using the IDI v.3 (Hammer, 2009). This assessment is an online tool that is easily administered and immediately generates individual and group reports called “profiles.” Hammer (2009) explained:

>. . . the IDI profile indicates key developmental, or ‘leading,’ issues that directly face the respondent that, when systematically addressed, can result in progression along the continuum. Also the IDI profile identifies ‘trailing’ issues that are currently holding back the respondent or group from moving further along the continuum. (p. 206)

It is the recommendation of the researcher that the results of the needs assessment are shared with CMs by qualified administrators and in conjunction with the explicit student outcomes and revised TAL teacher actions. Sharing the results and intentions with CMs may increase the sense of urgency and commitment to developing intercultural competence and culturally responsive mindsets, knowledge, and skills.

It is strongly recommended that the results of the needs assessment be used to provide support and challenge that will foster growth (Bennett, 1986; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Paige, 1993). Groups are one way to provide support and challenge. It is a recommendation of the researcher that CO TFA form small groups of CMs based on the needs assessment results to support and challenge CMs in their growth around culturally responsive teaching competence. However, McAllister and Irvine (2000) warned:

>. . . group support must be well designed and as authentic as possible. Merely plunging teachers into a new setting with little support or at the inappropriate time according to their developmental level may increase stereotyping and produce negative feelings on the part of the learner. (p. 20)
Professional development activities and assignments that provide appropriate support and challenge can be found throughout the literature (Bennett, 1986; Carger, 1997; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Salazar et al., 2010; Smith, 1994; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Two instructional assignments that span the literature are the exploration of one’s sociocultural background and educational history (Salazar et al., 2010; Smith, 1994; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). These two assignments can be completed separately or done together in one project. Smith (1994), a teacher educator, asks his teachers to complete a social identity paper and a school experience paper. The social identity paper has students reflect on and describe “their own socialization, specifically the messages they received about their own race, class, and gender identities as well as those of people different than themselves” (p. 2). The school experience paper, in contrast, has a specific lens of school and challenges teachers to reflect on and analyze their school experiences “identifying the influences of race, class and gender on their educational achievement” (p. 2). Salazar, Lowenstein, and Brill (2010) described a similar assignment:

In the first performance assessment of the [teacher preparation] program, the *Personal Education History*, teacher candidates are asked to explore how their own identities and key educational experiences have shaped their beliefs about teaching, learning, and the purpose of education. This particular learning experience is intended to serve as a catalyst for teacher candidates to examine their own humanity and diversity. (p. 37)

These assignments build sociocultural consciousness and color “awareness” in teachers, helping them to understand that “one’s worldview is not universal but is profoundly shaped by one’s life experiences, as mediated by a variety of factors, chief among them race/ethnicity, social class, and gender” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 27). These assignments help teachers realize that education and pedagogy or not culturally
neutral; culture influences how people learn, teach, and express what they know. And, importantly, that American schools privilege the learning and teaching styles of White, middle class culture.

Another instructional strategy of note in the literature on preparing culturally responsive educators is the use of “Teaching Cases.” Villegas and Lucas (2002) explained:

Teaching cases, typically five to ten pages in length, usually tell a short story in narrative form, often accompanied by some descriptive information about the context and participants. The events depicted in the narrative involve a problem, conflict, or dilemma that may or may not be resolved or resolvable. Teaching cases can be used to engage future teachers in examining their own beliefs about the nature of knowledge, teaching and learning, and about students from diverse backgrounds. (p. 133)

Teaching cases allow CMs/teachers to challenge themselves and others but around issues and scenarios that are not personal; teaching cases are a step-removed from CM classrooms and personal experiences.

Next, it is recommended that the results of a needs assessment be used for sequencing culturally responsive curriculum and instruction. Because intercultural competence and racial identity development are processes, there is a sequence that should be followed. For example, McAllister and Irvine (2000) reported that “when participants explore their own culture in the early stages of an intervention they are more likely to move toward a multicultural frame of reference” (p. 19).

Overall, a final implication of this research study is the need for CO TFA to prioritize culturally responsive pedagogy and dedicate significant human resources to its implementation. Organizational and regional leaders with cultural competence, color “awareness,” positive racial identities, and the belief that culture plays a significant role
in teaching and learning are needed to revise the aims and TAL rubric and, then, explain and promote these revisions. Resources are needed to conduct the annual needs assessments, generate group (and/or individual) profiles, and provide feedback to groups and individuals. Culturally competent and responsive leaders are also needed to intentionally group CMs for professional development and plan developmentally appropriate sessions with strategic supports and challenges. Lastly, CO TFA needs culturally competent and responsive facilitators to conduct professional development sessions, check for understanding and growth, and make modifications.

This enormous amount of human capital is the primary challenge in shifting CO TFA to a culturally responsive approach. Yu (2011) concurred, “The wide variability in the skills of facilitators was—and still is—one of the trickiest challenges” (p. 36). However, with the dedication of financial and human resources to the issue of diversity and culturally responsive pedagogy, there could be a shift in CM competencies, knowledge, and beliefs. Then, in the future, CO TFA could hire staff members and recruit volunteers from their trained alumni.

Implications for General Teacher Preparation

While this research study was conducted in partnership with CO TFA, it has implications for general teacher preparation programs as well. The results of this study indicated that TFA CMs, entering and after one year, require growth in each of the essential constructs to be culturally responsive educators. TFA and its CMs represent only a portion of teachers working with culturally and linguistically diverse learners. TFA CMs are likely representative of the general population of teachers, if not more sensitive to inequity, because TFA is “highly selective” and recruits individuals with a
strong commitment to working with low-income students and eliminating the achievement gap (Farr, 2010).

Villegas and Lucas (2002) explain that the growing diversity in American public schools requires that all teachers become culturally responsive educators through a reconceptualization of our approach to teacher preparation:

Now is the time to get down to the serious work of transforming teacher education for diversity. The changing demographics of the student population and of the country as a whole cannot be ignored, nor can the need for better preparation of teachers to teach this increasingly diverse population. (p. xvi)

Not only TFA, but all institutions that prepare teachers, need to fundamentally shift their aims to go beyond academic achievement and include positive racial (and anti-racist) identity development and critical sociocultural consciousness to the aim of academic achievement for all students. Institutions need to broaden their definitions of good teaching to promote teacher actions that are culturally responsive. Realizing these aims and actions requires commitment to a culturally responsive framework similar to Villegas and Lucas (2002) and providing research-based professional development. Lastly, it may be necessary to select teachers or teacher candidates who demonstrate a commitment to growing their culturally responsive teaching competence, including their intercultural competence, color “awareness” and anti-racist, positive identity development, and the belief that culture matters in education.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research that spans the entire corps experience is recommended: upon matriculation, post summer institute, end of Year 1, end of Year 2, and a final study 3-5 years post-completion of TFA. This research is needed to determine if competencies,
attitudes, and beliefs change during the course of the second year and/or post-completion of the corps experience. Ideally the study would be inter-regional and use mixed methods, collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data at each point.

Future research is also suggested to correlate intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity attitudes with valid and reliable measures of culturally responsive teaching competence (CRTC), both self-reported and observed behavior. To do this a comprehensive CRTC self-report measure must be developed, preferably based on the work of Villegas and Lucas (2002). Finally, to empirically evaluate culturally responsive teacher actions/behavior a CRTC observation protocol must be developed. This observation protocol could draw not only from the work of Villegas and Lucas (2002), but also the humanizing practices of Salazar (2008).

Once TFA develops and implements a CRP professional development intervention, future research is needed to determine the impact and effectiveness of the intervention and, subsequently, its impact on student success/outcomes. In this future research, student success/outcomes must not be limited to standardized achievement test data and must include assessing quantitatively and qualitatively students’ cultural identity development and development of a critical sociocultural consciousness.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non White</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age, 18-21</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age, 22-30</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age, 31-40</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age, 41-60</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Higher Ed</td>
<td>M.A. or equivalent</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D. or equivalent</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 3mo</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6mo</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-11mo</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* These percentages represent the demographics at Time 1. Time 2 demographics were explored and found to be similar to Time 1.
Table 2: Profiles of Qualitative Participants in Low Intercultural Competence Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Participant A</th>
<th>Participant B</th>
<th>Participant C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td>87.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>122.19</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>120.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Score</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>32.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Racial Privilege</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Blatant Racial Identity Issues</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Racial Identity Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded numbers represent highest WRIAS scores for each participant.
Table 3: Profiles of Qualitative Participants in Mid Intercultural Competence Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Participant D</th>
<th></th>
<th>Participant E</th>
<th></th>
<th>Participant F</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>94.24</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>123.87</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>100.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO Category Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Score</td>
<td>119.26</td>
<td>119.71</td>
<td>132.15</td>
<td>123.52</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>124.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Racial Privilege</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Racial Identity Attitudes Contact</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Bolded numbers represent highest WRIAS scores for each participant.*
Table 4: Profiles of Qualitative Participants in High Intercultural Competence Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Participant G</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td>118.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO Category</td>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>128.37</td>
<td>130.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Score</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Racial Privilege</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Racial Identity Attitudes</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Bolded numbers represent highest WRIAS scores for each participant.*
Table 5: Intercultural Competence Developmental Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Orientation</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1 (n = 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Intercultural Competence Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of IDI v. 3 Score</th>
<th>Time 1 (n = 134)</th>
<th>Time 2 (n = 78)</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Change over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>125.02 (5.02)</td>
<td>122.30 (5.40)</td>
<td>55–145</td>
<td>24.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Orientation</td>
<td>103.07 (12.43)</td>
<td>96.51 (14.59)</td>
<td>55–145</td>
<td>21.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Gap</td>
<td>21.95 (7.90)</td>
<td>25.80 (9.60)</td>
<td>55–145</td>
<td>17.73***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001
Table 7: Colorblind Racial Attitudes Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoBRAS Factor</th>
<th>Time 1 (n = 134)</th>
<th>Time 2 (n = 78)</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Change over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Racial Privilege</td>
<td>19.25 (5.89)</td>
<td>22.92 (5.92)</td>
<td>7–42</td>
<td>39.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>18.35 (5.50)</td>
<td>18.45 (4.86)</td>
<td>7–42</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues</td>
<td>10.02 (3.14)</td>
<td>11.56 (3.73)</td>
<td>6–36</td>
<td>20.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CoBRAS</td>
<td>47.95 (11.39)</td>
<td>53.17 (10.49)</td>
<td>20–120</td>
<td>27.39***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001
### Table 8: White Racial Identity Attitudes Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of White Racial Identity Development</th>
<th>Time 1 (n = 134) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Time 2 (n = 78) Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Change over time F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.15 (.41)</td>
<td>3.00 (.36)</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>9.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1.75 (.35)</td>
<td>1.76 (.39)</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.49 (.30)</td>
<td>1.59 (.37)</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.89 (.37)</td>
<td>3.79 (.40)</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.03 (.38)</td>
<td>3.83 (.37)</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>9.93*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
Table 9: Results of Qualitative Data Analysis: Group beliefs and themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes Across Groups</th>
<th>Group Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low IC Group (n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students value what their cultures/families value. Some of my families do not value education and are not involved and, therefore, students are unmotivated to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Parent apathy and resistance</td>
<td>Institutional discrimination and historic inequity are the roots of educational apathy and failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culturally responsive (congruent) curriculum, instruction, and communication are valuable for engagement and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure how to implement culturally responsive (congruent) instruction and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ cultural and racial identities</td>
<td>White teachers who teach racially and culturally different students face mistrust of parents and students and being called “racist.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White teachers need to know who they are, be comfortable with their culture and “Whiteness,” and bring who they are into the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP professional development</td>
<td>Professional development aimed at culturally responsive pedagogy needs to happen, but only after one’s first year of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development should include improving teacher’s ability to have difficult conversations about cultural difference with students and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of culture and care in achieving goals</td>
<td>Big educational goals for students are deficit-orientated and dominant culture driven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational goals are for students to grow and gain content and skills so that students can have expanded opportunities in the dominant culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care is more important than culture in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: Example for Creating a Culturally Responsive TAL Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General CRP Action: The use of culturally congruent curriculum, practices, and communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific teacher actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn the cultural heritages of students through the use of home visits; formal, and informal inquiry of students, family, and community members; observation; and systematic reading, writing, and reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create curriculum, instruction, and classroom management plans that reflect knowledge of students’ cultural experiences, skills, and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge and capitalize on students’ cultural and linguistic strengths, resources, experiences, and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously communicate that students’ heritage languages and dialects have social and academic value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique existing curriculum, practices, and communication for hidden cultural preferences and responsiveness to surface cultural features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Theoretical Frame of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

**Culturally Responsive Pedagogy**

### Attributes
- Comprehensive
- Multidimensional
- Additive
- Emancipatory
- Empowering
- Transformative

### Aims
- Academic competence
- Positive cultural/racial identity
- Critical sociocultural consciousness

### Actions
- Employ culturally congruent curriculum and instruction
- Use critical pedagogy
- Develop reciprocal relationships
- Establish a supportive and collaborative environment
Figure 2: Conceptual Framework

Fundamental Orientations for Teaching (Villegas and Lucas, 2002)

1. Sociocultural awareness
2. An affirmative attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds
3. Commitment and skills to act as agents of change

Essential Characteristics of Culturally Responsive Educators

1. Culturally competent and aware of cultural similarities and differences
2. Critical of inequity and aware of institutional racism and discrimination
3. Undergoing constant personal reflection and cultural (including White racial) identity development

Research Study Constructs and Measures

1. Intercultural Competence measured by the IDI v. 3 (Hammer, 2009)
2. Colorblindness measured by the CoBRAS (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Brown, 2000)
3. White Racial Identity Attitudes measured by WRIAS (Helms and Carter, 1990)

Essential Belief of Culturally Responsive Educators

Culture (of students and teachers) plays a significant role in teaching and learning
Figure 3: Model of White Racial Identity Development (Helms, 1984)

Phase 1: Abandonment of Racism

Phase 2: Defining a Positive White Identity
Figure 4: Mixed Methodology Phases of Research

Quantitative Phase A
- Time 1
  - Data Collection: n=134 & Analysis
  - Profile Results: IDI, CoBRAS, WRIAS
- Time 2
  - Data Collection: n=78 & Analysis
  - Profile Results: IDI, CoBRAS, WRIAS
  - Results of Change over Time

Qualitative Phase B
- Low IC
  - Interviews: n=3
  - Data Analysis
- Mid IC
  - Interviews: n=3
  - Data Analysis
- High IC
  - Interviews: n=1
  - Data Analysis

Implications and Recommendations
Figure 5: Recommendation for Revising TFA’s Teaching as Leadership

Culturally Responsive Teaching as Leadership Framework

- Academic competence
- Positive cultural/racial identity
- Critical sociocultural consciousness

6 TFA TAL Principles
1. Set big goals
2. Invest students and their families
3. Plan purposefully
4. Execute effectively
5. Continuously increase effectiveness
6. Work relentlessly

3 CRP Aims

4 CRP Actions

- Employ culturally congruent curriculum and instruction
- Use critical pedagogy
- Develop reciprocal relationships
- Establish a supportive and collaborative environment

- Academic competence
- Positive cultural/racial identity
- Critical sociocultural consciousness

• Academic competence
• Positive cultural/racial identity
• Critical sociocultural consciousness
OPTION 6: REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Reminder for all: While you received information on the reflection questions during the in-person sessions for licensure, reminders of the expectations can be found below. Remember that this is required for first year ('09) corps members and optional for second year ('08) corps members.

For '10 CMs:

- Your reflection questions can count for up to 3 hours of your total 12.
- Reflection responses are REQUIRED.
- For the first set of reflection questions, detailed answers are not required (for example, for question 5, you might write something like “I do not currently know any culturally responsive pedagogy strategies,” based on your prior experience.
- The first purpose of the reflection questions is for you to have a chance to step back and think about how diversity and culturally responsive pedagogy play a part in your classroom and in your role as a Teach For America corps member.
- The second purpose is for our region to be able to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of our programming as a whole (note: this really means regional strengths and weaknesses in terms of programming NOT your strengths and weaknesses – there are no “right” answers, you will only be judged on the thought you put into your answers).
- You will hand in your first reflection questions when you sign up for a DCA group or topic dinner this week, by emailing your responses to your facilitator. If you aren’t signing up for a group or dinner, you should hand BOTH the first and second sets in on December 16th.
- Your second set of reflection questions will be due with your first portfolio due date in December, and your last set will be due with your final portfolio in May (note: we will collect these from Special Educators as well for the second purpose outlined above).

For '09 CMs:

- First years must complete the reflection questions (see below) 3 times a year for licensure. This is optional for you. If you choose to complete them, reflection questions can count for 3 hours of your total 12. You must do all 3 sets of reflection questions to get the hours. You will get no hours if you only do the first set.
- For the first set of reflection questions, detailed answers are not required (for example, for question 5, you might write something like “I do not currently know any culturally responsive pedagogy strategies,” based on your prior experience. After this, as long as your answers show depth of thought, you will get full hours.
The first purpose of the reflection questions is for you to have a chance to step back and think about how diversity and culturally responsive pedagogy play a part in your classroom and in your role as a Teach For America corps member.

The second purpose is for our region to be able to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of our programming as a whole (note: this really means regional strengths and weaknesses in terms of programming NOT your strengths and weaknesses – there are no “right” answers, you will only be judged on the thought you put into your answers).

If you choose to do this, you will hand in your first reflection questions when you sign up for a DCA group or topic dinner, by emailing your responses to your facilitator. If you aren’t signing up for a group or dinner, you should hand BOTH the first and second sets in on December 16th.

If you choose to do this, your second set of reflection questions will be due on December 16th, and your last set will be due on May 17th.

Diversity Reflection Questions

Colorado State Teacher Performance Standards:

- 5.3 Apply appropriate intervention strategies and practices to ensure a successful learning environment.
- 6.1 Employ a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, and social level of each student, and choose alternative teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes.

Assignment:
You need to complete 3 written diversity reflections for the year: one in September, one in December (so the first 2 should be completed before the December due date) and one at the end of the year. For each reflection, answer the questions given, and include in your portfolio behind your diversity logs. We expect that your answers will change (and likely get more detailed) as the year progresses, which is why most of the questions do not change. For logs 2 and 3, it is fine to take what you wrote in an earlier log and expand on it, or to re-write your answer completely, depending on what you feel best captures your current answer. Additionally, for the first reflection, keep in mind that some answers may be short (for example, for question 5, if you do not know anything about culturally responsive pedagogy, you may simply state this). You may log up to one hour for each reflection you complete, though again, your first reflection will likely be less than this.

REFLECTION 1 (September)

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
1. Describe your own diversity/identity. How does this impact the way you learn and the way you will teach?
2. Describe your own personal educational history. How will this impact the way you teach and believe students should learn?
3. List 5 words that you would use to describe low income schools, students, and families.
4. What are the challenges you will face in low income schools? What resources can you utilize to meet these challenges?
5. If you know and use culturally responsive pedagogy, please describe briefly.
6. What have you learned about your students and community already and how might that impact the way that you teach?

**REFLECTION 2 (December)**

**ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

1. Describe what you have learned about your own diversity/identity. How does this impact the way you learn and the way you teach?
2. How are the instructional methods you use similar and different to the instructional methods you experienced as a student? For any differences, why do these exist? Do you think the education you provide should be different than the education you received? Why?
3. List 5 words that describe low income schools, students, and families.
4. What are the challenges you will face in low income schools? What resources can you utilize to meet these challenges?
5. If you know and use culturally responsive pedagogy, please describe briefly.
6. What have you learned about your students and community and how does that impact the way that you teach?

**REFLECTION 3 (May)**

**ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

1. Describe what you have learned about your own diversity/identity. How does this impact the way you learn and the way you teach?
2. How are the instructional methods you use similar and different to the instructional methods you experienced as a student? For any differences, why do these exist? Do you think the education you provide should be different than the education you received? Why?
3. List 5 words that you would use to describe low income schools, students, and families.
4. What are the challenges you will face in low income schools? What resources can you utilize to meet these challenges?
5. If you know and use culturally responsive pedagogy, please describe briefly.
6. What have you learned about your students and community and how does that impact the way that you teach?
Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Research Study
Title: Intercultural Competence, Colorblindness, and White Racial Identity of Teach for America Corps Members in the Colorado Region: Assessing Levels, Exploring Relationships, and Describing Implications for Intervention Design

You are invited to participate in a study that will explore the levels of intercultural competence, colorblindness, and White racial identity of Teach for America corps members who are placed in the Colorado region. The study is conducted by PhD student, Amber Kim. Results will be used to provide recommendations to Colorado TFA to improve Diversity, Community, and Achievement programming, to publish, to present at academic conferences, and may be used as part of a Ph.D. dissertation. Amber Kim can be reached at 303.XXX.XXXX or at XXXX@yahoo.com. This project is supervised by Professor Dr. Maria Salazar, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, 303.XXX.XXXX, XXXX@du.edu.

Participation in this study should take about 120 minutes of your time (60 minutes in July 2010 and 60 minutes in May 2011). Participation will involve completing the Intercultural Development Inventory (responding to 60 questions each time about your orientations toward cultural differences), the Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale (responding to 20 questions about social issues in the U.S.), and possibly the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (responding to 60 questions about your social and political attitudes). You will also be asked to complete several demographic questions. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue taking the inventory at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your responses will be identified by code number only and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. Only the researcher will have access to your individual data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use only group averages and paraphrased wording. However, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order or subpoena. Although no questions in this interview address it, we are required by law to tell you that if information is revealed concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-XXX-XXXX, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 303-XXX-XXXX or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121.

You may keep this page for your records. Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called “Intercultural Competence, Colorblindness, and White Racial Identity of Teach for America Corps Members in the Colorado Region:
Assessing Levels, Exploring Relationships, and Describing Implications for Intervention Design.” I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Printed Name________________________________ Signature _____________________ Date __________________

Email address to send surveys:______________________________________________________________________

Researcher:  Amber K. Kim    Signature _____________________ Date __________________

___________ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the following postal or e-mail address
## Appendix C

DCA Survey for Incoming Teach For America Corps Members: Colorado Region
Summer, 2010

Directions: Please read the question and write in or circle your response in the right column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Your response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>First Name?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Last Name?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is your racial background considered White? Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. (OPT.) In addition to answering question #3, you may describe your cultural, ethnic, and/or racial background. *Please do not answer this question instead of question #3.*
COLOR-BLIND RACIAL ATTITUDES SCALE

**Directions.** Below is a set of questions that deal with social issues in the United States. Using the 6-point scale, please give your honest rating about the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement. Please be as open and honest as you can; there are no right or wrong answers. Circle your response to the right of each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Racism is a major problem in the U.S.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color their skin.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Your Response</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society’s problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and adopt the values of the U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>English should be the only official language in the U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>White people are more to blame for racial discrimination in the U.S. than racial and ethnic minorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White Racial Identity Attitude Scale  
(Helms and Carter, 1990)

Directions: **Only answer the following questions if you answered “Yes” to question #3.**

This questionnaire is designed to measure people’s social and political attitudes. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement. On your answer sheet beside each item number, circle the number that best describes how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I hardly think about what race I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not understand what Blacks want from Whites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I find myself watching Black people to see what they are like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I feel depressed after I have been around Black people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There is nothing that I want to learn from Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I seek out new experiences even if I know a large number of Blacks will be involved in them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Your Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I enjoy watching the different ways that Blacks and Whites approach life.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I wish I had a Black friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I do not feel that I have the social skills to interact with Black people effectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A Black person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When a Black person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my viewpoint.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sometimes jokes based on Black people’s experiences are funny.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I think it is exciting to discover the little ways in which Black people and White people are different.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I used to believe in racial integration, but now I have my doubts.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I’d rather socialize with Whites only.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>In many ways Blacks and Whites are similar, but they are also different in some important ways.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Blacks and Whites have much to learn from each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>For most of my life, I did not think about racial issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I have come to believe that Black people and White people are very different.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>White people have bent over backward trying to make up for their ancestors’ mistreatment of Blacks, now it is time to stop.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Your Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>It is possible for Blacks and Whites to have meaningful social relationships with each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>There are some valuable things that White people can learn from Blacks that they can’t learn from other Whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I am curious to learn in what ways Black people and White people differ from each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I limit myself to White activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Society may have been unjust to Blacks, but it has also been unjust to Whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about which values Blacks and Whites share.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am comfortable wherever I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>In my family, we never talked about racial issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>When I must interact with a Black person, I usually let him or her make the first move.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I feel hostile when I am around Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I think I understand Black people’s values.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Blacks and Whites can have successful intimate relationships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I was raised to believe that people are people regardless of their race.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nowadays, I go out of my way to avoid associating with Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I believe that Blacks are inferior to Whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I believe I know a lot about Black people’s customs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Your Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>There are some valuable things that White people can learn from Blacks that they can’t learn from other Whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I think it’s okay for Black people and White people to date each other as long as they don’t marry each other.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sometimes I’m not sure what I think or feel about Black people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>When I am the only White in a group of Blacks, I feel anxious.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Blacks and Whites differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I am not embarrassed to admit that I am White.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I think White people should become more involved in socializing with Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I don’t understand why Black people blame all White people for their social misfortunes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I feel comfortable talking to Blacks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I value the relationship that I have with my Black friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Sample Interview Recruitment Email

Dear Study Participant,

Thank you for your participation in my Dissertation Research study entitled, Intercultural Competence, Colorblindness, and White Racial Identity Attitudes of Teach for America Corps Members in the Colorado Region: Describing Profiles, Evaluating Change Over Time, and Examining the Connection to Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. The time you spent completing the surveys in July 2010 and in May 2011 was very appreciated.

I am now currently recruiting for the second phase of the study, the interview phase. I realize that numbers only tell part of the story. I cannot determine wants and needs of corps members and design meaningful and appropriate professional development solely based on quantitative measures. I realize that I need qualitative input too. I would like to hear your thoughts, ideas, and stories as well as read your DCA reflections.

I am asking that you participate in an hour-long interview on a day/time and place that is convenient for you. Also, I would like to read your three DCA reflections from the 2010/2011 school year if that is possible. Upon the completion of the interview (and even if you do not decide to send or bring copies of your reflections) you will be given a thank-you gift card for your time and participation.

Please respond to this email if you would like to participate in the interviews or contact me directly at 303.XXX.XXXX. If you choose not to participate in this second phase, no further contact will be made regarding this study (and your past participation will still be much appreciated).

Thank you for consideration. I truly appreciate your time.

Best,
Amber Kim
PhD Candidate University of Denver
Appendix E

Interview Protocol

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me for this interview. Your thoughts, feelings, and experiences are very important to me, my study, and ultimately to the Colorado region of TFA. Our mutual goal is to improve professional development programming so that Corps Members can more positively impact the lives of students.

Before we get started, I will need for you to sign a consent form saying that you agree to participate in this interview. I will go over the consent form with you right now.

[Read over the consent form and have participants sign the form.]

This interview is in no way an evaluation or judgment of you or your teaching. I just want to understand your beliefs about the role of culture, ethnicity, and race in teaching and learning.

Here is a definition of culture for the purposes of this interview.

[Provide the definition of culture on a handout.]

This definition allows you to think of culture in many ways including race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Do you have any comments or questions about this definition?

Feel free to answer questions and explain your thoughts using examples, personal experiences, and stories. Remember this interview will be confidential and you will be given a pseudonym. Would you like to choose your own pseudonym?

[Allow participant to chose pseudonym. Record if given.]

If there is a question you do not feel comfortable answering, just tell me and we will skip it. Do you have any questions before we start?

Okay, let’s get started.
**Background Information**

1) Describe your TFA placement school.  
2) In what ways is your cultural background similar or different to the students you teach?

**TFA Purpose**

3) Why did you decide to join TFA?  

   Probes:  
   a. What motivated you to apply?  
   b. What did you/do you hope to accomplish?  
   c. What outcomes do you wish to achieve for yourself?  
   d. What outcomes do you wish to achieve for students? Overall? By the end of each year? On a daily basis?

**Role of Culture in Teaching and Learning**

4) What role, if any, does a student’s culture play in teaching and learning?  

   Probes if participant believes it play a role:  
   a. In what ways does the student’s culture matter?  
   b. What might a teacher do differently based on a student’s culture?  

   Probes if participant believes it DOES NOT play a role:  
   a. Why does the culture of a student NOT play a significant role in the teaching and learning of students?  
   b. If a student’s culture does not matter, what (about a student) does matter to best help that student learn?  

5) What role, if any, does a teacher’s culture play in the teaching and learning of students, particularly students who are culturally and linguistically different from the teacher?  

   Probes if participant believes it play a role:  
   c. In what ways does culture matter?  
   d. What might a teacher need to do regarding his/her culture in the classroom? During his/her personal time?
Probes if participant believes it DOES NOT play a role:
c. Why does a teacher’s culture NOT play a significant role in the teaching and learning of students?
d. If a teacher’s culture does not matter, what (about a teacher) does matter?

**Teacher Preparation and Professional Development**

6) What part, if any, should professional development play in helping teachers understand the role of culture in teaching and learning?

7) If TFA re-creates or refines DCA (or other professional development programming) what are the key outcomes it should aim for?

8) If TFA re-creates or refines DCA (or other professional development programming) what are the key experiences or activities it should include to achieve those outcomes?

**Wrap Up**

9) Would you like to add anything else before we close?

10) At the beginning of the interview I asked you about your reasons for joining TFA. Some of the things I heard include……

11) And then I asked you about the role of culture and color in teaching and learning. What I heard you say about this was……

12) And then I asked you about professional development. Some of the things I heard include……

Thanks. I really appreciate your help with my research.

[Give participant his/her gift card.]
Culture

“I have defined culture as the ever-changing values, traditions, social and political relationships, and worldview created, shared, and transformed by a group of people bound together by a combination of factors that can include a common history, geographic location, language, social class, and religion” (Nieto, 1999, 48).
Appendix F

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dissertation Study
Title: Intercultural Competence, Colorblindness, and White Racial Identity of Teach for America Corps Members in the Colorado Region: Describing Profiles, Evaluating Change Over Time, and Examining the Connection to Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

You are invited to participate in the qualitative portion of a study that will explore Colorado region, TFA corps members’ beliefs and attitudes about culturally responsive pedagogy. The study is conducted by PhD candidate Amber Kim. Results will be used to provide recommendations to Colorado TFA to improve Diversity, Community, and Achievement programming, to publish, to present at academic conferences, and will be used as part of a Ph.D. dissertation. Amber Kim can be reached at 303.XXX.XXXX or at XXXX@XXXX.com. This project is supervised by Professor Dr. Maria Salazar, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, 303.XXX.XXXX, XXXXX@XXXX.

Participation in this study should take about 60 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to questions about culturally responsive pedagogy in a one-on-one interview. You will also be asked to provide copies of your DCA reflection responses (in your certification binder). Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. You will receive a $20.00 thank-you gift card to Target upon completion of the interview. You do not have to complete the entire interview in order to receive your gift card. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue the interview at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your responses will be identified by pseudonym and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. The interview (with your consent) will be digitally recorded and transcribed by a transcription service. For this reason I will refer to you in your interview by your chosen pseudonym. Your transcribed responses will be sent to you via email (or given to you in person if you choose) for you to review and at that time you can add any additional comments. Upon receiving your “ok,” I will destroy the digital recordings of the interview. Only the researcher will have access to your identifying data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use your chosen pseudonym. However, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order or subpoena. Although no questions in this interview address it, we are required by law to tell you that if information is revealed concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-XXX-XXXX, or Syllk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 303-XXX-XXXX or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121.

You may keep this page for your records. Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of this study. I have asked for and received a
satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature __________________ Date __________________

___ I agree to be audio-taped.

___ I do not agree to be audio-taped

Signature __________________ Date __________________

___________ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the following postal or e-mail address:
### Appendix G

#### BELIEF CODES FOR INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>What code represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Deficit perspective of CLD students and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>Affirming perspective of CLD students and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP!</td>
<td>Cultural is important in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Care is more important than culture in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/CARE SAV</td>
<td>Care can be misguided; believes care can be a “savior” mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Commonality is important in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>CLD students and families don’t value education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>CLD students are apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnIn</td>
<td>CLD parents uninvolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>CLD students are resistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>CLD students and families are apathetic or resistant because they have experienced Institutional Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S GLS</td>
<td>Big goals for students are content and skill based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp GLS</td>
<td>Big goals for students are mainly that students have expanded opportunities and the chance to be “successful” in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLS?</td>
<td>Questions and struggles with what should be the big goals for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Culturally responsive curriculum, instruction, and communication are valuable for engaging CLD students and helping them master content and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>CRP is not formulaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC?</td>
<td>Does not know how to modify curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices to make them culturally congruent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoCul</td>
<td>Believes content or skill is not cultural and, therefore, modification cannot be made to make it more culturally congruent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP-WA?</td>
<td>Questions if CRP by White, affluent educators is even possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>White teachers who teach CLD students face mistrust and being called racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addl Imp</td>
<td>Teachers who share the same race/culture/background as students are better for CLD students and have additional positive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/-WI</td>
<td>White teachers need to know who they are and be comfortable with their culture and “Whiteness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/WI</td>
<td>Uncomfortable with being different from CLD students; try to hide “Whiteness” or affluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretend Spanish</td>
<td>Pretend to know more Spanish because that will lessen difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPPD After</td>
<td>CRP professional development comes only after one learns to teach first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC?</td>
<td>Questions if people can really become bicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPPD Diff Conv</td>
<td>CRP professional development should improve a teacher’s ability to have difficult conversations about cultural difference with students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPPD Students</td>
<td>CRP professional development should help teachers teach students to be culturally competent and develop a critical consciousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THEME CODES FOR GROUP BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>What code represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Beliefs regarding the role of care in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT</td>
<td>Beliefs regarding the role of culture in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Beliefs about the importance of commonality in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Beliefs about culturally responsive pedagogy training and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL</td>
<td>Beliefs about CLD students’ (and families’) value of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLS</td>
<td>Beliefs about goals for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/ID</td>
<td>Beliefs about teachers’ cultural, socioeconomic, and linguistic identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>Beliefs about White teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>