Pedagogies of Inclusion in Teacher Education: Global Perspectives

Christine E. Sleeter

California State University Monterey Bay

Educators around the world increasingly see teacher education as crucial to developing pedagogies of inclusion, particularly as student populations diversify. While neoliberalism greatly contributes to the growing diversity of students for whom teachers need preparation, however, it is also shrinking public resources for serving those same populations while simultaneously constraining the work of teachers and teacher educators.

Expansion of global capitalism prompts large-scale migrations of peoples, repopulating schools and communities on a scale not seen before (Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Around the world, in countries as different from each other as Hong Kong (Yuen, 2002), Greece (Vidali & Adams, 2006), the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco, 2001), and Spain (Soriano, 2008), schools are struggling, often for the first time, with how to respond to newly arrived students. For example, Korea has recently attracted many foreign workers, and a significant proportion of its marriages are now international; bicultural children entering elementary schools confound their unprepared teachers (Uhn, 2007). At the same time, it is also imperative that schools improve education for historically marginalized communities in their own countries so that young people are not locked out of economic and political participation. Examples of such communities range from Mapuche in Chile (Quilaqueo, 2006) and Maori in New Zealand (Bishop & Berryman, 2006) to African Americans in the U.S. (Ladson-Billings, 2006), Roma in Europe (Katz, 2005), and Dalits in India (Thorat, 1999). To complicate matters further, nation-building in post-colonial contexts has fostered debates and struggles over equity, justice and national identity, often in the midst of tremendous ethnic, religious, and linguistic diversity, historical complexity, and wealth co-existing with deep poverty (Meuleman, 2006).

While contributing to teacher education's challenges, however, neoliberalism is also

constricting teacher education. Cuts in public expenditures mean that in many nations, teacher education has become shorter. For example, preservice programs in the U.S. had gradually lengthened between the 1970s and the early the 1990s, when general studies and clinical experiences expanded, and programs developed field experiences and coursework to address changes in schools. In the early 1990s, however, due to cuts in public expenditures on higher education and competition from private vendors offering very short certification programs, average program length began to shrink, not only in the U.S. but in other countries as well (Feistritzer, 1999; Lyall & Sell, 2006; Openshaw, 1999). In addition, teaching in many areas of the world is becoming more technocratic as education is being defined as preparation for work, curricula are being oriented toward corporate needs, and the work of teachers being defined accordingly (Compton & Weiner, 2008; Puiggrós, 1997).

This chapter will examine what teacher education can do, given this broad context. Drawing on examples of programs in various countries, I will argue that teacher education stands to benefit by engaging with its local communities, both as a way of preparing teachers for diversity, and also as a way or pushing back against neoliberalism.

CONSTRUCTING PEDAGOGIES OF INCLUSION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Pedagogies of inclusion in teacher education rest on three pillars. One pillar -- *the university* -- encompasses professional knowledge and theoretical grounding for inclusive curriculum and practice. For example, Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) conceptualized professional knowledge in three overlapping domains. Knowledge of learners includes the learning process and how learning is prompted, guided, and transferred; the child developmental process; and the language development process, including development

of linguistic skills in more than one language. Knowledge of curriculum includes designing and planning curriculum, as well as envisioning it in relationship to broad societal goals for school. Knowledge of teaching encompasses a range of knowledge and skill for organizing learning, teaching subject matter, building teaching processes on cultural repertoires, linguistic skills, and varying abilities of students, assessing learning to guide instruction, managing the classroom, and collaborating with other professionals and parents. Zeichner (1996) synthesized generally agreed-upon dimensions of knowledge for multicultural teacher preparation: clarification of teacher candidates' ethnic and cultural self-identities; self-examination of ethnocentrism; dynamics of prejudice and racism, and how teachers can address these; dynamics of privilege and economic oppression, and how schools contribute to these; multicultural curriculum development; the promise and potential dangers of learning styles; relationships between language, culture, and learning; culturally appropriate teaching and assessments; exposure to examples of successful teaching; and experiences in communities and schools.

A second pillar underlying pedagogies of inclusion -- *the classroom* -- includes guided practice working with everyday realities and complexities of diversity and inequity in the context of teaching. Model teacher preparation programs feature extended fieldwork in classrooms that serve diverse students, built around close partnerships with universities that often locate coursework in the schools, and include active mentoring of teacher candidates by exemplary teachers (Rubenstein, 2007). However, a challenge is preparing teachers to transform and not simply replicate prevailing practices. According to Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985), classroom experience has three limitations: familiarity that reinforces taking prevailing patterns for granted, divergent demands of universities and classrooms that

prompt teachers to bifurcate rather than synthesize what they learn in each context, and incorporation of novices into already-running systems rather than classrooms serving as labs for experimentation.

While these two pillars can be designed to promote progressive and inclusive pedagogies, they very often reinforce a standardized view of children, curriculum, and pedagogy that grows out of professional conceptions of "best practices," cultural homogeneity among classroom teachers, and the press of school bureaucracies. A third pillar of teacher education – *communities in which schools are situated* – offers potential to transcend universalized and standardized concepts of students, teaching, and learning. Community contexts tend to be absent from most discussions of teacher education, but, I believe, are fundamental to pedagogies of inclusion. This argument was developed very thoughtfully four decades ago by the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers (1976).

The Study Commission envisioned community as central to the preparation of teachers for at least two reasons. First, teachers will "have to know the language and culture of the children and youth they teach" (p. 24). Not only is this a pedagogical necessity, but court cases and treaties in the U.S. guarantee rights of historically marginalized communities to maintain culture and language. Teachers, therefore, must be able to respond to and support the local community culture and language. Second, communities are a fundamental unit of social organization that schools can help to revitalize. Human welfare depends on close connections between individuals and local communities. As mass societies, exacerbated by neoliberalism, exert pressures that weaken communities, psychological welfare of citizens is diminished. By engaging schools in the life of local communities, not only can teaching

become more meaningful to students, but the community itself can be strengthened. For these reasons, the Study Commission envisioned communities not only as a context for teacher education, but also as active partners in deciding the nature of education for their children and the preparation of teachers to work with them.

In this chapter I highlight several programs in different national contexts that address all three pillars: university, classroom, and communities. I focus particularly on ways in which teacher education programs (at both preservice and professional development levels) work with and collaborate with historically marginalized communities. I have organized this discussion around somewhat different ways of building inclusion: through school-community dialog, through student voice, through community-based service learning, and through political consciousness-raising. To be sure, there is overlap among the four sections, but this organizational structure provides a way of highlighting different emphases of the community pillar of teacher education.

INCLUSION THROUGH SCHOOL-COMMUNITY DIALOG

Teacher education can be located at the nexus of school-community dialog. In the two examples below – one from Chile and one from Spain – faculty members in teacher education facilitates bridge-building between schools and communities. In that dialogical context, teachers or teacher candidates learn to work with communities and translate community knowledge into the classroom.

A teacher preparation project in Chile -- Pedagogía Básica Intercultural en un Contexto Mapuche (Elementary Intercultural Education in a Mapuche Context) -- illustrates bicultural dialog as a basis for rethinking classroom practice. According to Quilaqueo (2007),

a central problem in the preparation of teachers for indigenous Mapuche communities is that most teachers are steeped in Western knowledge and worldviews rather than those of indigenous peoples of Chile. Too often, if teachers learn about indigenous knowledge at all, it takes the form of teaching techniques or social activities to include in the classroom. A much deeper concern is that Mapuche and non-Mapuche people approach the world, and each other, through deep cultural frames of reference that non-Mapuche teachers typically do not recognize, but Mapuche adults have learned to navigate. The relationship between Mapuche and non-Mapuche knowledge is also hierarchical, with Western knowledge positioned as more scientific and modern. Typically, formal teacher education embodies a scientific and theoretical Western perspective, even when presenting information about "Others," implicitly giving secondary status to Mapuche knowledge.

To address this problem, Quilaqueo and his colleagues have been figuring out ways of engaging teachers in dialog with Mapuche communities in order to reconstruct classroom practice. They are researching epistemology of Mapuche knowledge, and creating a third space in which Mapuche and non-Mapuche can meet. The teacher education program helps both Mapuche and non-Mapuche teacher candidates who are interested in such preparation to learn to develop dialogical relationships with each other, as well as with members of the Mapuche community. Quilaqueo points out that everyone comes to teacher education from a cultural frame of reference; the challenge is making that frame of reference explicit, and learning to engage with people whose cultural frame is different from one's own. In the case of this program, some of the faculty members and teacher candidates are Mapuche; the matter is not one of non-Mapuche people training other non-Mapuche people to work in Mapuche settings, but rather one of learning to establish intercultural collaboration

throughout the entire program. The program is fairly new. At this stage of its research, Quilaqueo believes that structuring teacher education around on-going dialog and collaboration in which the community, the teacher preparation program, and teacher candidates become interdependent, has great promise.

A project in the south of Spain is developing teachers' ability to work with immigrant students by connecting schools with immigrant community associations (Soriano, 2008). In the late 1990s, Soriano and her colleagues investigated teachers' concerns about teaching newly-arrived immigrant students. They found that teachers were unable to communicate with immigrant students and their families, were unfamiliar with the cultures of immigrants, lacked relationships with immigrant families, and lacked time as well as training to directly address these problems. Spaniards (including teachers) also assumed that immigrants brought values that conflict with those of native Spaniards.

In a study funded by the government of Andalucía, Soriano then investigated the extent to which immigrant values do actually differ from Spanish values, identifying areas of overlap (such as shared value for the family). She reasoned that communication and collaboration between schools and immigrant communities could begin with recognition of shared values. Interviews were conducted with representatives from 16 immigrant associations (such as an association representing immigrants from Mali and three associations representing immigrants from Morocco); and with teachers in primary and secondary schools in regions that serve students represented by the immigrant associations. Soriano (2008) found both teachers and immigrant associations to express similar reasons why it would be beneficial to work together in the school.

For the most part, Soriano's research found teachers open to the idea of schools

mediating between cultural groups, but unprepared to do so by themselves (Ejbari & Soriano, 2006). Soriano and her colleagues have been working with immigrant associations to build dialog and collaboration between schools, teachers, and immigrant communities, and in the process, provide a form of teacher professional development resulting from dialog and collaboration. Immigrant community associations have been particularly beneficial partners with schools because they are able to interface between immigrant families and Spanish institutions, and have a commitment to working out solutions to problems that immigrants face. Teachers are learning to recognize that immigrant associations bring a wealth of knowledge that can help teachers learn how to teach diverse populations in the classroom, and how to mediate conflicts between native Spanish students and immigrant students (Soriano & Ejbari, 2006). With university facilitation, teachers have begun to work with immigrant associations in making curricular and pedagogical changes in the classroom. For teachers, collaborating with immigrant associations is not only helping them learn to communicate with and teach their immigrant students, but also learn to improve the attitudes of native Spanish students toward immigrants (Soriano, 2008).

INCLUSION THROUGH STUDENTS' VOICE

The two programs above work toward inclusion by engaging teachers in dialog with adults from communities that are culturally different from their own. A different approach is to ask students from a historically marginalized community what works best for them in school, then use what they tell us as the basis for teacher education. A project in New Zealand, Te Kotahitanga, is designed this way (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson 2006). This project currently involves professional development of practicing teachers in 33

secondary schools; it is projected to expand to encompass elementary education and preservice teacher education.

The project began with the Maori community's concern about poor academic achievement of Maori students. As one avenue to address this problem, in 2001 a Maori research team gathered narratives from Maori high school students, their family members, their teachers, and school administrators regarding the main influences that limit as well as support Maori student achievement. A striking pattern that emerged in the narratives was that while teachers mainly described the students and their families as contributing to Maori students' achievement problems (using a cultural deficit framework), the students talked mainly about relationships with teachers as central to helping them learn, but as lacking in most classrooms (Bishop & Berryman, 2006).

Based on an analysis of the student narratives, the research team constructed an effective teaching profile that represents the kind of pedagogy that would work for the Maori students. The team posited that effective teachers of Maori students "positively and vehemently reject deficit theorizing as a means of explaining Maori students' educational achievement levels," know how to "bring about change in Maori students' educational achievement and are professionally committed to doing so." The effective teaching profile includes 1) caring about students as culturally located beings, 2) caring for the academic performance of students, 3) creating a secure, well-managed learning environment, 4) engaging in effective teaching interactions with Maori students *as* Maori, 5) promoting effective teaching interactions and relationships, and 6) monitoring and reflecting on outcomes that lead to achievement of Maori students (Bishop & Berryman, 2006, p. 273).

A professional development program was then constructed on the basis of this profile.

Teachers read the narratives to find out how Maori students and their families view their schooling, and how teachers tend to see it. For many teachers, the very unsettling experience of seeing themselves reflected in the narratives is enough to prompt them to want to make changes. Reflecting on the narratives is followed by on-going in-school professional development led by one or more school-based facilitators, focusing on building relationships with Maori students and using interactive classroom pedagogies such as cooperative learning. The professional development processes include classroom-based coaching and teacher-led inquiry groups that examine what teachers are doing to improve Maori student achievement.

Research is documenting a pattern of improvement in Maori students' achievement and well-being in school. Maori students of Te Kotahnitanga-trained teachers report much higher levels of satisfaction with and engagement in schooling than they had before the project (Bishop, et al., 2006). Further, schools that have participated in Te Kotahitanga for several years are posting considerably higher student achievement scores among both Maori and non-Maori students than are other comparable secondary schools in New Zealand (Maori in Mainstream, nd).

Te Kotahitanga is not the only teacher professional development program that develops inclusive pedagogy through student voice, but is perhaps the most extensive and researched such project. Cook-Saither (2006) discusses a preservice project – Teaching and Learning Together -- based on the same basic philosophy. She points out that this approach to teacher education repositions those who occupy an institutional place as "least able and least power" into leaders and knowers, and those who occupy an institutional place as teacher, into learners. Teachers learn to listen, and students – especially those who schools have silenced – learn to speak. In the case of Te Kotahitanga, the students are explicitly

conceptualized as culturally located beings, so as teachers learn to listen to them and re-shape pedagogy based on student voice, they also learn to include some knowledge from the wider Maori community in the classroom.

## INCLUSION THROUGH COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICE LEARNING

In teacher preparation programs that include community-based learning (often organized as service learning), communities serve as co-teacher educators. Cross-cultural community-based learning means learning about a community that is culturally-different from one's own by spending time there, equipped with learning strategies such as interviewing, active listening, and nonjudgmental observation. In service learning, the experience is designed specifically to serve community-identified needs. Marginalized communities serve as co-teacher educators when members help to plan the experiences, and work substantively with teachers or teacher candidates. Research on the impact of cross-cultural community-based learning, although slim, underscores the potential of this kind of learning (e.g., Bondy & Davis, 2000; Brown, 2004; James & Haig-Brown, 2002; Melnick & Zeichner, 1996; Moule, 2004; Seidl & Friend, 2002; Wiggins, et al., 2007). I will describe three such examples – two in the U.S. and one in Canada.

Ideally, community-based learning is integral to the teacher preparation program as a whole; in reality, often it begins with an individual faculty member teaching a course. For example, working at the University of Indiana, Boyle-Baise (2002) developed a 20-hour community-based service-learning component of a three-credit multicultural education course. The great majority of her teacher candidates were white; she wanted them to learn to collaborate with and learn from communities of color and low-income communities. Her

work is particularly significant because of the collaborative power-sharing relationship that developed. The community partners included: "two pastors, one for a racially mixed congregation, the other for a predominantly Black church; a director of a university program for students of color and education director for the black church; the program director for Boys and Girls clubs; the director of a community center; [and] the parent coordinator for Head Start" (Boyle-Baise, 2002, p. 78).

Boyle-Baise described her work as an on-going process of building relationships, of "working with representatives of culturally diverse and low-income communities as coeducators for future teachers" (p. 91). The community partners described the process of working with her as one of shared control, not only over what students did in the community, but also over the nature of the course, which they helped to teach. Coursework was structured around a community-based inquiry project, as well as in-class reflections over what students were learning. Each student worked out a written contract with his or her community partner; the partner helped to evaluate the student's performance for the course grade. Underlying these structures was time and effort invested in building on-going communication and collaborative decision-making about the entire course and service-learning experience.

The Urban Teacher Education Center in Sacramento, California involves a collaboration  between the Teacher Education program at California State University Sacramento and the Sacramento City Unified School District. Created in 2004, this three-semester program is designed to prepare future educators for urban schools and communities. It is housed in an urban elementary school, where courses are held. Every classroom is assigned a pair of student teachers, and teacher education faculty members have become actively involved on school committees. By locating its work within an urban school, faculty

members have forged a much closer connection between theory, research, and practice that is normally the practice in teacher education.

In addition, student teachers become active in the local community. The purpose of community involvement is to help student teachers learn to draw on cultural strengths and resources of urban communities and families, when teaching urban children in the classroom. During their first semester, they complete a community study, "in which they get to know the community, the neighborhoods, and the public housing complexes in which the children and families live" (Noel, 2006). To do so, they gather information about the community by interviewing some key adults, meeting parents, visiting a local church, riding public transportation, and so forth. According to Noel (2006), the program's coordinator, the most significant community partnership has been with an after-school mentoring academy that is located in a housing complex near the school, and was founded by two men who grew up there. Student teachers act as program tutors and mentors, enabling them to learn about the out-of-school lives of children in their classrooms, interpreted through adults who live in and grew up in the local urban community.

Noel (2008) points out that significant issues related to power and privilege must be confronted when collaborating with historically marginalized communities. Such communities have histories of unstable relationships with mainstream organizations that come and go according to their own needs, and of working with agendas set by others who presume to know what communities need. To confront these issues and strengthen relationships with community members, Noel spent a sabbatical in the community. Like Boyle-Baise, she worked hard to develop the trust and communication that enabled the community to take ownership over a portion of the teacher education experience.

In Toronto, Canada, York University's Urban Diversity (UD) Teacher Education Program, which has been in operation since 1994, institutionalizes similar work, but on a larger scale. The UD Program is designed to prepare teachers through experiences that link schools, university, and urban communities. Community involvement is integrated throughout the entire program as a basis for learning culturally relevant practice and critical social analysis. As faculty members who are involved with the program explain,

> In the foundational dimension of the curriculum, candidates were introduced to the study of the social, cultural, political, and economic forces in the larger community that affect the pedagogical process; the concept of community-based teacher education with unique service as well as learning aspects; and theory-practice linkages, critical reflective practice, and an evaluation process that provides the structure for candidates to think, talk, and write. (Solomon, Khattar Manoukian & Clarke, 2005, p. 175)

The program intentionally recruits teacher candidates from widely diverse racial, ethnic, linguistic, religious, and social class backgrounds. Learning to plan and share with each other prepares teacher candidates "to move across institutional borders: from the university to the practicum school to the community" (Solomon, Khattar Manoukian & Clarke, 2007, p. 73).

As a part of the UD Program, candidates are required to participate in a community-based project, of which there are four types: health and safety, educational, recreational, and political. For example, health-oriented breakfast and snack programs give teacher candidates "the opportunity to interact socially and academically with students, teachers, and parents, while simultaneously becoming more aware of issues of poverty and social class and their role as border crossers" (Solomon, Khattar Manoukian & Clarke, 2007, p. 74). A program

classified as political is a women's shelter, where teacher candidates tutor children while simultaneously learning about domestic violence and poverty in the local community. Prior to their work in the community, the teacher education program prepares candidates with research skills that emphasize interviewing (and listening), observing, and document analysis, as well as learning to "bracket their assumptions about urban, inner-city communities" (p. 75).

Based on an investigation of the impact of this program, Solomon, Khattar Manoukian and Clarke (2005) found the nature and extent of teacher candidates' learning to vary widely. While some continued to see community involvement as extracurricular and maintained a charity-work stance toward it, others came to see the community as a valuable partner in education and community involvement as political work. Some candidates saw themselves as distant outsiders to the community, while others learned to navigate structures of privilege and cultural identity to enter into substantive dialog with community members. Like Noel (2008), Solomon, Khattar Manoukian and Clarke (2007) emphasize that issues of power and privilege, visible in this kind of program, must be confronted. The most significant tension is that universities and university students bring assumptions and privileges that often undercut inclusion and solidarity. The authors note, "It is often the case that initiatives are taken without direct negotiation with community members or social agencies that operate in the community. Such actions often alienate the very people they are supposed to serve. Moreover, they confirm suspicions that those outside the community who have little vested interest in the community can engage in actions that directly affect community members without having to be accountable to the community" (p. 82).

As these three examples illustrate, teacher education programs can build

collaborative relationships with communities in order to engage teacher candidates in cross-cultural community-based learning. Building such relationships requires on-going communication in which community needs have priority, and community members have some say about the substance and process of teacher education.

PEDAGOGIES OF INCLUSION AND POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

Under neoliberalism, not only are peoples relocating globally on a massive scale, but also wealth is undergoing marked redistribution. Liberal policies generally emphasized opportunity and competition, moderated by protections against discrimination and market excesses. Under neoliberalism, the role of government shifts from regulating markets to enabling them, and from providing public services to promoting private enterprise. The result has been a massive redistribution of wealth upward, or, as Harvey (2005) put it, a new restoration of elite power. Pedagogies of inclusion need to rest on an analysis of these rapid political and economic dynamics, enabling teachers not only to understand them but also to envision organized counter-action (Compton & Weiner, 2008).

Collaboration with historically underserved and immigrant communities has the potential to raise teacher candidates' political consciousness, but may not do so unless political consciousness-raising is made an explicit part of the curriculum. An example from the U.S. illustrates. Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2008) work simultaneously with youth in urban schools and communities, and also with teacher candidates. Their work is situated in "critical counter-cultural communities of practice," which they define as pedagogy intentionally designed to counter "the existence of a dominant set of institutional norms and practices" (p. 11). Duncan-Andrade and Morrell explain that urban pedagogy needs to

recognize "the conditions of inequality and the desire to overturn those conditions for oneself and for all suffering communities as the starting point and motivator for the urban educator and for the urban student" (p. 10). Rather than assuming that gaining a conventional education will help students from marginalized communities move into the mainstream, a critical counter-cultural community of practice begins by focusing directly on structural and material inequalities in the school and the larger community, engaging students in a cycle of praxis that involves researching a problem, then formulating, implementing, and evaluating a plan of action to address it.

To prepare teachers for this kind of pedagogy, Duncan-Andrade and Morrell recommend not only that coursework and classroom experience focus on critical social theory and practice, but also that teacher candidates access learning spaces outside schools in which critical counter-cultural communities of practice already exist. Examples include "after-school dance and theatre programs, sports leagues, community-based organizations, or tutorials" in which adults in the community are working with youth to address real community issues (p. 183). Both authors work in programs in which teachers collaborate with urban youth to research and act collectively on local structural problems of inequity, projects that involve both research into the community and collaboration with the community. Coursework linked with community research helps teacher candidates to situate local problems within a larger analysis of power, and to connect action addressing local problems with other existing organized action. In this way, teacher preparation is linked with community empowerment.

CONLUSION

Pedagogies of inclusion must be situated within the context of rapidly growing diversity within schools and communities, histories of oppression that many communities have experienced, and impacts of the expansion of global capitalism under neoliberalism. This is a tall order for teacher education, particularly in light of cut-backs that many teacher educators are experiencing.

In this chapter, I have suggested three pillars on which teacher education for pedagogies of inclusion can be built: the university, the classroom, and the community. I have argued that communities, although absent from most teacher education programs, are critically important, particularly in light of cultural and political dynamics today. Immigrant and historically marginalized communities not only care deeply about the education of their children and house cultural and knowledge resources that teachers need, but also bear the brunt of deleterious effects of neoliberalism. As the Study Commission (1976) suggested over forty years ago, human welfare stands to benefit when local communities are strengthened; schools can be a part of that process. Examples in this chapter illustrate how teacher education, by bridging communities, classrooms, and university, can play a powerful role in strengthening teaching and forging collaborative relationships between teachers and the communities in which they work.

## REFERENCES

Bishop, R. & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2006). Te Kotahitanga: The experiences of year 9 and 10 Maori students in mainstream classrooms. *Ministry of*

*Education.* Retrieved May 29, 2007 from

http://www.minedu.govt.nz/goto/tekotahitanga

Bondy, E. & Davis, S. (2000). The caring of strangers: Insights from a field experience in a

culturally unfamiliar community. <u>*Action in Teacher Education*</u> *22*(2), 54-66.

Boyle-Baise, M. (2002). *Multicultural service learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brown, E. L. (2004). What precipitates change in cultural diverse awareness during a

multicultural course? *Journal of Teacher Education, 55* (4): 325-340.

Compton, M. & Weiner, L., Eds. (2008). The global assault on teaching, teachers, and their

unions. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). "Change based on what students say": Preparing teachers for a

paradoxical model of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education 9*

(4), 345-358.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing*

*world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R. & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy*. New York:

Peter Lang.

Ejbari, N. & Soriano, E. (2006). Migración, interculturalidad y mediación. In E. Soriano

Ayala, A. J. González Jiménez, & M. M. Osorio Méndez (Coords). *Conviviencia y*

*mediación intercultural* (pp. 153-156). Almería, Spain: Editorial Universidad de

Almería.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation.

*Teachers College Record 87* (1): 53-65.

Feistrizter, E. (1999). *The making of a teacher: A report on teacher preparation in the U.S.*

National Center for Education Information. Retrieved September 18, 2006 from http://www.ncei.com/MakingTeacher-rpt.htm

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

James, C. E., & Haig-Brown (2002). "Returning the dues." Community and the personal in a university-school partnership. *Urban Education,* 36 (2), 226-255.

Katz, S. R. (2005). Emerging from the cocoon of Romani pride: The first graduates of the Gandhi Secondary School in Hungary. *Intercultural Education* 16 (3), 247-261.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher 35* (7), 3-12.

Lyall, K. C., & Sell, K. R. (2006). *The true genius of America at risk*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Maori in Mainstream (n.d.). Te Kotahitanga. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education. Retrieved July 9, 2008 from http://tki.org.nz/r/maori_mainstream/tekotah_e.php.

Melnick, S., & Zeichner, K. (1996). The role of community-based field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M. L. Gomez (Eds.) *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176-196). New York: Teachers College Press.

Meuleman, J. (2006). Between unity and diversity: Construction of the Indonesian nation. *European Journal of East Asia Studies* 5 (1) 45-69.

Moule, J. (2004). Safe and growing out of the box: Immersion for social change. In J. Romo P. Bradfield &, R. Serrano (Eds.), *Working in the margins: Becoming a transformative educator* (pp. 147-171). Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Noel, J. (2006). Integrating a new urban teacher education center into a school and its community. Online submission, *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*

2, 197-205.

Noel, J. (2008). A school-based urban teacher education program that enhances school-community connections. Paper presented at the International Roundtable on School, Family, and Community Partnerships. New York, 2008.

Openshaw, R. (1999). Some twentieth century issues for twenty-first century teacher educators. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *34* (2), 323-334.

Puiggrós, A. (1997). World bank education policy: Market liberalism meets ideological conservatism. *International Journal of Health Services*, *27* (2), 217-226

Quilaqueo, D. (2006). Valores educativos mapuches para la formación de personas desde el discurso de *kimches*. *Estudios Pédagogicos 32* (2), 73-86.

Quilaqueo, D. (2007). Saberes y conocimientos indígenas en la formación de profesores de educación intercultural. *Educar em Revista* No. 29. Retrieved July 8, 2008 from http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php

Rubenstein, G. (2007). Building a better teacher: Confronting the crisis in teacher training. *Edutopia 3* (8). Retrieved July 22, 2008 from http://edutopia.org/magazine/nov07.

Seidl, B. & Friend, G. (2002). Leaving authority at the door. *Teaching and Teacher Education 18* (4): 421-433.

Solomon, R. P., Khattar Manoukian, R. & Clarke, J. (2005). From an ethic of altruism to possibilities of transformation in teacher candidates' community involvement. In L. Pease-Alvarez & S. R. Schecter (Eds). *Urban teacher education and teaching* (pp. 171-190). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Solomon, R. P., Khattar Manoukian, R. & Clarke, J. (2007). Pre-Service teachers as border crossers: Linking urban schools and communities through service learning. In R. P.

Solomon & D. N. Sekayi (Eds). *Urban teacher education and teaching* (pp. 67-88). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Soriano, E. (2008). The educational capability of immigrant associations in a multicultural context. Paper submitted for publication.

Soriano, E. & Ejbari, N. (2006). La práctica de la mediación intercultural. In E. Soriano Ayala, A. J. González Jiménez, & M. M. Osorio Méndez (Coords). *Convivencia y mediación intercultural* (pp. 157-162). Almería, Spain: Editorial Universidad de Almería.

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers (1976). *Teacher education in the United States: The responsibility gap*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review 71* (3), 345-365.

Thorat S. K. (1999). Poverty, caste and child labour in India: The plight of Dalits and Adivasi children. In K. Voll (ed.), *Against child labour: Indian and international dimensions and strategies.* Delhi: Masai Book and Third Millennium Transparency.

Uhn, C. (2007). Toward a multicultural society? *Korea Journal*, Winter, p. 5-7.

Vidali, E. L. & Adams, L. D. (2006) The challenges of globalization: Changes in education policy and practice in the Greek context. *Childhood Education 82* (6), 358-362.

Wiggins, R. Z., Follo, E. J., & Eberly, M. B. (2007). The impact of a field immersion program on pre-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 653-663.

Yuen, C. Y. M. (2002). Education for new arrivals and multicultural teacher

education in Hong Kong. *New Horizons in Education* n. 44-45, p. 12-21.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, &

M. L. Gomez, *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 133-175). New

York, NY: Teachers College Press.