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For this themed issue, we invited contributors to speak to the political dimensions of teacher education. A distinctly political enterprise, education generally and teacher education specifically are particularly vulnerable to the sway of public opinion (Cochran-Smith, Piazza, & Power, 2013). Over a year into the Trump presidency, we wonder how the political context of teaching and teacher education has evolved or changed, and thus sought articles for this special issue addressing how politics, broadly defined, influences education. Each of our featured articles addresses the political dimensions of teacher education in some way, whether focusing on legislation, vulnerable populations in this current climate, or how social inequality and cultural capital manifest in seemingly benign interactions. In our call for papers, we asked authors to address a host of questions, including “How can FATE members advocate for marginalized youth, particularly immigrant students, LGBT youth, students of color, etc.?” and “How do we prepare teachers who are responsive to the political climate?” Our submissions answered those calls in unexpected but important ways.

In the article “Preservice Teachers’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Global Competency,” Kaori Burkart addresses a persistent problem in education: how to prepare mostly white teacher candidates to work with an increasingly diverse student population. At a time when nativism, anti-immigrant sentiment, and racism appear prominently in the national conversation, Burkart’s article sheds necessary light on the competencies that lead to increased intercultural sensitivity in pre-service teachers. Studying pre-service teachers at seven Florida universities, Burkart demonstrates a positive relationship between global competency scale scores and intercultural sensitivity scale scores, suggesting the more globally competent one is, the more sensitive one is across cultures as well. Burkart’s findings also indicate that monolingual, white, Christian, female pre-service teachers scored
lower than their peers on both global competency and intercultural sensitivity scales, suggesting that diversifying teacher candidates through targeted recruitment efforts could go a long way toward enhancing intercultural sensitivity. In addition to recommending more communication between white pre-service teachers and other cultural groups, whether it be within their own colleges and universities or through study abroad programs, Burkart also offers an important set of questions teacher education programs should ask themselves about the experiences they provide for teacher candidates. Ultimately, Burkart suggests that if we truly wish to serve the diverse student populations in our nation’s schools, we must have globally competent and culturally sensitive teachers, and teacher education programs should actively meet this need.

Maria Coady, Shuzhan Li, and Mark Lopez’s literature review, “Twenty-five Years after the Florida Consent Decree: Does Preparing All Teachers for English Learners Work?,” takes up another hot political issue: how Florida’s teachers are prepared to teach English Learners (ELs). The authors explore the impact of the Florida Consent Decree, a 1990 document that provides specific guidelines for the teaching of ELs. Asking whether or not the Decree was effective in preparing all teachers to teach ELs, Coady, Li, and Lopez survey empirical studies written since the passing of the Decree that focus on the preparedness of in-service and pre-service teachers to teach ELs effectively. Finding only 16 studies that met their review criteria, Coady et al. call for more studies that connect the Decree (and the subsequent education of all teachers for experience with ELs) to influences on EL student learning. They claim, “The paucity of research conducted in Florida following an important legal ruling should galvanize the Florida teacher education community” to focus on this area of research because without those studies, they argue, it is extremely difficult to draw any substantive conclusions about the impact of the Decree. In addition to focusing readers’ attention on specific political concerns, such as Florida charter schools’ lack of oversight as related to the Decree, this literature review also raises broader questions about the origins and impact of educational policy.

Last, James Rigney’s conceptual paper, “Good Schools, Oppressive Binaries, and the Good Society,” looks at the relationship between real estate prices and “good” schools as measured by higher test scores. His article troubles this relationship because “labeling any particular school as ‘good’ involves a whole host of subjective considerations, some of which are connected with often-unexamined racial and economic inequalities.” Acknowledging that
many people do not take into account the “racial dynamics of their housing choice,” and that ideologies of individualism and meritocracy perpetuate this problem, Rigney proposes that teacher educators use John Rawls’ “veil of ignorance” to encourage students to imagine what a fair society might look like. Rigney suggests this exercise—“less a lesson plan than a tool borrowed from ethical philosophy”—will help students recognize and understand how privilege operates in an unjust society and manages to perpetuate itself through something as ordinary as purchasing real estate. Thus, Rigney offers a concrete example of how to invite pre-service teachers—and even the students they serve—into important conversations about the politics of education.

Our book and media reviews also address the political dimensions of education. Brittany Adams, in her review of *Giving Our Children a Fighting Chance: Poverty, Literacy, and the Development of Information Capital* (2012) by Susan B. Neuman and Donna C. Celano, highlights the ecological isolation of those in poverty—an isolation that impedes literacy development. Adams underscores Neuman and Celano’s argument that education policy often approaches education reforms without acknowledging how cultural capital and concentrated affluence benefit some and harm others, despite reforms that insist upon leveling the playing field. Indeed, as she aptly notes, “community equity flows far deeper than policy is willing to address.”

Closing out the issue, Cody Miller and Elizabeth Currin, in their review of the Netflix drama *House of Cards*, illustrate how even a fictional portrayal of the darker side of education policy-making has implications for teachers and teacher educators. If, as Supovitz (2017) argues, politics amounts to “efforts to shape opinions, beliefs, and decision making” (p. 52), the manipulative Frank Underwood, as he schools his antagonists, should give educators pause. Miller and Currin argue that finding the overlap between politics and education, and using popular culture to do so, can enrich our understandings of school and society.

Each of these articles, in its own way, takes up the enduring political problem of how best to prepare teachers, articulating some of the field’s essential dilemmas and suggesting how teacher educators may go about addressing them. We encourage readers of our journal and members of FATE to accept these challenges, and we welcome future contributions regarding any successes and struggles along the way.
References


Preservice Teachers’ Intercultural Sensitivity and Global Competency

Kaori Burkart
kburkart@oita-u.ac.jp
Center for International Education and Research, Oita University

Abstract

This study combines two conceptual frameworks, the Intercultural Sensitivity Index and the Global Competency Index, to examine the contributions of three subscales of global competency to intercultural sensitivity levels. Study findings suggest that each of the three global competency factors significantly contributes to intercultural sensitivity. Intercultural communication skills were found to have the strongest influence on preservice teachers’ intercultural sensitivity. Further analysis used demographic variables to enrich a multiple regression model.
Introduction

The United States Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2017) reports that from 2004 to 2014, the White student population in public schools decreased from 58% to 49.5%, while the Hispanic student population increased from 19% to 25%. The U.S. Department of Education (NCES, 2016a) indicated that the immigrant population has more than tripled since 1970, comprising about 13% of the entire nation. A large portion of the foreign-born population speaks a language other than English at home, and about 4.6 million public school students are enrolled in English Language Learner programs (NCES, 2016b). Thus, contemporary classroom environments are increasingly diverse and concerns persist regarding slow development or impractical implementation in bridging this gap between teacher and student populations (Zeichner, 2014).

Despite a racially and culturally diversifying United States classroom environment, the teacher population in public schools remains homogenous, composed mostly of middle-class, White females from rural or suburban communities who are monolingual and have little multicultural or international experience (Cushner, 2012). According to NCES (2017), the total number of education bachelor’s degrees awarded was 91,623 in 2014-2015, nearly 80% of which went to White students (n = 71,749). That number is nearly 10 times more than that of Black students (n = 7,260) or Hispanic students (n = 7,198). Although the U.S. population has been continually diversifying, the teacher population seems isolated from these trends. Cushner (2012) also expresses concern that those enrolled in teacher education programs typically come from within 100 miles of where they grew up. Labor markets for teachers do not require preservice teachers to relocate much geographically or to step out of their cultural comfort zones (Kissock & Richardson, 2010). Teacher education’s strong emphasis on local perspectives often precludes global perspectives, leaving a majority of teachers disconnected from culturally diverse classroom realities and sometimes resistant to changes in contemporary learning environments (Levine, 2010).

To move forward in internationalizing teacher education programs, it is important to learn more about preservice teachers’ intercultural sensitivity levels and global competency constructs (Kirby & Crawford, 2012; Mahon, 2009; Zhao, 2015). To date, little is known about the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and factors of global competency perceived by preservice teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine those
relationships using Olson and Kroeger’s (2001) Global Competency Index and Intercultural Sensitivity Index. Promoting preservice teachers’ competency in multicultural environments is essential to building a strong foundation for the future of internationalization in U.S. teacher education programs (Zhao, 2010).

**Conceptual Framework**

**Global Competency**

Based on Piagetian theorist Kegan’s theory (1994), the Global Competency Index (Olson & Kroeger, 2001) also contains three components of global competency, classified as substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills (see Appendix A, p. 22). Substantive knowledge embodies broad knowledge of cultures, including languages, global issues, and dynamics. Perceptual understanding is related to an individual’s perceptions, which in this context include open-mindedness, anti-stereotyping, critical thinking, and deeper and wider consciousness of one’s environment. Intercultural communication skills represent the ability to engage in positive interactions with others. Specific skills include flexibility, empathy, intercultural self-awareness and consciousness, multicultural leadership and negotiation, and a global mindset, all of which assist in effectively communicating with people having different worldviews.

**Intercultural Sensitivity**

The Intercultural Sensitivity Index (Olson & Kroeger, 2001) is based on Bennett’s (1986) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, which was designed to identify an individual’s intercultural sensitivity level along a continuum (see Appendix B, p. 23). Olson and Kroeger’s Intercultural Sensitivity Index also introduces a continuum of personal growth in intercultural sensitivity, going from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism along stages of intercultural sensitivity: denial, defense, minimization, adaptation, accommodation, and integration. According to this theory, ethnocentrism resides on one side of the spectrum and is defined by the stages of denial, defense, and minimization (Bennett, 1993). Williams (2005) suggests that Olson and Kroeger’s Intercultural Sensitivity Index (2001) could identify levels of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, making it possible to identify attitudes and behaviors common to people of a certain cognitive stage.

**Combination Effects**

Previous research has gauged intercultural sensitivity development by assessing individuals’ developmental level but generally has not captured factors that might drive
shifts along the continuum in a cultural frame of reference (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). Similarly, research exploring major constructs of global competency illuminate individuals’ strengths and tendencies in global contexts, but global competency is “not specifically designed and constructed to measure the vectors of student development” (Chickering & Braskamp, 2009, p. 29). Each instrument highlights specific and distinct dimensions, so integration of the two approaches can allow not only identification of preservice teachers’ perceptions of intercultural sensitivity and global competency but also examination of the combined effects, uncovering possible correlations between the two constructs to the extent that they take complementary approaches.

**Methodology**

The present study is an ex post facto correlational study employing multiple regression analysis. The following research questions (RQs) guided the investigation of relationships between intercultural sensitivity and global competency of preservice teachers enrolled in the State University System of Florida (SUSF):

RQ1: Which factors of global competency contribute to the overall level of intercultural sensitivity as perceived by preservice teachers in the SUSF?

RQ2: What other factors have influenced the relationship of global competency and intercultural sensitivity as perceived by preservice teachers in the SUSF?

**Participants**

After discussing the intended data collection with institutional representatives at ten education colleges within the SUSF, seven out of ten Florida universities agreed to participate in this project. An online link to a survey package including the instrument, a copy of the informed consent form, and a cover letter was sent to each institution’s facilitator. The facilitators on each campus identified the target population and distributed the survey link through a student email list. In addition to the online survey, an alternative data collection approach was used to augment the sample size with paper-and-pencil questionnaires administered at a mid-sized state university located in the western part of Florida. The text of the paper-and-pencil survey package, including the instrument, a copy of the informed consent form, and a cover letter, was identical to the online version. The researcher worked with the teacher education program coordinator at the target university to obtain permission to distribute the survey and visited eight participating classes to administer the questionnaire. In order to ensure anonymity in this data collection procedure,
a co-investigator collected the survey package after each participant completed and separated the consent form from the questionnaire. The researcher received the raw data with only a generic number assigned to each response.

Results from completed questionnaires \((n = 428)\) from the online \((n = 313)\) and paper-and-pencil \((n = 115)\) survey approaches were assembled in the fall semester of 2013. The results of Levene’s test for equality of variances suggested that the assumption of homogeneity of variance between the two different data collection methods used in this project would be considered reasonable. Responses revealed that the majority of participants were White \((n = 299; 69.9\%)\) females \((n = 368; 85.7\%)\). The rest of the ethnic composition was 13% Hispanic/Latino \((n = 56)\); 8% African American/Black \((n = 34)\); 6% Biracial/Multiracial \((n = 27)\); less than 2% Asian \((n = 7)\); and less than 1% Native American/Native Alaskan \((n = 2)\), Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders \((n = 1)\), and other \((n = 5)\). In gender and ethnicity categories, the sample fairly represented the education student population based on a report produced by the State University System of Florida Board of Governors (2012). The majority of respondents identified themselves as traditional-aged students between 18 and 24 years old \((n = 308; 72.0\%)\), Christian \((n = 319; 74.5\%)\), native speakers of English \((n = 387; 90.4\%)\), and United States citizens \((n = 392; 91.6\%)\).

**Instrumentation**

The instrument employed for this study was the Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (Olson & Kroeger, 2001) which employs a total of 49 items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“Doesn’t describe me at all”) to 5 (“Describes me extremely well”) and consists of two indices: a Global Competency Index and an Intercultural Sensitivity Index. In general, the lower the Intercultural Sensitivity Index score (ISI score) the less sensitive, and the lower the Global Competency Index score (GCI score) the less competent the participants are in intercultural and global contexts.

The Global Competency Index uses 24 items to identify individuals’ levels of global perspective development based on three subscales: substantive knowledge (7 items), perceptual understanding (6 items), and intercultural communication skills (11 items). Potential scores for the Global Competency Index range from 5 to 120. Thus, each subscale has a range from 7 to 35 for substantive knowledge, from 6 to 30 for perceptual understanding, and 11 to 55 for intercultural communication skills. The Intercultural Sensitivity Index consists of 25 items. The instrument employs items that describe
characteristics of six intercultural sensitivity stages: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration, with scores ranging from 5 to 125.

In addition to the Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (Olson & Kroeger, 2001), individual-specific demographic variables were elicited based on existing literature. The literature presents the majority of teachers as White, female, monolingual, middle-class, from midsize suburban neighborhoods, and with little multicultural and international experiences (Cushner, 2012). Bennett (1993) stated that strong religious preference would place an individual in the minimizer range, as this tends to lead people to view the world as if their perspectives are the center of cultural norms. Therefore, the demographic section of the questionnaire also included religious affiliation.

Results

Prior to formal data analysis, inspection of the screened data indicated that the two quantitative variables (i.e., ISI generated by the Intercultural Sensitivity Index and the Global Competency Index) were approximately normally distributed.

Teacher Archetype Descriptions

The Global Competency Index (GCI) and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (ISI) employ a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Doesn’t describe me at all, 5 = Describes me extremely well). A higher score indicates greater competency in global contexts. The total possible GCI score was between 24 and 120 points, and the sample average was 78.08 points ($SD = 14.43$). The possible subscale range was from 7 to 35 for substantive knowledge ($M = 19.01, SD = 5.81$), from 6 to 30 for perceptual understanding ($M = 23.07, SD = 3.76$), and from 11 to 55 points for intercultural communication skills ($M = 35.91, SD = 7.25$). The participants in this study ($n = 428$) scored as low as 36 and as high as 110 points. Similarly, the total ISI score range was between 5 and 125. The participants’ responses in the sample ($n = 428$) fell between 64 and 105 points, and the average was 87.14 points ($SD = 9.96$).

Descriptive statistics indicated that the monolingual White female Christian teacher archetype with little international experience scored lower on both Indices. For example, Whites ($n = 299$) scored an average of 85.78 ($SD = 9.91$) for the ISI and 76.33 ($SD = 14.11$) for the GCI, both of which were the lowest among all ethnic groups. Female participants ($n = 368$) were lower on both indices (ISI: $M = 86.97, SD = 9.92$; GCI: $M = 77.35, SD = 14.13$). Among religious groups, the Christian group ($n = 319$) presented the lowest average ISI scores ($M = 86.14, SD = 9.60$) and lowest average GCI score of 76.57 ($SD = 14.08$). The
only demographic group displaying lower than average scores on both the ISI and GCI was the Christian group.

Most participants were born in the United States \((n = 392)\), and these respondents' average ISI and GCI scores were lower (ISI: \(M = 86.55, SD = 9.92\); GCI: \(M = 77.15, SD = 14.37\)) than those born outside the United States (ISI: \(M = 93.53, SD = 8.10\); GCI: \(M = 88.19, SD = 11.01\)). Native English speakers had lower ISI (\(M = 86.72, SD = 9.90\)) and GCI (\(M = 77.27, SD = 14.33\)) averages than those participants whose first language was something other than English. Similarly, participants who identified themselves as monolingual had lower ISI (\(M = 84.94, SD = 9.77\)) and GCI (\(M = 74.00, SD = 13.49\)) averages. International travel experience responses indicated that the more people travel internationally, the higher the average GCI scores.

**Intercultural Sensitivity Contributing Factors**

The results of Pearson correlation tests indicated that the ISI score is positively correlated with substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills, and that these correlations were statistically significant. A multiple regression analysis model using these three predictors with the ISI score generated an \(R^2\) of .52, an adjusted \(R^2\) of .52, and an F statistic of \(F(3, 424) = 152.01\), leading to rejection of the hypothesis that all parameter values in the regression were zero at the less than .001 level (see Appendix C, p. 24).

The parameter values also estimate the relative magnitude of impact of the three predictors on ISI scores. In this case, comparisons of the standardized beta coefficients among each of the three predictors (substantive knowledge: \(\beta = .19\), perceptual understanding: \(\beta = .10\), intercultural communication skills: \(\beta = .51\)) indicated the strength of the subscale's relationship with the ISI scores. The most influential predictor on the overall ISI scores was intercultural communication skills. Intercultural communication skills had more than five times the weight of perceptual understanding, and substantive knowledge had nearly twice the predictive weighting of perceptual understanding (see Appendix D, p. 25).

Relevant demographic predictors were used to help explain variation in ISI scores. To examine the statistical significance of these predictors, the nominal level data were dummy coded to represent group membership. The dummy coded variables were expected to help
explain some of the variability in the ISI scores. For example, ethnic group membership was dummy coded into two groups, Caucasian \((n = 299)\) and non-Caucasian \((n = 129)\). Similarly, religious affiliation was categorized as Christian \((n = 319)\) and non-Christian \((n = 109)\). In addition, academic status was divided into undergraduate \((n = 398)\) and graduate student \((n = 30)\) groups.

With several demographic predictors representing group memberships of the majority of the teacher population, the regression \(R^2\) improved to .54, the adjusted \(R^2 = .53\), and \(F(8, 418) = 60.48\) at \(p < .001\). The analysis indicated the following statistically significant demographic predictor variables: Caucasian/White or non-Caucasian/White \((p < .02)\), Christian or non-Christian \((p < .05)\), and undergraduate or graduate level \((p < .04)\). The predictors gender and first language (whether English was a first language or not) were not statistically significant. The demographic predictors presented in the model indicated that non-Caucasian/White participants \((n = 109; \beta = 1.94)\) and non-Christian participants \((n = 129; \beta = 1.53)\) had significantly higher ISI scores than their counterpart groups. Similarly, the group differences between undergraduate \((n = 398)\) and graduate students \((n = 30; \beta = −2.72)\) indicated that the graduate students had systematically lower overall ISI scores.

**Discussion**

The current study explored relationships between intercultural sensitivity and global competency using the Global Competency and Intercultural Sensitivity Index (Olson & Kroeger, 2001), which contained two sections measuring participants’ global competency and intercultural sensitivity. The multiple regression analysis through the two combined theoretical approaches—developmental and holistic—described a multidimensional platform to explore the variables influencing intercultural sensitivity among university preservice teachers in the state of Florida. Related literature has suggested that intercultural communication skills might be highly influential for intercultural sensitivity (King & Baxter Magolda, 2005). Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, and McMillen (2009) and Williams (2005) also employed the Intercultural Sensitivity Index and suggested significance of intercultural communication skills in the improvement of ISI scores. However, none of these studies examined the magnitudes of the effects. One of the most revealing findings generated from the combined approach is that a prospective teacher’s intercultural communication skills score is five times more influential than the perceptual understanding score as a contributor
to the ISI score, controlling for relevant demographic variables. Therefore, improvement in intercultural communication skills is likely to be most effective in improving perceptions of intercultural sensitivity and global competency among preservice teachers. Findings from the present study’s multiple regression analysis not only confirm statistically significant relationships between intercultural sensitivity and global competency, but also reveal the relative strengths of the three GCI constructs (substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, and intercultural communication skills).

In addition, the model generated via the multiple regression analysis also indicated that Caucasian/White and Christian respondents had significantly lower ISI scores than other demographic groups, thereby indicating that Caucasian/White and Christian groupings are less sensitive in intercultural situations and environments than other demographic groups.

As previous research has indicated, the majority of the teacher population (in this case a group of monolingual White female Christians from middle-class suburban communities) is likely to reside in the third stage of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity: minimization (Bennett, 1986). Mahon (2009) described individuals in the minimization stage as having an “ethnocentric understanding of culture, minimizing it in favor of a common humanity or spirituality” (p. 48). Members of the minimization group who are from a dominant cultural group often fail to recognize their own cultural background as distinct (Goodwin, 2010). According to Groff and Peters (2012), such lack of cultural self-awareness can have a strong negative influence on multicultural understanding. The results of Mahon’s study (2009) also indicated that ethnicity was influential on intercultural sensitivity.

**Implications of the Study**

The results of the present study indicated that all three factors of global competency—knowledge, perception, and communication skills—have strong positive relationships with individual and group intercultural sensitivity. One of the notable results from the multiple regression analysis was the strong positive relationship between communication skills and intercultural sensitivity. Researchers describe intercultural communication skills as the ability to engage in positive interactions with others (Olson & Kroeger, 2001) and the willingness to interact with people of diverse backgrounds (Brigham, 2011). The ability to engage in positive interactions with people of diverse backgrounds
requires flexibility and empathy, intercultural self-awareness and consciousness, multicultural leadership and negotiation skills, and a global mindset (Bennett, 1993). All of these factors foster more effective communication with those having different worldviews. These are the constructs of intercultural communication skills that can enhance preservice teachers’ perceptions of intercultural sensitivity and global competency (Bennett, 1986; Hammer et al., 2003). The development of intercultural communication skills in preservice teachers may be a challenge due to the composition of teacher and preservice teacher populations. This suggests that policy makers and university administrators need to provide preservice teachers with as much intercultural exposure and experience as possible (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Zhao, 2015). Initial efforts could include recruiting students from demographically diverse populations to teacher education programs.

Implementing various extracurricular activities on campus such as study abroad, service learning, civic engagement and volunteering, and internship and practicum experiences would also be beneficial for those already enrolled in programs (Brigham, 2011).

Various studies examining study abroad programs emphasize its effectiveness in providing meaningful intercultural experiences and creating intrinsic motivation for learning about different cultures (Gullekson, Tucker, Coombs, & Wright, 2011). Although study abroad programs are not particularly popular among education majors, investing in such programs and encouraging preservice teachers to explore outside of their comfort zones could be a successful strategy (Kissock & Richardson, 2010). Discovering differences via participation in intercultural programs such as studying or teaching abroad can widen students’ perspectives (Alfaro & Quezada, 2010). Such opportunities can help preservice teachers experience differences and reflect more clearly on their own cultures. However, such international experiences are not for everyone; financial constraints, class scheduling, and degree requirements can all be hurdles. University policies that accommodate and support student overall achievement in intercultural sensitivity and global competency are needed (Childress, 2009).

Even if preservice teachers are willing and able to study abroad, the literature presents the criticism that one-time experiences provide little reflective time to connect and integrate experiences with academic learning (Jones & Esposito, 2006). Therefore, it is important to establish ongoing “transformative learning, reflective practice, experiential learning, and collaborative learning” (Brigham, 2011, p. 27) such as multicultural learning
communities and foreign language requirements. Collaborative learning, for instance, can provide students with opportunities to learn authentic and complex global perspectives from their peers and experience them from other perspectives (Brigham, 2011). Such programs can be organized and implemented without traveling overseas. Agnello, White, and Fryer (2006) argued that prospective teachers in particular should develop global perspectives while retaining their focus on local contexts. The main goal of these programs is to develop fundamental self-efficacy to recognize differences, integrate diverse perspectives, and construct new knowledge (Kissock & Richardson, 2010). Broader knowledge must be cultivated through curricula because this knowledge plays a vital role in fostering campus internationalization (Groff & Peters, 2012).

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Although the present study did not include the exploration of systematic differences among participating universities, further research might be able to shed light on differences in institutional attitudes toward campus internationalization. In this study, the respondents from the three universities with the highest ISI average also displayed the three highest GCI average scores, which may indicate that these three universities encourage more sensitivity and competence in intercultural and global environments than the other three universities. Previous research has shown that institutional cultures reflect general attitudes toward internationalization efforts (Zeichner, 2014). Bennett and Kane (2011) argued that institutions with apathetic approaches to campus internationalization, including international activities and implementation motives and intensity, often exhibit weaker campus internationalization outcomes. More precisely, differences across institutions in teacher education program requirements related to diversity and global study may provide avenues for comparison. Some important questions could be posed: Are preservice students required to study diversity or global studies beyond basic general education requirements? Are they encouraged to study abroad or to experience student teaching at racially and culturally diverse schools? Do state standards contain requirements for cultural sensitivity learning and globalization concepts included in preservice education programs? The exploration of differences in each institution’s teacher education requirements may uncover factors that influence individual students’ intercultural and global readiness levels.
Conclusion

The present study revealed a positive relationship between intercultural sensitivity and global competency among Florida preservice teachers. All three primary predictors of the Global Competency Index indicated positive relationships with the Intercultural Sensitivity Index. Regression results showed that intercultural communication skills had the strongest connection to participants’ intercultural sensitivity. Additional predictors including ethnicity, religious affiliation, and academic status were also statistically significant. Future research exploring systematic differences in campus internationalization would also be beneficial in supporting progress in this area. The results of the study suggest that ongoing programs fostering student growth in multicultural understanding are essential. Postsecondary education must take campus-wide internationalization seriously to achieve this goal and adequately prepare new teachers for rapidly diversifying and globalizing learning environments.
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Appendix A

Three Subscales of Global Competency

Substantive Knowledge

Intercultural Communication Skills

Perceptual Understanding

Global Competency

Appendix B
Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

### Appendix C

Global Competency Index and Intercultural Sensitivity Index

Multiple Regression Analysis Summary\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( SE ) of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Change ( F )</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>Sig. ( F )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.720(^b)</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>6.939</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>152.058</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: Intercultural Sensitivity Index.

\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Substantive Knowledge, Perceptual Understanding, Intercultural Communication Skills.

*** \( p < .001 \)
### Appendix D
Global Competency Index and Intercultural Sensitivity Index Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>49.398</td>
<td>2.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Knowledge</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Understanding</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Comm. Skills</td>
<td>7.719</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Sig. = significance.*

*a Dependent Variable: Intercultural Sensitivity Index

*p < 0.05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
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Abstract

The Florida Consent Decree (“Decree”), a legal document outlining specific educational guidelines for English Learners (ELs), was signed into Florida law in 1990. One of the most far-reaching sections of the Decree outlines the preparation of all Florida teachers to work with ELs. Twenty-five years have passed since the Decree, yet little is known about the effectiveness of the rule to prepare teachers to meet the learning needs of ELs. We examine the empirical research on pre- and in-service teachers who work with ELs in Florida from 1991 to 2016, after the signing of the Florida Consent Decree.
Introduction

The Florida Consent Decree ("Decree") was signed into Florida law on August 14, 1990. The Decree was the result of a legal settlement between a coalition of fifteen named groups and individuals, and several named defendants led by the state of Florida Board of Education. Also known as the META Decree, named after the plaintiffs Multicultural Education Training Advocacy, Inc. (META; MacDonald, 2004), the Decree brought into light the educational disparities faced by ELs across the state approximately twenty-five years ago. In the legal case that preceded the signing of the Decree, the plaintiffs argued that the Limited English Proficient* (LEP, hereafter referred to as English learner, EL) students were not receiving adequate instruction and were failing to learn. The plaintiffs also argued that ELs were denied access to equal educational programs and services.

The goal of the Decree was to create and implement a plan to ensure that EL students across Florida received adequate and appropriate instruction as outlined in previous federal and state legal cases. Several key federal legal cases guided the Decree, including Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Lau v. Nichols, 1974; the Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974; the Fifth Circuit court decision in the case of Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; and the Supreme Court decision in Plyler v. Doe, 1982. Hence, the Decree sought to align Florida educational policy with federal civil rights and national educational policies that aimed to ensure high quality education of ELs.

The Decree was written in five sections, intended to outline the rules and requirements associated with ELs’ education. The five sections include: Identification and Assessment, Equal Access to Appropriate Programming, Equal Access to Appropriate Categorical and Other Programs for LEP Students, Personnel, and Monitoring Issues. The five sections of the Decree sought to offer “a structure that ensure[d] the delivery of the comprehensible instruction to which ELL students are entitled” (FL DOE, 2017a). Of the five sections of the Decree, the most forward reaching was the preparation of personnel to provide adequate instruction for ELs. For example, teachers of ELs are required to undertake significant professional development in ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages), consisting of teacher performance standards organized around five curricular areas: applied linguistics, cross-cultural communication, ESOL methods, ESOL curriculum and materials development, and ESOL assessment. These five specific areas were delineated in the Decree at the time of signing in 1990. However, a dissertation written by
Palaez (2002) changed the landscape of the Decree to include preservice teachers. Govoni (2011) writes

In effect, Pelaez opened the door for teacher education programs to meet the training mandates of the Consent Decree that were already in place for K-12 public school teachers. At this same time, the State Board of Education (SBE) rule was amended to include ESOL competencies and skills for teacher certification (4th edition). (p. 1)

The state legislature subsequently extended the original in-service requirements to include all preservice teacher education programs affiliated with a Florida public university. The content consisted of five domains that paralleled similar areas of the in-service education; however, the ESOL content could be ‘infused’ throughout a Florida preservice teacher education program (Govoni, 2011).

Various levels of preparation are required for different groups of educational personnel. For example, 300 hours are required for elementary level teachers and 60 hours are required for secondary content area teachers (mathematics, science, and social studies). The latter requirement was established in 2009 (FL DOE, 2009). The 60 ESOL professional development hours, or the equivalent of one graduate level course, was also required for school counselors and educational leaders. Florida educators successfully completing the required preparation were considered to have received an “ESOL endorsement.” Teachers in affiliate program areas such as music, physical education, and art education are also required to take 18 in-service hours or equivalent in academic coursework. In 2003, educational leaders and school counselors were added to personnel required to have ESOL preparation. The Decree was amended in 2003 to reflect 60 hours of in-service preparation for leaders and counselors to meet the revised State mandate.

**Florida’s ELs since the Decree**

Florida has the third largest number of ELs in the country, following California and Texas (Ruiz Soto, Hooker, & Batalova, 2015), and the academic success of EL students has a significant impact on overall state indicators of education quality and equity. Prior to the Decree there was no systematic process for identifying EL students via a language proficiency test, nor was there a mandated “home language survey” to be used as a screener that would warrant further testing of a student’s English language ability. Hence, it
was difficult to accurately determine the number of ELs who required ESOL services and EL students’ language learning needs across the state.

In 1993, the then-Deputy of Education Commissioner Walter J. McCarroll wrote to Florida’s superintendents that the number of identified ELs reported by districts had risen from 80,025 to 176,546 between 1991 and 1992. He cited “positive trends in the delivery of educational services to LEP [sic] students in Florida” (FL DOE, 2017b). The Commissioner’s letter concluded that the increase in ELs receiving services marked a five-fold increase in EL participation in three key educational programs: (a) Chapter 1; (b) ESE (Exceptional Student Education); and (c) dropout prevention. Chapter 1 is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which aimed to improve education for ‘disadvantaged’ students (US DOE, 2018). ESE refers to students identified with learning disabilities and specialized learning needs. In addition, the Commissioner noted that graduation rates among ELs rose from 78% to 91% in a single year. While these data point to gains made across the state’s EL population, they more accurately gauge the establishment of a more effective process of identification and placement for EL students into appropriate language education programs.

In 2004, MacDonald reviewed the Decree and the status of EL education in Florida. At the time of her publication, there were 288,413 ELs in Florida, and one out of every five public school students in Florida was identified as an EL receiving ESOL services. MacDonald noted that 71% percent of ELs were native speakers of Spanish and 11.4% were first language speakers of Haitian Creole. In 2004, more than 200 languages were spoken across Florida public schools, representing immigrants from 257 countries (MacDonald, 2004). However, the high school graduation rate for all of Florida’s students in 2004 was 54.6%—the third lowest in the US—and for ELs the graduation rate was only 36.2%.

To bring our analysis into focus, we reviewed recent data (2016-17) on Florida’s K-12 public school students. Data show that there were 294,309 identified ELs in grades K-12 (FL DOE, 2017a). Of the number of ELs, roughly 232,576 (79.4%) were identified as Hispanic or Latino; 29,842 (10.1%) were Black/African American; 18,010 (6.1%) were White; and 11,224 (3.8%) were Asian (FL DOE, 2017a). In 2015-16, the State graduation rate, specifically those students who graduated within four years of high school enrollment and who received a high school diploma, was 80.7% (FL DOE, 2017c). During that year, 62% of ELs graduated, as compared with 82.2% of non-ELs (see Appendix A, p. 50). When
comparing ELs over time across three key periods noted herein (1991/2, 2003/4, and 2015/6), data show that there have been some positive changes for Florida’s ELs. In particular, graduation rates for all students have increased by 27.6%, and graduation rates for EL students in Florida have increased by 26%, or approximately the same as those for the general student population.

**Academic Achievement of Florida’s ELs**

At the time of the 1990 Decree, Florida used a High School Competency Test (HSCT) to determine high school student achievement. In 2002, the HSCT was replaced with the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT), which reflected Florida’s standardized testing movement and the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards. In 2001, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was signed into law. NCLB ushered in a new wave of educational accountability for teachers and EL students. It put EL students squarely and openly on the map of academic accountability (Crawford, 2006) in Florida as well as across all US states. As a result of NCLB, Florida began to administer standardized assessments with grade 10 students in reading and mathematics. Assessments were expanded downward over the subsequent five years to include 8th grade reading and mathematics, followed by 5th grade reading. As MacDonald (2004) noted, about 10 years after signing of the Decree (2000-2001), 96.6 percent of EL students in 10th grade failed to meet state standards in reading, compared with 58.4% of non-EL students.

In 2014, Florida replaced the FCAT test with the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). Data from 2015-16 on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) indicate that ELs continue to be outperformed by non-EL students across all of the state standardized assessments (see Appendix A, p. 50). The 5th grade gap in both English language arts and mathematics persists across all grade levels. For example, the percentage of EL student considered “proficient” on the English language arts portion of the FSA—that is, receiving a score of 3 or higher—was 16.1% in grade 5. The comparison group of non-EL students on the 5th grade English language arts portion of the FSA was 55.6%. Similar trends exist at the 10th grade level. At 10th grade, only 7.9% of EL students were proficient in English language arts as compared to 52% of non-EL students, representing an achievement gap of 44.1 percentage points (FL DOE, 2017d).

Similar trends can be found in mathematics, where grade 5 ELs are outperformed by non-ELs by about 30 percentage points. Data from state standardized tests raise several
important questions that should be of great concern to educators in Florida and across the US. Our specific research question was: *Does preparing all teachers for EL students, as required under the Florida Consent Decree, make a difference in EL student learning in Florida?*

The research question subsumed two sub-questions: first, we asked: *What is the relationship between the mandated preparation of all teachers in Florida and EL student standardized tests scores?* We are aware that teacher effectiveness has only a modest association with student academic achievement (Berliner, 2017). As a second sub-question, we asked: *What other EL student performance measures might be associated with EL teacher preparation, such as EL student graduation rates and teachers’ sense of self-efficacy for teaching ELs?*

MacDonald’s 2004 review of EL student achievement led to four key policy recommendations: (1) increase funding for the State of Florida Department of Education office overseeing the education of ELs (formerly called the Office of Multicultural Student Language Education [OMSLE] and subsequently referred to as the Bureau of Student Achievement through Language Acquisition [SALA]); (2) provide funds for research to conduct external evaluations that monitor the Decree’s mandates; (3) enhance in- and pre-service teacher education programs by certifying ESOL teachers in the areas they teach, recruit minority teachers, remove teaching exemptions related to the ESOL endorsement; and (4) focus resources on high school ELs at risk for dropping out of school. MacDonald’s analysis notes the limitations of state-mandated teacher education as a means to close the achievement gap between EL and non-EL students. In short, other approaches should be considered.

In a more recent policy analysis in Florida, Rodriguez (2011) used document and critical discourse analytic methods to determine school district compliance to state mandated preparation across the 67 school districts in Florida. Among her findings, Rodriguez noted that approximately 10% of Florida’s ELs participated in charter school programs that continue to fall outside of the accountability and oversight of the FL DOE. Although in Florida those schools are considered public for funding and accountability purposes, Rodriguez noted that there has been a lack of monitoring of EL achievement or compliance to the Decree by Florida charter schools. Rodriguez’s analysis did not include data at the classroom, teacher, or student levels. However, she noted that only
“documenting compliance on a District ELL Plan [was] insufficient” for the significant number of ELs across the state who enroll in charter schools (p. 122).

Finally, the FL DOE is responsible for monitoring its own compliance to the various sections of the Decree. Based on her research, Rodriguez recommended that the FL DOE “increase funding for SALA so that staff can monitor the implementation of the [Decree] on a more direct level and not only through the submission of a District ELL Plan” (p. 130).

Rodriguez called for district-level support for ELs, including education for parents surrounding EL issues and funding for an ESOL contact specialist for those districts across the state that did not already have specialist-level personnel in place. This is an especially crucial point for Florida’s 20 rural school districts (NCES, 2014), where resources of time, money, and personnel are stretched while districts focus on issues of social and professional isolation of teachers, transportation, and food security (Coady, 2018, in press).

MacDonald (2004) and Rodriguez (2011) illuminate the FL DOE’s limitation in terms of monitoring, recommending changes to, and adapting the Decree to the current context of EL students. The question remains: how effective is a state-mandated policy to prepare all teachers for EL students?

**Methodology**

This literature review was guided by one primary question: does preparing all teachers for EL students, as required under the Florida Consent Decree, make a difference in EL student learning in Florida? We define ‘student learning’ broadly to include student performance on state standardized tests, English- or first language proficiency tests, student graduation or dropout rates, and qualitative measures of student learning such as EL students’ satisfaction. Our initial aim of this work was to conduct a meta-analysis derived only from quantitative studies that investigated the association between teacher education and EL student learning outcomes, based on student test scores and other quantitative data. We found only six studies that used quantitative analytic methods since the Decree’s 25 year period from 1991-2016. This made it not feasible to conduct a meta-analysis, because this type of analysis requires a more robust number of studies, ideally 25 or more. We then shifted our methodology from a meta-analysis to a thorough review of literature that included qualitative studies in addition to quantitative studies.

In our search for empirical studies, we deliberately focused on those that explicitly addressed EL teacher education, either pre-service or in-service. We used an excel
spreadsheet to arrange and synthesize a final pool of empirical studies that met our inclusion criteria: (a) conducted between 1991 and 2016 in the state of Florida and (b) focused on teacher education and ELs. The studies were organized and analyzed with regard to (a) study methodological design and sample, (b) findings, and (c) implications for EL teacher education as discussed by the authors. Our primary analysis was guided by our research question and sub-questions, above.

We used three primary databases: ERIC (both ERIC-US DOE and ERIC-ProQuest sub-databases), EBSCO Host, and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. EBSCO Host is a large dataset management system that has multiple databases within it. We ensured that both Academic Search Premier and Education Source were included.

We used three primary search terms and searched both the Abstract and Document Text: Florida; English language learner, ELL, ESL, or Limited English Proficient; and teacher education, teacher training, or teacher preparation. We eliminated studies where “Florida” appeared only as an affiliation to the author but not related to topic or region. Our initial search identified 122 peer-reviewed, scholarly studies and articles between 1991 and 2016, in addition to 21 dissertations. When we narrowed this search by adding “Florida” to the search abstract in order to eliminate authors’ professional affiliations, the pool of peer-reviewed studies (not dissertations) reduced to 21. We eliminated studies related to adult English learner education and early childhood education because those fall outside of the personnel preparation of the Decree. We also eliminated studies related to special education and English learners as well as book reviews. Finally, we double checked that the citations were empirical studies and not literature reviews published in scholarly journals. Our final search resulted in 16 empirical studies that met our inclusion criteria (see Appendix B, p. 51).

Empirical studies related to “teacher education” were separated from empirical studies that focused only on teacher beliefs or specific teaching strategies when they were disassociated from teacher education. In other words, we remained focused on the association between teacher education (pre- or in-service) and the instructional work of teachers of ELs. While some studies investigated specific strategies, we eliminated studies that did not specifically address strategy use as a result of teacher education.

Numerous studies have been conducted on teacher beliefs, perceptions, and/or attitudes about ELs or teachers’ beliefs about teaching ELs. While many of those studies
show that teacher education can have a positive effect on teachers’ beliefs about ELs or beliefs about teaching ELs, we reiterate that there is no direct association between teacher education (in- or pre-service) and EL student learning, defined above. We did include teacher perception of their professional development (PD) or preservice teacher education program to prepare them for ELs. We have ordered our review under each category chronologically in order to illuminate emerging trends in research over time.

Findings

Findings from our review are organized into two categories: studies conducted on or with in-service teachers of ELs, which was the original aim of the Decree to adequately prepare personnel; and studies related to preservice teachers who subsequently work with ELs. We chose these two categories in order to illuminate the focus and intent of the teacher education program. To our knowledge, none of this work has been funded by the Florida Department of Education.

Research on In-Service Teachers who Work with ELs

The first area of review consisted of studies conducted with in-service teachers who work with EL students in Florida. Our search identified nine studies that address EL teacher PD, which included five dissertations on the preparation and professional development of in-service teachers of ELs in Florida (Johnson, 1995; McMillen, 2009; Rodriguez, 2013; Simmons, 2008; and Uribe, 2013). To our knowledge, none of the dissertations were later published as refereed articles or books, but one author (Uribe) had a manuscript under review at the time of this review.

An early study after the Decree was conducted by Johnson (1995), who studied the effectiveness of an ESOL telecourse—an educational course offered via television and designed for content area teachers to gain knowledge of second language acquisition principles. Specifically, Johnson sought to assess what content area teachers learned about second language acquisition via a telecourse. The author also sought to associate factors, such as adult learning, media effects, or distance education, that affected teachers’ learning. Finally, demographic data, such as age, gender, experience with LEP [sic] students, or second language acquisition were related to teacher learning. Analyses of the data revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between content teachers’ knowledge of second language acquisition acquired in the telecourse versus knowledge acquired by content teachers who had no preparation. Moreover, distance learning and
media effects did not appear to correlate with teachers’ opinions of EL students. Johnson’s study, one of the first conducted upon ratification of the Consent Decree, illustrated that the EL professional development via telecourse in this case did not prepare content area teachers in second language acquisition methods.

Nearly a decade later, Hite and Evans (2006) investigated teacher beliefs surrounding in-service PD for EL students. The scholars used an open-ended survey (n = 22) and interviews (n = 19) with first grade teachers to determine their stated use of instructional strategies and expectations for their ELs. Teachers represented 10 urban and rural schools with an EL student population of 15% or greater. Six themes emerged from the data: first, teachers believed that they adjusted their lessons for ELs, including making input comprehensible; second, they felt that they modified instructional materials for students, established effective communication with parents, and used peers as student helpers for ELs. Teachers stated that they followed a student-centered philosophy that set high expectations for ELs and used EL students’ first language as a strategy for support. This study indicated that teachers held high expectations of their ELs and used students as peer-resources in classrooms. As a result of the findings, the authors stated that teachers believed that good teaching strategies were “a springboard for the strategies specifically suitable for their ELLs” (p. 105).

To examine teacher PD provided at the district level, Simmons (2008) aimed to determine whether training sessions in three local districts in Florida sufficiently covered the state-mandated ESOL content for teachers and how teachers perceived their preparation to teach ELs. Simmons collected both qualitative and quantitative data based on observations, surveys, and in-depth interviews. Based on observations of 10 ESOL training sessions in three school districts, Simmons found that the sessions had a pattern of overemphasis on cultural awareness and cross-cultural communication and an absence of assessment issues and practices. Both interview and observation data indicated that the training sessions were perceived as bureaucratic “check-it-off-and-move-on” (p. 78). Participating teachers expressed frustration as the trainings were tiresome, time-consuming, and confusing, with an overemphasis on culture without practical strategies that they could use in classrooms.

McMillen (2009) investigated the impact of teacher PD on academic vocabulary instruction on 1253 sophomore high school students’ performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test in years 2008 and 2009. Students represented various
subgroups, including ELs (about 6-7%); low socioeconomic status; and Hispanic, White, and African American. A teacher survey was administered before and after the vocabulary training. Teacher variables included years of teaching experience and content area. The author used regression analyses and ANCOVA to determine changes in student performance and found that all student subgroups declined subsequent to the training. Though not statistically significant, there was an increase in teachers’ perception of their knowledge base regarding vocabulary instruction. The author surmised that the decline in reading scores was due to reductions in school funding, instructional time, and instructional personnel but felt that

the research-based vocabulary instruction program [...] implemented at the study school was a successful addition to the instructional practice of all teachers [...] even though FCAT reading scores [...] did not reflect a positive change. (p. 99)

O’Brien (2011) examined the attitudes of high school social studies teachers in a school district in Florida and their perceptions of the PD they received for teaching ELs. All of the social studies teachers who did not have the required coursework for working with ELs were required to participate in the in-service PD by the district within two years of being hired. A total of 123 social studies teachers in the district were interviewed following the PD. Findings showed that more than 50% of the participants stated they had not had adequate preparation in their college or university coursework to effectively teach ELs. The authors further reported that a small number of teachers exhibited overall negative attitudes towards ELs in their social studies classrooms. Teachers attributed their attitude to the lack of support they received from EL support staff at their schools.

Two studies examined teachers’ direct engagement with EL students and their non-EL counterparts. Lewis, Maerten-Rivera, Adamson, and Lee (2011) examined three areas: the relationship between four key domains of science instruction with ELs, teachers’ perceptions of their practices, and teachers’ actual practices in their classrooms. The four domains of science instruction included: 1) teachers’ knowledge of science content knowledge, 2) teaching practices to support scientific understanding, 3) teaching practices to support scientific inquiry, and 4) teaching practices to support English language development in science classrooms. The researchers recruited 38 3rd grade teachers in an urban Florida district with a diverse student population. All 38 teachers received
professional development consisting of curriculum support delivered in five, day-long teacher workshops.

The researchers collected survey and observation data, focusing on the four domains above. They conducted a correlational analysis of survey and observation data. Findings revealed that teachers’ self-reported practice for understanding correlated with practices for inquiry and practices for English language development. Observation data revealed that teachers’ practices that support scientific inquiry correlated with practices that support scientific understanding and teacher knowledge of science content. Importantly, the researchers found no relationship between teachers’ self-report of their practices and their actual practices.

Loeb, Soland, and Fox (2014) investigated variations in teacher effectiveness in classrooms with both EL and non-EL students. The study included data from an urban Florida school district with a large EL student population. Data were used to compare the Value Added Measure (VAM) of teachers with ELs and those of teachers without ELs. Findings revealed that teacher effectiveness in classrooms is generally as great for ELs as it is for non-ELs. The authors stated, “results provide evidence that the variances are similar for ELs and non-ELs, and that observed differences are likely due to measurement error” (p. 18). The study also reported that teachers who are ‘good’ with ELs tend to be good with non-ELs and vice-versa, though some teachers appeared to be more effective with one group more than the other. Lastly, the findings indicated that teachers who were fluent in Spanish appeared to be more effective with ELs relative to non-ELs.

Uribe (2013) investigated an in-service PD that focused on the use of a curriculum-based readers theatre approach (Flynn, 2005) with teachers of ELs in south Florida. Eighteen teachers representing grades two through five participated in the study, and eight of those teachers also participated in a Readers Theatre Professional Learning Community. The study employed survey, interview, and online discussion forums before and after the PD took place. A Likert-type survey was used to ask teachers multiple questions regarding their perception of how effective curriculum-based readers theatre was with ELs. Subsequent to the PD, teachers could identify ESOL strategies in readers theatre such as chunking, modeling, and repeating, and they indicated that 26 different ESOL instructional strategies were ‘effective’ (p. 121) based on the approach. Qualitative data confirmed teachers’ enthusiasm for the approach. Overall, participants also indicated that the use of readers
theater was an effective means for engaging EL students. The author cautioned that “ESOL strategies should not be taught in isolation” (p. 169) but rather become part of mainstream literacy and content area teacher education designed to meet the needs of EL students.

Finally, Rodriguez (2013) conducted a quantitative study that examined Hispanic EL kindergarten students’ performance on vocabulary learning and storybook comprehension after their teachers were trained to use Dialogic Reading (DR) strategies. Four teachers were randomly assigned to two groups: one group participated in a one-day training on how to engage students using DR skills in storybook reading, and the second group received no training. Both groups of students participated in an eight-week reading program that lasted 90 minutes each day, and both groups of students used the same materials. Rodriguez administered the Florida Assessment of Instruction in Reading (FAIR) test to assess students’ vocabulary, and she used the Stanford Achievement Test 10th Edition (SAT-10) to assess reading comprehension in pretests and posttests. An ANCOVA showed significant increase in the vocabulary and reading comprehension mean scores for the students whose teachers had been trained in DR discourse strategies, suggesting that the one-day training was a successful intervention for EL student learning.

In sum, there have been a limited number of studies that examine in-service teacher education for ELs in the State of Florida over a period of about 20 years, and those represent specific approaches, methods, or strategies. Some indicate that in-service teacher PD was useful when it related to specific strategies for ELs, while others indicate that the PD was less focused on actual instruction for teachers of ELs, making it less useful. Across the nine identified studies on in-service teacher PD, it is difficult to determine the long-term impact of in-service teacher education since the signing of the Decree, and it is even more difficult to associate in-service EL teacher education or PD with EL student learning outcomes. However, we can say that teachers who are prepared to work with ELs in in-service PD programs request PD that directly relates to their work.

**Research on Preservice Teachers Who Subsequently Work with ELs**

Seven studies were identified related to preservice teacher preparation and EL students, with the knowledge that preservice teachers (PSTs) in Florida will quite likely work with ELs. While preservice teachers’ perceptions regarding their knowledge and skills in working with ELs play a vital role in the preparation of teachers, exposing them to actual classroom teaching and learning contexts seems paramount. Evidence of this connection is
found in two studies conducted with preservice teachers in Florida (Al Otaiba, 2005; Ariza, 2003). Ariza (2003) investigated a university teacher preparation program titled TESOL Tutor Time Homework Center, where preservice teachers volunteered to teach EL students. The tutoring program consisted of hour-long sessions at the school’s media center for 16 weeks. The study reported positive results of the tutoring intervention. There were three key outcomes from the program: an increase in EL students’ comprehension and language proficiency, an increase in PSTs’ experience working with language learners, and the engagement of EL parents, which the author noted as many parents’ “first unequivocally positive interaction with American public schools” (Ariza, 2003, p. 715).

A study by Al Otaiba (2005) examined the effects of a code-based reading tutorial in English for eight beginning-level, at-risk readers who were ELs and who worked with PST-tutors. The tutoring program consisted of a university service learning project between a university and a magnet elementary school in a small city in Florida. Eight female undergraduate PSTs participated in the case study. Quantitative data included a researcher-administered pre- and post-treatment assessment of vocabulary, phonological awareness, and reading of the EL tutees. In addition, tutor proficiency was measured through qualitative analysis of their reflections of their tutoring experiences and their final reports about their tutees’ responsiveness to the program. Fifteen reflection journals were collected each week from the tutors, and the researchers also compiled field notes and discussion notes with the tutors. Results revealed a statistically significant improvement in EL tutees’ raw scores, which served as evidence of their growth across the three measures. Qualitative data revealed that the tutors were able to build rapport with their EL tutees, used individualized instruction, and employed scaffolding strategies to explain meanings to their learners. Finally, PSTs uniformly agreed that the service learning experience helped them develop a repertoire of teaching methods and strategies with ELs.

Hancock (2010) studied preservice preparation and sought to understand graduates’ (then-practicing teachers) perceptions of their ESOL preparation following a five-year, ESOL-infused teacher education program. Hancock investigated the similarities and differences in perception of teaching ELs between graduates who specialized in ESOL and those who did not. Five teacher graduates of the program comprised a collective case study, and data were derived primarily from in-depth interviews.
Hancock noted the following findings: first, field experiences were important, but more experiences with ELs were needed; second, although the two ESOL “anchor” courses grounded the 300-hour requirement, “none of the teachers explicitly identified language objectives for their ELLs” in their subsequent work with ELs in mainstream classrooms (p. 208). Some of the obstacles to working with ELs included lack of parental support, limited time to plan and prepare, rigid state mandates (e.g., standardized testing), and difficulty meeting the needs of all students in an inclusive classroom setting.

Similar findings were identified by Coady, de Jong, and Harper (2011). The authors administered a perception survey as part of a larger study that sought to determine the relationship between the preparation of preservice teachers following a 300-hour ESOL-infused program and the academic achievement of ELs in the state. The survey consisted of 49 statements of teacher knowledge and skills, including open-ended questions that aimed to determine teacher background characteristics, such as views regarding their field experiences during their preservice program. About 1200 paper surveys were mailed via the US postal service to teachers who graduated from the program between 2002 and 2007, and 85 were returned and analyzed. Data revealed that teacher-graduates felt least prepared to write language objectives for their ELs and to learn about ELs’ home languages. Teacher-graduates felt most prepared to organize a positive and welcoming classroom environment for their ELs. The findings provided feedback for the preservice teacher education program and the preparation of teachers of ELs.

A study conducted by Smith (2011) investigated PSTs and their perceptions and attitudes towards working with ELs in inclusive, mainstream classrooms, the primary language education “model” for EL students in Florida since the Florida Consent Decree. Smith’s survey was administered to 293 PSTs before an ESOL course, and 273 PSTs took the post-course survey. The survey was titled the ESOL Awareness Survey Instrument (EASI) and investigated factors related to (a) perceptions of ESOL and (b) skills and attitudes toward inclusion. Smith found that while there appeared to be a positive change in PSTs’ perceptions of their knowledge and skills for teaching EL students, they did not demonstrate a positive change toward working in inclusive classroom settings. As a perception study, this study has implications for building a cadre of teachers who are positively disposed for teaching ELs but no data on actual, subsequent teaching practices. 
A mixed methods study conducted by Shamon (2015) revealed more favorable outcomes in terms of the PSTs’ perceptions of ESOL methods. PSTs were asked their perceptions of their ESOL preparation, assessment activities, and assignments, including the factors that they perceived as influencing their understanding of ESOL. Data were gathered via a questionnaire and interviews. Findings revealed that PSTs held varying degrees of knowledge of ELs, with most PSTs reporting that they had significant knowledge of ELs, while some reported having just the right amount. All of the PSTs interviewed demonstrated an increase in empathy and understanding of ELs after taking the ESOL-infused courses. The study concluded that the PSTs’ perceptions of their knowledge, skills, and preparation to work with ELs was influenced by the preservice curriculum that was anchored on an ESOL ‘infusion’ model, that is, a portion of the mandated ESOL coursework was delivered in stand-alone courses, and a portion of the ESOL coursework was woven or infused into different courses. PSTs’ perceptions of their work did not include an advocacy stance, which, the author noted, was a key characteristic of well-prepared teachers of ELs.

A study conducted by Coady, Harper, and de Jong (2016) sought to investigate the instructional practices that teacher graduates used in classrooms with ELs subsequent to their 300-hour ESOL-infused preparation in a state-credentialed teacher preparation program. Authors used video-recorded observation and audio-recorded interviews, in addition to data gathered by surveys, with two ‘focal’ teachers. This was part of a larger study that sought to associate preservice teacher education with EL student learning outcomes, also noted above. Of the two focal teachers, one self-identified as White, had an intermediate level of Spanish, and three years of teaching experience. The second self-identified as Hispanic and had an advanced, native level of Spanish and four years of teaching experience. Data revealed that neither teacher actively planned for their three EL students and used “on the go” instructional accommodations for their ELs (p. 14). Authors noted that teachers used “unplanned” and spontaneous responses to an EL’s immediate learning needs (p. 21). They conclude that, despite their 300 hours of preparation, the teachers engaged in what they felt were good teaching strategies for all students.

These seven studies of preservice teacher preparation and EL students show varied outcomes. On the one hand, PSTs’ varied field experiences and interactions with ELs appeared to provide them with a positive view and disposition towards working with ELs. On the other hand, some findings indicate that PSTs do not employ the ESOL strategies
subsequent to their preparation programs. However, it is difficult to determine the relationship between teacher preparation, what teachers subsequently do with ELs, and EL students’ learning outcomes. However, the dearth of studies in this area from the state of Florida makes it difficult to draw conclusions on the effectiveness of preservice teacher preparation in Florida across a variety of contexts. Numerous factors affect PSTs who subsequently work with EL students. In order to draw associations between PSTs and EL student learning, scholars need to understand the nature of EL preparation within preservice teachers’ programs, where PSTs subsequently teach, how they subsequently work with EL students, and how the ELs perform academically. Only one study to our knowledge has been conducted in this area (de Jong, Coady, & Harper, 2007). Further investigation is warranted with a better understanding of preservice teacher education programs across Florida’s varied settings and its relationship to EL student learning outcomes.

**The Consent Decree: Time for a Change?**

As teacher educators in the State of Florida, we have observed and shared anecdotal accounts regarding the dearth of ESOL instructional strategies that we observe in classrooms in Florida. However, there has been no comprehensive review of the empirical literature to confirm or deny these observations, many of which occur during supervision of preservice teachers or while conducting in-service professional development in districts across the state. Specifically, we wondered the degree to which having all teachers prepared for ELs through a state-mandated endorsement makes a difference to the academic achievement of ELs, or if the Decree is in fact a double-edged sword under which the need for ESOL specialists has been diluted in favor of preparing all teachers with weak effects.

Platt, Harper, and Mendoza’s (2003) study of 29 Florida K-12 administrator beliefs regarding EL preparation found that inclusion as a theoretical model for teacher education could work, provided there is sufficient teacher preparation and resources. However, in many of Florida’s rural districts in particular, resources are stretched, limited and unavailable, and districts must identify alternative approaches to language development for ELs, such as use of Rosetta Stone software (Lord, 2016), even when these approaches yield limited results. Related to Rosetta Stone, Lord found that “analysis of the learner outcomes indicates that the Rosetta Stone program, while capable of presenting isolated,
decontextualized language elements, does not seem as adept at helping learners develop crucial communicative strategies in the foreign language” (p 23).

Underscoring the varied resources and teacher quality in Florida, Richards (2014) aimed to understand the distribution of resources across secondary schools in south Florida and if they were equitable. Using multiple regressions, Richards found that there was a significant negative relationship between students participating in free and reduced-price lunch programs and teachers who held advanced degrees. Similarly, a positive association was found between EL students and the number of teachers who were out-of-field and/or found not highly qualified. It seems that the neediest population of students has the most under-prepared teachers. This is cause for concern. Hirschfield (2004) sought to understand the factors that affected teacher attitudes of EL students in mainstream Florida classrooms. She surveyed 600 elementary, mainstream teachers with EL students in their classrooms and found that teacher training was considered to be the 4th most influential factor on teachers’ attitudes towards ELs, following cross-cultural experiences of teachers, their ethnicities, and having administrative support. Hence, research indicates that teacher education does matter in Florida, at least to the degree that teachers hold positive attitudes towards ELs. However, how positive attitudes translate into student learning gains remains unclear.

Educational policy for EL teacher education in Florida is at a crossroads. The 16 studies reviewed here demonstrate two key points: first, there are too few studies over a 25-year period from which to draw definitive conclusions on the efficacy of the Decree to positively influence EL student learning. That said, we note that some in-service teacher PD programs yield positive outcomes on teachers’ perceptions, while others yield the opposite effect. Some single-focused PDs such as curriculum-based readers theatre hold promise but only at a small, single-school, or local scale, while others, such as vocabulary instruction PD in another school, had no effect on student learning gains on the FCAT. One thing is for sure: it is extremely difficult to design, implement, and draw conclusions from studies that associate teacher education and EL student learning outcomes. However, gaining access to Florida databases that have the capability to align teachers with EL student learning is essential, while aiming to understand the multiple variables that affect student learning and that are outside of teachers’ instructional control (e.g., socioeconomic status, school resources, time, and training).
Second, the State has not commissioned studies that could point to informed decisions regarding policies and practices in the preparation of teachers of ELs. For example, data from the large EdStats data warehouse should be used rigorously to identify associations between teacher education, teacher preparation, and EL student outcomes, including standardized test scores, graduation rates, satisfaction, college admissions, and so on. The limited research that has been conducted since MacDonald’s (2004) charge to focus state resources in this area nearly 15 years ago should cause policymakers, educators, and teacher educators to reexamine the role of research in policy and decision-making (Cummins, 1999).

The paucity of research conducted in Florida following an important legal ruling should galvanize the Florida teacher education community. While Florida has seen some gains for EL students over the past 25 years, it is unclear what academic gains ELs have made since the Decree. The category of “ELL” is itself a moving target, as some students exit and others enter. Moreover, the relationship between teacher education and student learning outcomes is difficult to conduct because the variables that influence student learning are multiple and varied, beyond the influence of teachers alone (Berliner, 2017).

Legal rules and legislation passed in the 20th century regarding teacher education must now be re-conceptualized in the context of 21st-century learning goals. Is there a threshold of teacher preparation that positively affects EL student learning? What are the best models of in-service teacher education for ELs? What is an optimal range of preservice teacher field experiences that appear to affect EL student performance? What should evaluation models for Florida’s teachers of ELs look like in inclusive classrooms, and how are they different from existing models, such as the Danielson or Marzano models? Should ESOL “specialists” replace the policy of preparing all teachers? Or can specialists play key roles in rural school districts to support teachers in inclusive classrooms? These and other critical questions remain.

Conclusion and Future Directions

Based on the data reviewed from the 16 studies over the 25-year period following the Florida Consent Decree, it seems a cohesive plan for research across the State is needed. In addition, considerations should be taken to realign the Decree to the 21st-century educational context, both for teachers of ELs and for those students and their families. One consideration may be the (re-)establishment of ESOL specialists who want to work with EL
students as their primary role in schools and who offer targeted support for teachers in terms of guidance, in-service PD, and coaching. Specialists could provide support particularly for Florida’s rural school districts, which represent about 30% of Florida’s schools (FL DOE, 2017e), where inclusive classroom teachers are professionally isolated. Another consideration may be modifying the amount of preparation required of all teachers of ELs and investigating how ESOL infusion in teacher preparation translates into subsequent student learning outcomes.

We acknowledge that in-service and pre-service EL teacher preparation are qualitatively different, despite the fact that the hours required under the Decree are similar. The former takes place online and in districts with teachers already in classroom settings, some of which teachers perceive to be effective and others not so. The latter occurs primarily before students become classroom teachers and may occur simultaneous to part-time field experiences. Field experiences also vary tremendously in terms of quality and access to EL students. The difference between these types of preparation, such as the effectiveness of online, on-site (district), in-class (coaching), or preservice (with field experiences) is an area of extreme importance in states like Florida where there is mandated EL teacher preparation.

Finally, future research should focus on the association between teacher education for EL students and specific measures of EL student learning, such as English language proficiency using the state’s standardized test (currently the WIDA ACCESS 2.0), multiple language assessments for students in dual language and two-way immersion programs, the Florida Standards Assessment, End-of-Course examinations, qualitative satisfaction surveys and interviews, and more systematic collection of formative assessment data by teachers of ELs. Other states across the US looking to Florida for guidance should be cautioned that preparing all teachers for ELs is no panacea for either teachers or EL students.
References


Palaez, G. M. (2002). *Curricular integration in higher education: The development and implementation of an elementary education/English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) endorsement degree program at Florida Atlantic University.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.


Appendix A

EL versus non-EL FSA Scores 3 or Higher (2015-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA, grade 5</th>
<th>ELA, grade 10</th>
<th>Math, grade 5</th>
<th>Math, grade 8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Status</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EL Status</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ELA = English Language Arts

*8th is the highest grade taking the FSA in mathematics; high schools use End of Course (EOC) examinations for content such as Algebra, Geometry, Calculus
## Appendix B

Empirical Studies on Florida Teacher Education and ELs (1991-2016), arranged in alphabetical order by section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Location(s) in FL</th>
<th>Study Design &amp; Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION I: STUDIES ON IN-SERVICE EL TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite &amp; Evans (2006)</td>
<td>In a large Florida district (10 Title 1 elementary schools) with 15% or more of EL population</td>
<td>Qualitative study of 19 1st grade teachers, using open-ended survey and interviews. Data analysis included iterative data analysis, and open and axial coding. The open-ended survey asked teachers (1) how they adjusted teaching for ELs; (2) whether or not they created their own materials; and (3) strategies/concepts related to ELs that they perceived were most beneficial for preservice teachers to acquire.</td>
<td>Six themes emerged from data on teacher beliefs: (1) adjusting their instruction to make lessons more comprehensible to ELs with importance of comprehensible input; (2) modifying instructional materials; (3) establishing effective communication with parents; (4) using peer helpers, peer tutors, and buddies to assist teaching ELs; (5) following a student-centered philosophy of learning and setting high expectations of ELs; and (6) using a child who is proficient in L1 to provide assistance for ELs who have the same L1.</td>
<td>Teachers stated that they employed various instructional accommodations that enhanced instruction for ELs and they held positive and high expectations for ELs. More than half of the participants (12 out of 21) had ESOL training ranging from 120 to 300 hours of in-service training, and their positive beliefs were attributed to in-service training, particularly their beliefs about competence of ESOL methods and awareness of their learners’ abilities and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (1995)</td>
<td>Content area public school teachers in elementary, middle, or high school classrooms who had taken 60 hours of ESOL in-service education via a</td>
<td>73 content area teachers who took a telecourse served as the sample; 52 teachers responded to the questionnaire. The control group of 50 teachers consisted of 2 intact classes of 25 teachers (this</td>
<td>Survey consisted of 15 questions and nine hypotheses. There was a significant difference in scores between older and younger teachers on the LAI/CAT, with teachers ages 44 and above scoring higher. Significant correlation between</td>
<td>Developers of an ESOL telecourse for content area teachers must take into consideration factors in adult learning theory, media effects theory, and distance education. Some parts of the telecourse were considered useful (e.g., working with peer tutors and modeling classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewis et al. (2011)</strong></td>
<td>One urban district with a diverse student population, 24% identified as ELLs</td>
<td>Researchers examined the relationship among four key domains of science instruction with ELs, teachers' perceptions of their practices, and actual practices in their classrooms. 33 of 38 teachers had ESOL preparation through an endorsement program.</td>
<td>Correlational analysis of survey and observation data revealed that practices for understanding (PU) positively correlated with practice for inquiry (PI), practice for English language development (PELD), and science knowledge (SK). There was one statistically significant correlation between teachers' self-reported practice for inquiry and actual practices observed.</td>
<td>There is a weak relationship between the teachers’ self-reported perceptions of their practice and their actual, observed practices with ELs. Implications are to design targeted in-class practices and strategies for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loeb, Soland, &amp; Fox (2014)</strong></td>
<td>Miami-Dade County public school district</td>
<td>Quantitative study with high school teachers in an in-service PD</td>
<td>There is little discernible difference in the importance of teachers for the achievement gains of ELs and non-ELs, which means that the variation in teacher effectiveness is generally as great for ELs as it is for non-ELs. Teachers’ language proficiency in the students’ first language and bilingual certification both predict differential positive effectiveness with ELs.</td>
<td>Teachers of ELs need additional, specific skills to boost their effectiveness with ELs. More support should be provided to build the bilingual teaching profession in Florida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McMillen (2009)</strong></td>
<td>Vocabulary instruction and Correlational study between a district-wide PD</td>
<td>Subsequent to the PD, there was a statistically significant increase in teachers who felt positive about adult learning factors within the context of the telecourse and their high scores on the LAI/CAT.</td>
<td>While this study was not EL-specific, it sheds light on the implications for...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>telecourse</strong></td>
<td>was the class limit imposed by seating space who came to the county educational center for an ESOL workshop with on-site consultants during Summer 1993 and 1994.</td>
<td>teachers who felt positive about adult learning factors within the context of the telecourse and their high scores on the LAI/CAT.</td>
<td>interaction). Recommend additional funding for in-service PD for LEPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien (2011)</td>
<td>Mixed methods; 123 high school social studies teachers with EL students who participated in an in-service PD</td>
<td>More than half of participants felt they did not have adequate training in their college coursework to effectively teach ELs, nor did the in-service PD offer the support they needed.</td>
<td>The in-service trainings were deemed inadequate, ineffective and impractical. More practical strategies should be identified and included that reflect 21st-century learning contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez (2013)</td>
<td>Sixty-three self-identified Hispanic, English Language Kindergarten students and four teachers (31 control group and 32 experimental group)</td>
<td>There was a significant increase in the vocabulary and reading comprehension mean scores for the students whose teachers had been trained in Dialogic Reading strategies.</td>
<td>The one-day training provided by the researcher and her colleague was a successful intervention. However, participating teachers were ESOL-endorsed and some of them were bilingual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons (2008)</td>
<td>Training sessions in three large Florida school districts with high proportions of ELs</td>
<td>There was a pattern of the districts’ overemphasizing cross-cultural awareness to the detriment of ESOL methods and curriculum. There was a general consensus that the trainings lacked specificity and were both impractical and redundant.</td>
<td>Modify the focus of the trainings, provide incentives to teachers, and create more accountability and oversight of the training sessions themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uribe (2013)</td>
<td>Teacher perceptions of preparation to use readers’ theater with ELLs</td>
<td>Mixed-methods study that used surveys, interviews, and online-discussion forums before and after participating in the PD</td>
<td>Findings showed that teachers were able to identify and implement different ESOL strategies (chunking, modeling, repetition) subsequent to the PD, and they could explain key concepts to their ELLs.</td>
<td>PD on readers’ theater was an effective means for delivering various ESOL strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Otaiba (2005)</td>
<td>A district magnet elementary school for ELLs in a small city in northern Florida</td>
<td>Case study design; preservice teacher tutors in a service learning project on English reading class with young EL students</td>
<td>Statistically significant improvements among the ELs were evident. Tutees (PSTs) also indicated an improvement on building rapport, individualized instruction, and scaffolding and behavior management of their tutees.</td>
<td>Recognition of the importance of service learning projects, i.e., tutoring programs, which grounded their understanding of their English learners, helped them learn to apply their ESOL knowledge, and supported them in developing a repertoire of strategies to differentiate instruction for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariza (2003)</td>
<td>Florida Atlantic University afterschool tutoring program</td>
<td>Qualitative study with preservice teachers who volunteered in an afterschool TESOL program</td>
<td>Positive results for both the tutors and their tutees, including advantages for their parents. University-school collaborative efforts provide opportunities for PSTs to practice working with EL students.</td>
<td>While the program provided advantages for the EL students in various areas of literacy, the PSTs were also afforded opportunities to apply theory-based methods to ELs, identify methods and strategies in actual situations, and become familiar with the school district’s language-reclassification indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coady, de Jong, &amp; Harper (2011)</td>
<td>State of Florida; graduates of an ‘infused’ elementary education program</td>
<td>Survey mailed to more than 1200 teacher-graduates of the program. Eighty-five surveys were returned and analyzed.</td>
<td>Teacher-graduates felt most prepared to create a welcoming classroom environment for their ELs, subsequent to their 300-hour preparation. Teacher-graduates felt least prepared to address language (linguistics)</td>
<td>Questions the actual preparation that ESOL-infused teachers receive as part of their teacher preparation program. Additional coursework or emphasis should be placed on field placement experiences and language development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION II: STUDIES ON PRE-SERVICE EL TEACHER PREPARATION**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coady, Harper, &amp; de Jong (2016)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mainstream classrooms of two teachers in Florida</strong></th>
<th>Qualitative study (observations, interviews, document analysis, survey data) of 2 focal teachers in mainstream classrooms with low numbers of ELs.</th>
<th>Both teachers had knowledge of their ELs’ home language (Spanish). Key instructional “strategy” was micro-scaffolding or on-the-go English language support.</th>
<th>Identifies the need for teachers to plan for language learning in classrooms and additional preparation for more directed and targeted instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hancock (2010)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Large public school districts in Florida</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative design using interviews and focus groups with 5 graduates of a state teacher education program</td>
<td>Primary roles participants described were those of: (1) instructor, (2) secretary, and (3) nurturer. Participants were supported in carrying out their responsibilities by: (1) ESOL coordinators and (2) bilingual paraprofessionals. They were constrained by: (1) lack of time to plan and carry out instruction specifically designed for ELs, (2) unskilled colleagues, (3) limited parental educational support for some ELs, and (4) lack of autonomy.</td>
<td>Participants’ journeys to teaching were influenced by their own educational experiences, including their parents’ involvement in their education. They developed beliefs about teaching that they brought to their teacher education program and later to their teaching. Findings can help district and school administrators and teacher educators better understand what it is like to be a teacher who is responsible for the instruction of ELs within the context of a mainstream classroom and learn to address the linguistic and cultural needs of ELs in such a setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shamon (2015)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Large university in the southeast US</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-methods research study with elementary education preservice teachers (PSTs)</td>
<td>PSTs perceived themselves to be culturally competent, aware of their own cultural lens, and prepared to integrate their future students’ cultures and backgrounds into their instructional strategies and curriculums. However, an in-depth analysis of their</td>
<td>Implication for PSTs who will work with ELs, particularly on opportunities and experiences outside of coursework to develop their critical awareness of the needs of ELs. Implications for teacher educators on the types of assessments and assignments they give to PSTs that should develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (2011)</td>
<td>Public university in Florida</td>
<td>Quantitative study; 293 preservice teachers volunteered to take the ESOL awareness survey instrument (EASI) pre-course survey and 273 volunteered to take the EASI post-course survey. The EASI measured 2 factors: Perceptions of ESOL knowledge (PEKS) and skills and attitudes towards inclusion (ATI).</td>
<td>Research purpose: to investigate the effects of ESOL education on preservice teachers by examining their perceived knowledge and skills in working with ELLs and their attitudes toward having ELLs in their mainstream classrooms.</td>
<td>While the ESOL courses had a positive change in preservice teachers’ perceptions of both knowledge and skills, no significant changes in their attitudes towards inclusion were reported. This study has implications for preparing PSTs to teach ELLs through university coursework but offers no data on actual teacher practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Responding to a call for greater understanding of social justice among teachers, this paper outlines the impact of oppressive binaries on various groups. The wealth disparity in neighborhoods across the United States will be analyzed in relation to its impact in inequitable school funding. It will be argued that preferences of homebuyers for neighborhoods with so-called “good” schools, whether intentionally or not, contribute to continued inequity. Finally, a version of John Rawls’ thought experiment, the veil of ignorance, will be proposed as a tool to help students identify more just social policy.
Introduction

For real estate agents, it pays to know the local schools. A 2013 National Association of Realtors survey found that 60 percent of prospective homebuyers consider the quality of local schools. In addition, more than 30 percent of respondents reported being willing to exceed their budget by five percent to live within the boundaries of a particular school (Back to School Survey, 2013). More recently, Realtor.com found that houses in neighborhoods with high-rated public schools are almost 50 percent more expensive than the median home price and more than 75 percent more expensive than homes near lower-ranked schools. To restate in dollars, on average homes near “good” schools cost $400,000, while homes with the poorest ranked schools cost $225,000 (Wedgeworth, 2016). Finally, consider the case of Paul and Cassie Wilcox, two parents who detailed to Money their three-year-long quest to purchase a home in a “great” school district in Atlanta. As they tell it, they worked hard to “win” a house in a “very competitive” area. They even wrote a letter to the seller explaining their desire for their son to attend a school zoned for the house’s neighborhood. That letter—along with offering the list price of $469,900 and a down payment of almost 30 percent—secured their purchase (Sahadi, 2015).

These statistics and anecdotes make clear that sending one’s children to “good” schools is a powerful motivation for American parents with real material impact upon the values of houses in neighborhoods across the United States. Though homeownership is considered part of the American dream, millions of American families cannot afford the median house price, let alone the higher premium for houses near the highest-ranked schools. The statistics above also exclude the millions of Americans who rent either by choice or necessity. Since the rating of schools can translate into tens of thousands of dollars in home values, it makes sense to ask: how do parents decide if a school is indeed “good,” and how does the correlation between school ratings and real estate prices intersect with social inequalities—especially in terms of race? As will be shown, labeling any particular school as “good” involves a whole host of subjective considerations, some of which are connected with often-unexamined racial and economic inequalities.

These questions fit within recent calls for teachers to develop greater social justice awareness. For example, Martell (2017) argues that children learn of racial differences and discrimination early in life, yet social studies teachers at the elementary level teach race and racism as an individual-level problem, thereby avoiding addressing “how race has been a
factor in many historical and present-day events, specifically leading to a system of advantage based on race” (p. 81). Hostetler and Neel (2017) point out that some novice teachers avoid difficult conversations involving race, class, and gender because of the tangled web of identity. Thus, it is hoped that by exploring injustice with a need as basic as real estate, readers will not only better understand social inequity, but also see how it plays out in neighborhoods across our towns and cities. The critical social justice work of Sensoy and DiAngelo (2017), and their concepts of social binaries and individualism, can help illuminate inequities in the quest for “good” schools. Far from an apolitical parental decision, the widespread method of judging school quality and the resulting scholastic self-segregation have serious impacts on both school funding and American democracy. After outlining the racial and socioeconomic implications of a naïve view of “good” schools, this paper will shift to a larger question: that of the “good” society. A classroom discussion tool will be presented to help students rethink aspects of a “good” society—that is, what a “good” society for any and all of America’s students would look like.

**Location, Location, Location**

How do parents decide what school their children should attend? Researchers have found that parental school choice can be correlated with parental involvement (Goldring & Phillips, 2008), parental educational attainment (Martinez & Thomas, 1994), and parental socio-economic attainment, among other variables (Yang & Kayaardi, 2004). One new influence upon parental school choice is school ranking websites, which aggregate the massive amounts of assessment data made public since the implementation of No Child Left Behind. These sites promise a simple, objective, and accurate way for parents to inform themselves. Indeed, Chingos, Henderson, and West (2010) find that school assessment data does impact parent perception of the quality of schools.

*GreatSchools.com*, supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates and Walton Family foundations, endeavors to rank schools in every neighborhood in America via the GreatSchools Rating. Each school receives a score of 1 to 10 with which parents can compare local schools. Because of the financial impacts of school ranking, real estate companies provide school rankings in their sales pitches. For example, two of the largest nation-wide real estate listing sites integrate GreatSchools rankings in their home listings. In turn, GreatSchools integrates with real estate website *Zillow.com* to provide local home listings along with school ranking search results.
As an example of the rankings themselves, I examined the top-rated high school in Charlotte County, Florida. Florida SouthWestern Collegiate High School is located on a college campus and admits students by lottery. It earned a GreatSchools ranking of 9 out of 10. Posted reviews of the school are glowing and come from both parents and students. However, despite the site’s boasting that it compiles “over one million reviews from parents, teachers and students sharing information about the schools they know best” (GreatSchools.org, 2016), these reviews do not factor into the numeric rating. Instead, state-provided data is compiled into equity, college readiness, and academic growth components. These individual scores are then aggregated into an overall score. This appears to be an improvement upon the previous methodology used by the site when I examined it in 2016. At that time, testing data was the sole criterion for ranking. However, upon closer inspection, almost all the data used to determine this new composite score ultimately fall back upon test scores, though now disaggregated along income and racial lines. The sole additional metric beyond testing data was student enrollment in Advanced Placement courses. So, at least for GreatSchools, and the real estate sites that rely on its data, “good schools” are mostly those with the best test scores.

“Good” Schools and Social Inequalities

It is important to note that the data sources by which websites such as GreatSchools derive their rankings are problematic, as has been noted in the general press as well as the academic literature. In the last decade, education journalists have reported growing controversy among education experts in the ranking of schools, the lack of quality data nationwide, and the simplicity of letter- and number-based rankings (Nadworthy, 2016; Raymond, 2010; Resmovits, 2016). Academic sources have criticized standardized tests as well. As far back as the 1990’s, Urdan and Paris (1994) show teachers questioned the validity of standardized tests. More recently, Tanner (2013) finds that education suffered as schools changed curricula and teachers adapted their instruction to teach to the test, and he finds a “taboo” against publically discussing known issues in the validity of these types of tests informing the curriculum. Hursh (2013), using the Regents Examinations in New York, sees standardized tests as a neoliberal construct reinforcing competition and privatization. Walpole, McDonough, Bauer, Gibson, Kanyi, and Toliver (2005) find that students of color perceive college-placement standardized tests as unfair and anxiety provoking, and some students were influenced by their knowledge of the relative poor performance of
underrepresented minorities. This finding echoes Claude Steele’s concept of stereotype threat, the finding that individuals from a stereotyped minority display reduced ability on testing when tests mention or highlight skills relevant to the stereotype (Morgan & Mehta, 2004; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). These findings complicate the goal of ranking “good” schools with sites like GreatSchools while also demonstrating that judgments of school quality are mired in social and economic inequality. CNN Money makes this clear in an article titled, “You probably can’t afford a neighborhood with good schools” (Sahadi, 2015). Why is this so? The author’s answer is that real estate prices—both for rentals and purchases—are dramatically higher than the average income in those areas with “good” schools—412 percent higher in the most expensive district analyzed. As Diane Ravitch (2010) puts it, the race for ever higher test scores privileges the wealthy, reaffirming already existing disparities.

Beyond economic inequality, standardized test scores are known to differentiate along racial lines. For example, reporter Dan Hardy (2015) writes that for a vast majority of standardized tests, average scores for African American and Latino students are significantly lower than average scores for White and Asian students. Many object to calling this an ‘achievement gap,’ citing vastly different resources available to students in different circumstances.

Researchers at the Center for Educational Policy Analysis at Stanford University find that even when adjusted for income disparities, members of racial minority groups tend to score lower than white students. They cite “the quality of public schools, patterns of residential and school segregation, and state educational and social policies” as potential sources for this discrepancy (“The Educational Opportunity Monitoring Project,” 2015).

Because school rankings impact home values, and school funding schemes in the U.S. tie tax revenue to property values, it is important to understand the correlation of “good” schools and the social position of American families. As Semuels (2016) put it, “Good School, Rich School; Bad School, Poor School.” Again, any disparity of wealth leads to greater inequity in school funding as housing values for “good” neighborhoods climb while those of less-desirable neighborhoods stagnate or decline. Additionally, Sensoy and DiAngelo (2017) find that students of color are much more likely to live in less-wealthy communities, meaning that any connection between real estate values and school funding—and by proxy, the quality of schools—contributes to systemic racism. Far from being
objective, politically neutral data points, standardized test scores have been shown to correlate with familial wealth (Wildman, 2007), and are thus part of maintaining a segregated and unequal distribution of resources in our nation. Further, America’s courts agree that adequate funding, when spent well, is important to educational opportunity for students (Rebell, 2017), yet racial segregation has increased in recent history (Ayscue & Orfield, 2015).

DiAngelo (2015) argues that when white people talk about “good” schools, they are talking about segregated schools and neighborhoods where most students are white. The National Bureau of Economic Research, a conservative think-tank, corroborates this sentiment, finding that for the most part, Americans are unwilling to pay more for better schools and that much of the difference in perceived quality between neighborhoods can be attributed to the desire of Americans to self-segregate by race and education level (Bayer, Ferreira & McMillan, 2007). It should be noted that as the product of free-market advocates, the think-tank report does not adequately address the documented disparity (DiAngelo, 2016, p. 209) in the ability of non-white families to procure housing. In other words, Americans may be telling the National Association of Realtors that the quality of local schools attracts well-off homebuyers, but other surveys suggest a different possibility: does saying one wants to move for “good” schools sound less jarring than saying one is moving because of the greater wealth, educational attainment, and more homogenous racial makeup of the new neighborhood? Undoubtedly, many Americans are not consciously aware of the racial aspects of their housing choices. Whether this segregation is intentional or not, Sensoy and DiAngelo’s (2017) concept of the racist/non-racist binary sheds some light on why some white people may use the desire to live near “good” schools as a cover for self-selected racial segregation, and why others may not even realize the racial dynamics of their housing choice but contribute to segregation nonetheless. In addition, an analogous examination of the binary of “good” and “bad” schools along with the American ideal of individualism helps explain one way that parents skirt broader questions about racism, school funding, and school segregation.

**The Binary**

A binary implies a gulf between two concepts such that a person, place, or thing can partake in or represent one side of the binary or the other—but never both. This prevents any possibility of gradient, or positions that partake of both sides of a binary. Sensoy and
DiAngelo (2017) apply this to racism in mapping a divide between racist/non-racist onto the privileged/suppressed sides of binary thinking. In sum, most whites understand racists are “bad” while non-racists are “good,” and the concept of a “good person” who is also racist is discordant with the beliefs of whites (pp. 124-127).

This binary contributes to the delicate nature of racial conversations. When racism is understood both as a binary and as an intentional action—a racist person saying/doing racist things—it does two things. First, it preempts any need for systemic analysis of differing outcomes between members or groups of different races. Second, it pressures the speaker in any racial conversation to see him or herself as on the “good” side. Since racism is a binary concept and not a gradient, most white people will disassociate with the “bad” side of the binary, and any suggestion that they have a part in, or have benefited from perpetuating, a racist system is met with defensiveness. This ensures that those from the dominant culture cannot easily see or analyze systemic racism and their participation in it. As DiAngelo (2016) explains, for those raised in the dominant culture in which being white is privileged, to recognize one’s privilege is to see oneself implicated in racism—to be a “bad” person (p. 24).

Sensoy and DiAngelo’s (2017) concept of individualist ideology becomes relevant here. Individualism is an ideology—a set of beliefs that reinforces a dominant social order—that claims each person is an individual and thus not impacted by historical and/or social forces (p. 91). Individualism promotes the notion that when a family strives to ensure the success of its children, it operates outside of social power systems. Applied to real estate, as families purchase homes zoned for local “good” schools, individualism pushes family members to ignore the larger social consequences of their housing decisions, such as unequal school funding and subsequently unequal schooling.

The ideology of meritocracy, the belief that achievements—such as wealth—are the result only of one’s ability, also contributes. Think back to the language of the Wilcox family of Atlanta: they had to “win” their house in a “competitive” marketplace (Sahadi, 2015). The racial binary prevents conscious analysis of the implications of housing choice on racial inequality, individualism prevents analysis of that choice within the larger socio-civic perspective, and meritocracy prevents problematizing the so-called right to live in wealthy neighborhoods and associate with mostly those homeowners who can afford a half-million-dollar property. In short, the race binary and the ideologies of individualism and meritocracy
prevent confrontation with the larger systemic impact of one’s choices. This cycle reaffirms individual and consumer choice while skirting and confusing the issue of the regressive school funding. Some studies have found, for instance, that the poorest districts in the nation spend more than 15 percent less per pupil than wealthier districts (Semuels, 2016). Kozol examined the funding of New York public schools and found a negative correlation between the percentage of low-income students and the amount spent per pupil (as cited in DiAngelo, 2016).

Politically speaking, the argument here is that ideologies such as individualism and meritocracy make conversations of race and school funding problematic for both liberals and conservatives. Thus, perhaps it is fitting that the two most important federal education policies of the twenty-first century seem so at odds with the political orientation of their respective administrations. President Bush, a millionaire conservative who believed in free markets and meritocracy, pushed for No Child Left Behind, a policy name implying that all children in the U.S. receive a quality education regardless of circumstances. However, the realities of No Child Left Behind contributed to the data-driven economy of funding in education. Contrast this with President Obama’s signature education policy, Race to the Top, a goal implying competition and individualism. Keep in mind that Obama was roundly criticized from those on the political and economic right. This critique created the iconic—and philosophically misguided—argument that he represented socialism, a system predicated upon abolishing—or at least curtailing—the individualistic and competitive bent of capitalism.

To summarize, ideologies like individualism and meritocracy make it harder for Americans to question their place in this unjust system and can complicate conversations about inequity. These ideologies also mask the deleterious impact of policies that unfairly benefit those with material advantage—those, in other words, who will almost certainly fall onto multiple, dominant sides of the various binaries.

Between the Binary

For Sensoy and DiAngelo (2017), the binaries operate at the macro level, pushing individuals into various identities, yet tellingly, the authors note that at the micro level, these divisions are not so simple. By their very nature, social identities operate by defining themselves against their opposite—black/white, female/male, poor/rich—but individuals will not always fit neatly into one side of the binary and may instead be better understood as
sitting somewhere on a sliding scale or gradient. This non-dualist positionality means any person, place, or thing could exist on a continuum between any two socially constructed binaries, as well as sitting at the intersection of multiple identities. It can be argued that moving beyond the white resistance to social justice requires individuals to realize that all persons and groups are positioned somewhere in the dimension of racist/non-racist, and that there are no points that are wholly racist or non-racist. This may make it easier for whites to acknowledge that on some level, they take part in racist systems and may unintentionally harbor attitudes. As has been argued, simply deeming “racists” as irredeemably “bad” while simultaneously understanding racism in individualist terms serves to insulate one’s ego and reaffirm resistance to change. Thus, I argue that instead of a switch, binaries are more fruitfully conceived of as a dimension, gradient, or number line.

Following this logic, another major point stands out when the binary of good/bad school is remapped as a gradient. First, this presses us to realize that no school is perfect, and conversely, no school is hopeless. In fact, in researching this paper, many references spoke to dissatisfaction with public schooling in the general sense, but far fewer sources spoke about particular bad schools. Like the defensiveness and/or obliviousness that results from seeing oneself and society as either wholly racist or color-neutral, seeing schools in terms of perfection or corruption contributes to helplessness and inaction on the part of parents, teachers, and students as well as policymakers. Given that the racist/non-racist binary and individualism muddy the thinking of Americans as regards school funding, and their belief in a right to choose their child’s school, what can teachers do in their own classrooms to contribute to clarity?

Moving Forward

Seeing beyond the binary with help of a gradient prompts us to look beyond simplistic conceptions of schools and our society. Because of the defensiveness outlined above, students, especially those from the dominant culture, may need a scaffold to help them temporarily step outside of their lived reality. Once outside of their own identity, it is hoped they will be able to locate common concerns and areas where our society treats different identities unjustly. I propose a two-part thinking process that could help students discover new possibilities of what American schools and society should be. Less a lesson plan than a tool borrowed from ethical philosophy, thought experiments such as the following can help students imagine new possibilities for schools and for our nation.
The first step asks students to leave their social and historical positionality through an imaginative thought experiment. After all, those in positions of dominance, like fish in water, often cannot see their own privilege and resist efforts to challenge it (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). The second step is to bring the individual back to our current socio-political context to imagine how to change it for the better.

John Rawls’ veil of ignorance is one tool for locating common human concerns and imagining a more just society (Rawls, 1999; Sandel, 2009). Rawls asks us to consider what the social contract, the rules by which our society should be run, would look like were we completely separated from our biography, our positionality in race, class, gender, sexuality and ability. Within the thought experiment, participants are to pretend they know nothing about their particular lot in life and decide on a fair social contract. Not knowing into what race, gender, sexual orientation, or ability level one would be born prompts participants to both question social arrangements as they currently stand as well as to attempt to identify social arrangements that diverse individuals could unite around. In other words, what would a given institution look like were we to redefine “justice as fairness” (Rawls, 1999, p. 15)? Applying this to a classroom, a teacher might ask, “If we were able to create a ‘good’ society from the ground up, but didn’t know anything about the type of person we’d be in it, what would our ideal society look like? Who would be the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’? How would we assign privilege?”

Students might be asked to answer a few key questions about their imaginary society:

1. Should employment be limited to only certain types of people?
2. How will society determine who should earn the most income?
3. What groups should benefit most from schools?
4. Who should be responsible for raising children?
5. How should taxes be collected?
6. Who pays the most?
7. Who pays the least?
8. What would those taxes be used for?
9. How much of one’s earnings should one be allowed to pass on to one’s family?
10. Who, if anyone, should receive assistance from the government?
As students attempt to answer, they may need to be reminded that in the veil of ignorance, they do not know whether they will be black, white, gay, straight, male, female, rich, poor, fully-abled, or otherwise. They are to locate the policy that is best no matter what their particular circumstances may end up being. Rawls argues that were they to think through the exercise, they would tend not to award extreme or overwhelming privilege to any one group. Under the veil of ignorance, the rules that make the most sense are the rules that are best for the least privileged.

Rawls’ experiment led him to adopt the difference principle: society should be organized so that social and economic profit and privilege contribute to the benefit of the disadvantaged and do not, as in our current capitalist society, accrue to the advantaged (Rawls, 1999; Sandel, 2009). His thinking is rooted in an elaborate understanding of the philosophy of contracts, but a brief overview will suffice. On the one hand, oppressing all people into perceived equality diminishes the benefits of a diverse humanity. An authoritarian socialism, enforced equality of outcomes, or the nightmare world of Vonnegut’s (1968) “Harrison Bergeron,” in which a “Handicapper General” handicaps all dominant binaries until no individual or group is privileged in any meaningful way, are oppressive rather than equitable. Knowing this, a teacher can anticipate some student concerns. Rawls, for instance, allows some aspects of merit, that some individuals are more talented in certain fields than others, which may assuage concerns of conservative students. The question becomes how the rewards of merit or ability should be distributed.

Put differently, if one applies the veil of ignorance consistently, one will not know what one’s talents may be, as the “gift” of ability in any domain is ultimately arbitrarily. Genius or exceptional ability in music, science, literature, etc. cannot be predicted beforehand. Thus, proposing extreme meritocracy and inheritance as the dominant way to distribute social and economic riches makes no sense. In the veil, one does not know to what degree one would be smart, hardworking, innovative, or entrepreneurial. Additionally, one will not know how wealthy their parents would be. Instead, it is more desirable to allow individuals to excel at their particular set of gifts with the knowledge that any major inequalities in social and economic capital—i.e. the profit from those gifts—will be redistributed to the least advantaged.

That leads to the second step in thinking through the betterment of schools and society. In conceptually applying Rawl’s veil of ignorance, the students will better understand
the concept of privilege, or the way society affords rights and advantages to members of certain sides of the binary (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017, p. 81). Of course, we do not live in Rawls’ ideal world. Moving from an interesting philosophical thought experiment to our own world would require the student to think through ideologies that disadvantage and privilege and consider which, if any, of these ideologies should be retained. Once the students have a grasp on these concepts, the teacher might approach the following questions through follow-up lessons: What bearing does social position have on our lives, our thoughts, and our communication—the media we choose to view, for instance? What can be done to ameliorate these inequalities? What can we do to make our own classroom and school live up to the ideals we discovered in the veil of ignorance? These are questions that could easily be revisited throughout a course in English or social studies.

In a society as pluralistic as ours, there may be danger in proposing one set of rules and in advocating for a single way by which to run society, but there is perhaps an equal—if not greater—danger in proposing that what makes for good schooling—along with a good society—is dependent upon the socially constructed binaries of our culture. This is akin to saying “good” schools and neighborhoods are separate but equal. Frameworks like Sensoy and DiAngelo’s (2017) analysis of binaries and Rawls’s (1999) veil of ignorance could help students recognize the impact of ideologies like meritocracy, individualism, and privilege. This may not change their housing purchases, but it may inform their views on public policies such as school funding and the need for a robust social safety net. If nothing else, thinking beyond binaries might make students more skeptical of sites like GreatSchools as they will better understand how supposedly objective measures are informed by constructions that derive from, and yet have material impacts upon, the social and economic resources of an unjust political and economic system.
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Neuman and Celano (2012) explore how ecological factors of affluence and poverty affect literacy development and, in turn, the acquisition of information capital—a combination of knowledge-based and rule-based reasoning, stemming from firsthand and secondhand experiences. An intangible resource, information capital has become increasingly important due to worldwide computerization and globalization. The authors connect reading to exponential growth of both aspects of information capital, positing that limited information capital resources at a young age can negatively affect a child’s lifelong learning trajectory. Using an ecological perspective, Neuman and Celano argue that poverty isolates people “geographically, socially, economically, and educationally” (p. 2), creating mutually reinforcing patterns that impede social and economic mobility.

The authors hold up two starkly contrasting Philadelphia neighborhoods to support their claims: the mostly White and affluent Chestnut Hill, and the crime-ridden, majority non-White, deeply impoverished Badlands. Neuman and Celano selected these neighborhoods because the William Penn Foundation transformed the public libraries in both locations (among many others) into technologically modern hubs of information. The authors wanted to discover if equal access would level the playing field between the information-seeking, literacy-developing children in each neighborhood, yet they found significant disparity between how community residents used the available resources. Additionally, the authors
explored the density of each community’s readily available print-literacy resources, such as road signs and booksellers, and found that affluent Chestnut Hill was imbedded with more opportunities for print literacy than the Badlands. By exploring each library’s utility to and relationship with the community around it, the authors explain that information-capital inequity spreads far deeper than inadequate library resources.

The authors suggest that access to resources is not enough; children must be exposed to the value and practices of using print in the early stages of literacy development. The children of Chestnut Hill possess several distinct advantages, such as living in a more print-rich environment with more locations for peaceful reading. Additionally, these children have parents with the financial means to spend less time working and more time scaffolding their learning and who generally possess the necessary skills to gain access to mainstream society. The authors believe that “scaffolding adults,” often parents or guardians, are the most significant reason for such alarming disparities in knowledge between the affluent and impoverished students of their study. They argue that children with early knowledge and exposure to print progress more easily through challenging texts, learning more information at a faster pace. This ease of interaction with texts at the preschool and elementary age positively correlates with embracing digital media resources later on. Therefore, children with preexisting information capital pull ahead of struggling readers through multiple means of knowledge acquisition throughout preschool and elementary education. Such deep-rooted inequity reinforced the institutionalized class strata in which children in affluent communities continue to acquire more information capital to successfully engage in mainstream society than children from economically disenfranchised communities, regardless of the quality of their public library.

The authors conclude that even when the field is leveled, it is never actually level, as community equity flows far deeper than policy is willing to address. The authors urge policymakers to consider the value of human resources rather than additional technology in libraries in impoverished communities, suggesting that the manpower to provide more reading scaffolding would have enormous implications for children’s academic success. Simultaneously, the authors encourage educators and librarians in low-income areas to seek out ways to educate parents on how to engage their children in successful reading practices, again reifying the influence of adults in early literacy engagement. The authors conclude by offering inquiry-based pedagogical suggestions for educators in urban schools.
while advocating that there is no reason an urban school in a low-income area cannot be wildly successful with the right (technological and human) resources in place.

Overall, this book offers a good introduction to the material circumstances with which low-income minority students grapple in their everyday life, and how community socioeconomic status affects both student perspectives on literacy and their ability to acquire information capital. However, in some instances, the descriptive language seemed unnecessarily dramatized to emphasize the differences between the environments of Chestnut Hill and the Badlands. It seemed to reflect the attitude of the authors more than that of the individuals being described. For example, the authors describe a father from the Badlands community as “looking like he’d much rather finish his work” instead of reading to his child (p. 46). In another anecdote, they describe a daycare provider as “clearly annoyed” and “completely indifferent” (p. 55), while the provider’s assistant is checking her cell phone. As a product of affluence, I find it difficult to believe that there were not at least a few parents in the Chestnut Hill library checking their cell phones or seeming “distracted, lost in their own world”; affluent parents and caregivers are not less inclined to occasional distraction. Furthermore, an adult might be checking a cell phone for any number of important reasons, or focused on work in order to maintain socioeconomic standing. I do not dispute the authors’ findings that the parents of Chestnut Hill were frequently more attentive to their children and displayed more mainstream reading practices; however, I took pause at some of the negative connotations of the language used to describe Badlands families. Potential coded prejudice worked against their arguments regarding fundamental attribution error. I believe this book would benefit from an examination of tone and objectivity when painting purportedly neutral scenes of community life.

This book offers a sociocultural look at reading while examining trajectories in print literacy through multiple social, community, and economic factors. The authors examine the role of parent motivation, the importance of home literacy interactions, the significant difference in word exposure between students of different backgrounds, and the issues that linguistically diverse learners face in mainstream schools. Although the authors provide few pragmatic solutions, their work illustrates how deep print inequities run through an examination of two nearby and dissimilar communities. *Giving Our Children a Fighting Chance* is merely an exploration of how two communities interact with print and acquire
knowledge, presenting knowledge in a traditionally ethnographic format and allowing the reader to extrapolate on the implications.
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Pop culture’s influence on our understandings of school and society requires critical examination (Dalton, 2010; Trier, 2001). By reviewing the first season of the Netflix series *House of Cards* (Fincher, 2013), we encourage teachers and teacher educators to look for professional implications in everyday entertainment.

**Education and American Politics**

Education policy rarely steals the spotlight, even in presidential elections (Hess & Hamilton, 2016; Mead, 2016), yet education and politics are inherently linked (Tyack, 1974). This is especially true for a number of notable teachers-turned-politicians, including Harvey Milk, the country’s first non-incumbent openly gay man elected to public office (Schmiechen, Epstein, & Bex, 1984); Shirley Chisholm, the first Black woman elected to Congress, as well as to seek a major party’s presidential nomination (Lynch & Bertelsen, 2004); and Lyndon Johnson, who became an “education president” when he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Rury, 2016). House of Cards evokes these historical trends while also speaking to the current political moment, when educators’ political interest and activism are on the rise, even to the point of running for office (Burnette, 2017; Green, 2016).
Getting Schooled on *House of Cards*

*House of Cards*, the American adaptation of an identically-titled British series, begins after a fictional 2012 presidential election. The drama follows anti-hero Francis “Frank” Underwood, a bitter Democratic representative seeking retribution for the broken promise of a cabinet position. Our review focuses on the first season because education is a crucial plot-point from the pilot through Episode 7.

As majority whip, Frank uses an education bill to curry favor with aspiring “education president” Walker, who, in his inaugural address, vows “to fix, finance, and strengthen schools” within his first 100 days. Education policy is thought to be an easy win for the new president because “immigration is too controversial” and “tax reform isn’t sexy enough.” However, *Learning to Learn*, the first, “unfortunately titled” draft (Hackett, 2016, p. 130), reads “to the left of Karl Marx,” thanks to Donald Blythe, a Democrat from Vermont with an extensive education background. Frank uses Blythe both to signify legitimacy and to stir opposition, leaving critical viewers to wonder whether Washington truly values expertise. “Education is your life’s work,” Frank coos, while deftly manipulating his congressional colleague to secure a lead role in the bill’s revision.

When Frank’s changes rile Martin Spinella, lobbyist for the fictional American Organization of Teachers and Educators, the conflict parallels former President Obama’s antagonistic relationship with the nation’s two largest teacher unions, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). Though education was the “issue where Obama […] veered farthest from his liberal base” (Grunwald, 2015), the NEA and AFT officially endorsed Hillary Clinton’s candidacy in 2016 (Klein, 2016), a testament to the fraught yet formidable marriage between real-life unions and Democrats.

*House of Cards* turns up the drama by spending multiple episodes on the heated negotiations over performance standards and collective bargaining rights, prompting headlines like “Classrooms in Jeopardy?” Episode 5, in particular, highlights the very real differences between the AFT and the NEA, while Episode 6 finds Chief of Staff Linda Vasquez reminding Frank, “We’re the Democrats. We’re the ones who are supposed to be defending the teachers.” Adding to this verisimilitude, Marty confronts Frank on CNN about his deliberate use of the phrase “disorganized labor” to disparage unions while claiming to
support teachers. The lobbyist manages to get the best of the politician, who sheepishly admits, “You schooled me there, Marty.”

This is out of character for Frank, who generally displays a chilling command of all situations. Indeed, Frank baits Marty into a one-on-one meeting, demanding an end to the strike and taunting his foe: “No one respects unions anymore; they’re dying.” President Walker subsequently signs the controversial bill in Episode 7, pontificating from the Oval Office that it “will affect every child and parent in the United States, will ensure a better educated workforce for decades to come, and will reinforce America’s preeminence as an intellectual superpower.” Prominently placed for this photo-op, Frank earns direct praise from both the president and chief of staff, as well as a standing meeting at the White House. Unbeknownst to President Walker, the price of being an “education president” is immeasurably steep.

From Netflix to News Bites

The current political climate, like its fictional counterpart, has witnessed a revived activist spirit among public school teachers. In 2018 alone, teachers in West Virginia collectively acted for the first time in nearly 30 years, successfully earning a 5% pay increase (Hefling, 2018). Echoes in Kentucky, Arizona, and Oklahoma have caused journalists to ask, “What is going on with public school teachers?” (Rossman, 2018). Indeed, there appears to be a “nationwide movement” of teachers’ strikes (Hackman, 2018).

In addition to this real-world connection to House of Cards, when David Hogg, a survivor of the Parkland shooting and leader of the ensuing movement for gun control, cited the show as a source of political knowledge, Rosenberg (2018) derided the series for “convincing viewers that it was a savvy, moral look at American politics rather than a shallow, brittle fantasy.” In our view, Hogg’s comment reveals the show’s ability to influence how viewers perceive the political process, underscoring the need for critical analysis.

As critical viewers, we would be remiss not to mention the allegations that have led to the ouster of series star Kevin Spacey (Melas, 2018). We applaud the #MeToo movement for demonstrating the power of collective activism and for ushering in a new sort of accountability era, and we know House of Cards can succeed in its sixth and final season with one less Underwood.
Conclusion

By reviewing Season 1 of *House of Cards*, we hope to have piqued the interest of teachers and teacher educators while demonstrating how to critically analyze pop culture with a view to our profession. As we bid farewell to the Underwoods in 2018, it is worth remembering their rise to power began with the high drama and high stakes of public education.
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Call for Papers: Technology in Teacher Education

The Florida Association of Teacher Educators (FATE) is dedicated to improving the effectiveness of teacher education through leadership in the development of quality programs to prepare teachers, by analyzing issues and practices relating to professional development, and by providing opportunities for personal and professional growth of Association members.

The FATE Journal is a peer-reviewed publication meant to showcase the best articles on teacher education research and practice in the state of Florida. The journal has recently transitioned to themed issues that connect statewide issues to the larger national context.

The next special issue will focus on technology in teacher education. As we near the end of the 21st century’s second decade, how have teacher educators harnessed the power of technology to improve their practice? How can/do we prepare teachers to embrace emerging and even unimagined technology? How, if at all, does technology pose risks for teacher education, and how can we mitigate those tensions and maximize the affordances of various technologies? This special issue asks potential authors to articulate and respond to the critical intersections of technology and teacher education.

Authors are encouraged but not required to consider any of the following questions in their manuscripts:

- With the rise of edTPA and other performance assessments, how has technology assisted and/or interfered with the evaluation of teachers?
- What should teachers and teacher educators know about diagnostic software like iReady?
- How are teacher education programs using technology in innovative ways (e.g. online education, distance supervision, etc.)?
- What are some best practices for the use of technology in K-12 classrooms?
- How can technology serve as a research tool for students, pre-service and in-service teachers, and teacher educators?

We encourage manuscripts written by practicing and aspiring teachers and teacher educators. Conceptual and empirical papers are welcome, as well as papers guided by practitioner inquiry, self-study, or historical inquiry.

Submission Timeline

Deadline for Submission: December 15, 2018 (Midnight, EST)
Anticipated Publication: April/May 2019
General Submission Guidelines

Manuscripts should be in double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font with one-inch margins. Manuscripts, excluding references, tables, and figures, should not exceed 20 pages. All pages should be numbered. Please place tables and figures at the end of the manuscript. All manuscripts should follow APA (6th edition) format. Please do not include a running head. An abstract of 150-250 words should be included at the beginning of your manuscript.

In addition to your blinded manuscript, please submit a separate cover page that includes the following: (1) title of the manuscript, (2) authors’ names and institutional affiliation & email address of the corresponding author, and (3) statement that this manuscript is not under consideration nor has it been published elsewhere.

Please submit all manuscripts to FATEjournal@gmail.com by the submission deadline. If you have questions as to whether your manuscript is appropriate for the call, please feel free to submit an approximately 250-word abstract to the editors for review.
Call for Media and Book Reviews

The FATE Journal welcomes media and book reviews related to education, broadly conceived. Reviews should be no longer than 1000 words (excluding references) and include the following:

- The full reference of the work
- A brief summary, including key points
- A summary of how the work is structured and how that structure helps to facilitate or impede the work’s central argument
- The strengths and weaknesses of the work and how it connects to similar books, texts, or films
- For whom this work would be useful and why

General Submission Guidelines

Reviews should be in double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font with one-inch margins. All pages should be numbered. All reviews should follow APA (6th edition) format. Please do not include a running head.

Media and book reviews are welcomed on a rolling basis. Please submit all reviews and/or questions to FATEjournal@gmail.com.