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Abstract

Increasingly, diversity education in initial teacher education (ITE) is identified as a global need in pluralist contexts. Recent policies in India and Canada make explicit commitments to addressing diversity and inclusion as part of teacher education reforms. Despite strong and growing policy recommendations, limited information is available on how ITE programs approach diversity education in practice.

In response, I conducted a qualitative international comparative study of ITE programs in Ontario, Canada, and Delhi, India. The purpose of this study is to identify the similarities and differences of approaches to diversity education in ITE programs. The study analyzes six programs—three in Canada and three in India—that prepare novice teachers for diversity. I focus primarily on two of the programs and include the other four as context for the regional beliefs and practices in each country.

Through interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, I explore: a) participants’ understandings of diversity education; b) program policies, structures and procedures; c) curriculum content and pedagogy; and d) the challenges of approaches to diversity education.

The findings reveal that the approaches of both programs are framed by three images of the diversity educator—the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer—albeit in
varying ways and with different emphases. The *affirmer* focuses on empowering students, reinforcing positive views of diversity, and building community in the classroom; the *conscious practitioner* on being mindful of diversity and aware of the implications of social issues on candidates’ lives and practice; and the *reformer* on implementing diversity education curriculum for social reform. Each image highlights distinct conceptions of diversity, inclusion, professional knowledge, and social action.

The images of the diversity educator offer a framework for comparative international inquiry on diversity education in ITE. They generate insights into how diversity education is approached in three ways: 1) as distinct forms based on sociocultural context, ITE participants’ beliefs, and program practices; 2) as important opportunities for social action in education; and 3) as multiple forms simultaneously operating in a single ITE program. The images provide new directions on how to best understand and improve diversity education in ITE.
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As a classroom educator and researcher, I have witnessed beginning teachers struggle to create inclusive classrooms for students with different heritages, beliefs, and identities. Sonia Nieto (2006) echoes what many have observed in saying that teachers are “woefully unprepared” to meet the needs of today’s diverse classrooms and rapidly changing demographic (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Cochran-Smith, Davies, & Fries, 2004; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Zeichner, 2010). A lack of practical knowledge and skills coupled with problematic attitudes on equity often result in teachers excluding or only partially including children in the greatest need of safe and supportive learning environments (Goodlad, 2004; Holden & Hicks, 2007; Wasley, 2008).

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is unequivocal on this: an inclusive curriculum is recognized internationally as fundamental to achieving quality education for all learners (Hernes, 2004; UNESCO, 2011). Furthermore, they assert that countries “where teacher education includes attention to addressing diversity achieve the best outcomes” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 239). It is crucial that initial teacher education (ITE) engage teacher candidates in a curriculum and pedagogy that fosters a positive disposition toward all students and prepares them to respond successfully to the diversity in their classrooms, communities, and the world.

Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses curriculum and teaching practices for fostering inclusion. Drawing on Booth, Nes, and Strømstad (2003), I see inclusion as the removal of obstacles to learning and a commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation, and respect for others. Inclusion involves not only supporting all learners, but seeing the diversity of the student population as a resource for learning (Cochran-Smith, 2004). The readiness of teachers to take on the task of diversity education is contingent on many factors including the knowledge, skills, and dispositions fostered in ITE (Allard, 2006; Melnick & Zeichner, 1998; National Council of Teacher Education, 2010; Sharma, Moore & Sonawane 2009).
Comparative international studies of teacher education have identified diversity education in ITE as a global need. A review of ITE programs in nine countries by Gopinathan et al. (2008) found that “nearly all the [participants] brought up the issue of diversity, of diversifying schools, of teacher preparation for diverse learners, and for increasing attention to be given to these topics” (p. 54). Indeed, recent policies in India and Canada make explicit commitments to addressing diversity and inclusion in ITE.

However, despite strong and growing policy recommendations, limited information is available on how programs approach diversity education in practice (Burns & Shaodian-Gersing, 2010; Gorski, Zenkov, Osei-Kofi & Sapp, 2013; Santos Rego & Nieto, 2000). Comparative education scholars in particular are calling for greater attention to participant perspectives in ITE (Nieto & Bode, 2008; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2010; Watson, 1996). In response, I offer a qualitative international comparative study of ITE programs in Ontario, Canada and New Delhi, India that focuses on policy, practice, and the perceptions of teacher educators, candidates, and administrators. The study supports Ball and Tyson’s (2011) recommendation that casting diversity education in a global context “motivates [scholars] to put new issues on the research agenda as well as a public and global agenda that will open opportunities…to address the needs of specific constituencies around the world” (p. 212).

The study analyzes six programs—three in India and three in Canada—that share a commitment to preparing novice teachers for diversity. I focus primarily on two of the programs and include the other four as context for the regional beliefs and practices in each country. The two primary sites of my research—Rani College in India and the Glebe Cohort in Canada—form the basis of two comprehensive case studies that tell the stories of various ITE participants and their experiences. Through interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, I explore the concepts, structure, and pedagogy of diversity education at each site. In particular, I examine:

- participants’ understandings of diversity education
- program policies and procedures
- curriculum content and pedagogy
- the challenges of different approaches to diversity education

1 The countries in this review were Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, South Korea, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
This chapter provides an overview of my study in five parts. In the first part, I trace my personal and professional motivations for studying diversity education in elementary ITE programs, as well as issues that have inspired me from teacher education theory and international comparative research. In the second part, I explain why I chose to compare Indian and Canadian approaches to diversity education, specifically the two regions of Ontario and New Delhi. In the third part, I define the key concepts of diversity, diversity education, and diversity education in ITE that frame my study. In the fourth part, I outline the questions that guided my research and, in the final part, I discuss the structure of the thesis and the significance of the work.

**Rationale for the Study**

This section locates the motivations for my study in three contexts: my personal and professional experiences, questions arising from the literature on teacher education and diversity education, and the need for more comparative international research on the intersections of diversity education and ITE. I am also inspired by the teacher educators who work tirelessly to prepare candidates for their responsibilities as teachers in pluralist societies. In the words of one of the Canadian teacher educators in my study:

Diversity education in ITE is about teacher educators who say: 'This is my life and this is what I believe,' and then show you with their actions….When you walk out of here, it’s not that we just want you to make a difference in the lives of children, we want you to make a difference in the lives of a lot of people. It is, I would say, a moral imperative…a passport to the future.

**Personal and Professional Experiences**

Various life experiences have brought me to this study and shaped my belief that valuing diversity and social inclusion is fundamental to education. My parents immigrated to Canada from India in the 1960s. I was raised on their stories of adjusting to Canadian culture and forging their own place in what proved to be both a beautiful and challenging world. I grew up in Cornwall, Ontario. It was a place that was not always welcoming of difference, especially for someone from India. I can still remember vividly a group of children running behind our car yelling “Pakis go home.” My parents' stories of discrimination in the workplace left marks on our family and my father unable to work. As Indians, my parents also shared their experiences of partition and how they survived mass migration from present day Pakistan to Delhi. Religious
cleavages made it a dangerous time to be Muslim or Hindu in the region. Thus, at a young age I learned that social exclusion is real and occurs on both sides of the world.

My parents offset my experiences of intolerance with compassion. They nurtured in my sister and me the belief that one must take action for social change to occur. They made volunteer work part of our family routine. They also reinforced education as key to social change, a place to learn new perspectives and open new life opportunities. Their teachings became part of my worldview and increasingly significant to my choices as a K-12 classroom teacher, an educational researcher, and most recently, a teacher educator. Since leaving Cornwall, I have lived abroad, taught English language learners, studied the experiences of new immigrants in Ontario, and researched marginalized communities in India. Looking back, I realize I was asking questions about how to support diversity and foster inclusion in education.

It was in India that I researched some innovative teacher education programs offered by non-governmental organizations. I interviewed parents and students from some of the most neglected communities in the country. We discussed their perceptions of education. Consistently, they cited a shift in their beliefs due to the teachers. Recent ITE graduates had transformed schools into worthwhile and safe spaces.

During my doctoral studies, I taught a course on anti-discriminatory education to elementary teacher candidates. Drawing on my background, I developed my pedagogy from several fields: inclusive education, second language education, intercultural education, multicultural education, and global education. As I was teaching, I began to see a pattern. Some of the more confrontational readings and activities on social issues would engage some candidates and alienate others. I sought strategies to re-engage those who felt alienated. In exploring the available resources, I found very few solutions and more often stories of similar struggles by other teacher educators (Caouette & Taylor, 2007; Solomon & Sekayi, 2007; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). In my view, those candidates who disengaged from diversity education were not necessarily disinterested in the content. In fact, the majority of the candidates were dedicated to making diversity education part of their practice. But they were uncertain how to implement social issues education in the elementary classroom and/or felt that my approach conflicted with their own beliefs. I therefore enter this study as both a learner and a teacher seeking answers for the possibilities for diversity education in ITE.
I approach my doctoral work with a passion that only happens when personal and professional interests converge. I had committed to studying the Canadian context. It is home, the place of my first foray into the classroom, and the place where I felt a greater attention to diversity education was needed. I also wanted to go beyond Canada to India, a place where I had witnessed powerful diversity education, yet found little that was published on ITE in this area. I find that my worlds have come together in my doctoral work in a way that I had not anticipated—my heritage and my homeland, my personal and my professional identities, the little girl from Cornwall and the teacher educator in ITE.

**Queries on Diversity Education in Teacher Education**

Although ITE is the cornerstone of quality education systems, its capacity to effectively prepare teachers for diversity has been criticized (Nieto & Bode, 2008; OECD, 2010; Rezai-Rashti, 1995). ITE program designers have responded to the criticisms in various ways. One response has been to offer courses in specialized areas such as multicultural or special education. Another has been to designate special tracks or cohorts within ITE that concentrate on areas like inclusive, global, or social justice education. Still others have rewritten institutional visions to include diversity and equity policies in the belief that this will lead to the spread of these values into all areas of ITE.

Despite these responses, the existing research on diversity education in teacher education is both limited and diffuse. Hollins and Guzman (2005) argue that the available research is dominated by small studies of single courses and policy “because diversity issues are generally not well integrated into teacher preparation as a whole” (p. 480). Zeichner (2011) concludes that “much of the research in this area consists of individual studies by teacher educators that are often about their own teaching” (p. 329). Ball and Tyson (2011), in their introduction to *Studying Diversity in Teacher Education*, suggest the lack of empirical evidence is also due to diversity education often being seen as separate from teacher education scholarship. “Regardless of the reason,” they argue, “the fact remains that the need for further information in this area is great” (p. 3).

In the available ITE literature, researchers have examined the perspectives and values stakeholders hold about inclusion in education (Huerta & Flemmer, 2005; Smolen, Colville-Hall, Liang & MacDonald, 2006). Some have investigated the discourse of ITE policies and content
(Gorski, 2008; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Quinn & Meiners, 2011). Others have investigated the impact of ITE courses or field experiences on candidates’ learning (Goodman & Fish, 1997; Ryan, Carrington, Selva & Healy, 2009; Sadruddin & Wahab, 2013). However, the available research is limited to how courses are structured in terms of intentions or goals, how practice is manifested in a single course, or how courses are understood from individual perspectives. Few studies examine the connection between the envisioned, enacted, and experienced dimensions of diversity education in ITE from both institutional and multiple participant perspectives.

The research also indicates that implementing diversity education is influenced by many factors. For example, at the institutional level, practices of recruitment, faculty composition, resource distribution, partnerships, and infrastructure can bolster or challenge engagement in diversity education (Desrochers, 2006; Levine-Rasky, 1998; Melnick & Zeichner, 1998). At the individual level, teacher educators’ beliefs, knowledge, and teaching strategies can be equally influential (Brown, 2004; O’Hara & Pritchard, 2008; Solomon, Manoukian, & Clarke, 2007). However, Sleeter (2008) argues that despite this information, ITE literature offers limited empirical evidence on the program and classroom dynamics of diversity education:

> In short, there exists a considerable professional knowledge base for equity and democracy related teaching. … With a few exceptions (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Solomon et al., 2007), however so far little research shows how to build this knowledge into a well-conceived programme, and research is only beginning to examine the impact of such programmes on classroom teaching. (p. 1950)

Clearer insight is needed, she argues, into how diversity education is both “conceived” and “intentionally woven” into an ITE program.

Diversity education in ITE is garnering attention in global forums and is part of international conversations on how best to prepare teachers (Banks, 2012; Grant & Portero, 2010; Madhavi & Pushpanadham, 2011; OECD, 2010). Indeed, the last decade has seen greater emphasis on inquiry into the multiple constructions of diversity education in ITE around the world (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Kim, Lee, Kim, & Cha, 2010; Mills, 2008; Winter, 2009). However, despite the universal mandate for countries to meet the needs of all learners, the standards and strategies for achieving this goal differ from context to context (Jones, 2014; Leeman & Reid, 2006). In their chapter for the OECD publication *Educating teachers for diversity: Meeting the challenge*, Burns and Shaodian-Gersing (2010) call for more empirical research on diversity
education and particularly for inquiry into the “beliefs and practices” guiding diversity education in ITE.\(^2\)

By probing ITE programs in two countries, I seek to understand what these programs ‘say and do’ to prepare teachers to support diversity and social inclusion in their local contexts. My study responds to the call by ITE scholars and policy makers to define the assumptions guiding diversity education and teacher educator practice, as well as the program participants' responses to these assumptions. In the next section, I consider more deeply my rationale for a comparative study of India and Canada.

**Need for Comparative International Research**

My decision to undertake a comparative international study was prompted by the need for research in the field. Watson (1996) and Tato (2011) deem teacher education an understudied area of comparative education, even though it is a critical part of professional development and occurs in all parts of the world. Of the existing comparative studies on ITE, very few are focused on diversity education. These include Craft’s (1996) compilation of teacher education for pluralist societies, Jones’ (2014) work on inclusive education, and Kumashiro et al.’s (2004) article on anti-oppressive education. These studies present single country (often single program) profiles of diversity education in ITE.

Further, this study is a response to the relatively few comparative international studies on this area of ITE. With the exception of a few scholars (e.g., Kumashiro, Baber, Richardson, Ricker, Wilson, & Wong, 2004; Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008), comparative scholarly work on diversity education in ITE focuses largely on North American, European, and Southern Pacific commonwealth countries.\(^3\) Indeed, Howe (2010) and Ma (2014) provide two of the few examples of empirical research that examine both ‘Eastern and Western’ approaches to ITE, though neither focuses explicitly on diversity education. Thus, the available research does not reflect the many perspectives that could and should be part of global conversations on how diversity education is addressed in ITE.

---

\(^2\) This is an OECD funded comparative international study of diversity education in ITE and commissioned country reports on initial teacher education from various places including Canada, New Zealand, Germany, Spain, and Italy.

In relation to the scale and scope of inclusionary efforts in education, India offers an interesting counterpoint to Canada. The population of Canada is approximately 35 million (Statistics Canada, 2013), while the population of India is approximately 1.2 billion (Government of India (GOI), 2013). Both countries are democratic pluralist societies and see teacher education as a response to national demographic needs.\(^4\) Both countries value equity, equality, respect, tolerance, harmony, and unity (Joshee, 2009; Obhrai, 2014). Many of these values are reinforced in the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom* (1982) and the *Constitution of India* (1949). Yet, the two countries also differ in their views of what is fundamental to education.

Joshee (2003) argues that Indian diversity education derives *from* its pluralist history, whereas Canadian diversity education has arisen *for* what has become recognized as a pluralist society.\(^5\) She describes diversity education in India as long-held intertwined goals driven by “a desire for national integration, a commitment to creating an egalitarian society, and a need to develop or reclaim a national identity or common culture inclusive of diverse traditions and rooted in pre-colonial Indian tradition” (Joshee, 2003, p. 286). In Canada, by comparison, diversity education is driven by “social cohesion” approaches focused on the integration of individuals, the acceptance of groups, the recognition of universal human rights, and the establishment of shared Canadian interests (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Joshee & Sinfield, 2010). Despite these differences, both countries approach diversity education as a tool for emphasizing their respective democratic values and promoting a more positive, cohesive, and socially just form of pluralism.

The diversity of students in Ontario and Delhi is a significant force and shapes diversity education priorities in both contexts. In Ontario, student diversity includes categories such as ethnicity, citizenship status, religion, language, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, religion, gender, indigeneity, (dis)abilities, and mental health. Census data show that 28.5% of Ontarians are foreign born (Statistics Canada, 2013). Increases in the number of immigrant

---

\(^4\) As a nation, Canada established itself as a democracy in 1867, whereas India did so after gaining independence from British colonial rule in 1947.

\(^5\) Contemporary Canadian views of diversity include efforts to acknowledge and honour the historical plurality of the country from the first peoples of the land and other communities subjugated through Anglo-Franco settlement and citizenship policies.
families, seasonal workers, visa students, and refugee claimants, as well as significant internal migration, are changing school demographics in urban and rural areas (Coelho, 2004; Canadian School Board Association, 2006). In addition, one in seven Ontario children and one in four Aboriginal children live in poverty (Campaign, 2000, 2011; Monsebraaten, 2013).

In Delhi, student diversity reveals similar categories as Ontario with the addition of regional and caste distinctions. Comparatively, diversity in Delhi is characterized by a greater emphasis on socioeconomic differences, a marginal focus on (dis)abilities, and no mention of sexual orientation, mental health, or other genders. As in Ontario, the need for diversity education is founded on population shifts as well as on knowledge of inequities in education. Government incentives such as “Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan” (Education for All) have resulted in elementary schools including historically marginalized groups such as girls, scheduled castes, and minorities (Bhog, 2005; Chakravarty, 2001; Choudhary, 2003; National Council of Education Research and Training, 2005). Yet some groups such as Muslim youth and children with special needs remain underrepresented in student enrolment (NUEPA, 2011).

School curriculum mandates in both countries also clearly stipulate support for diversity and inclusion, implicating teachers and subsequently teacher education in the process. For example, the Ontario Ministry of Education’s (2009b) Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy expects teachers to provide education that is based on “the principles of acceptance and inclusion of all students.” Students should “see themselves reflected in their curriculum, their physical surroundings, and the broader environment, in which diversity is honoured and all individuals are respected” (p. 4). In addition, teachers should be able to “understand, identify, address, and eliminate the biases, barriers, and power dynamics that limit students’ prospects of learning” (p. 6).

In Delhi, the Indian National Curriculum Framework (2005) defines the aims of education and teachers’ responsibilities for inclusion:

The foremost among these is the importance of including and retaining all children in school through a programme that reaffirms the value of each child and enables all children to experience dignity and the confidence to learn. Curriculum design must reflect the commitment to Universal Elementary Education (UEE), not only in representing cultural diversity, but also by ensuring that children from

---

6 Of the 240,000 immigrants and 7,250 refugees admitted into Canada, roughly half choose to settle in Ontario.
different social and economic backgrounds with variations in physical, psychological and intellectual characteristics are able to learn and achieve success in school. In this context, disadvantages in education arising from inequalities of gender, caste, language, culture, religion or disabilities need to be addressed directly, not only through policies and schemes but also through the design and selection of learning tasks and pedagogic practices, right from the period of early childhood. (NCERT, 2005, p. 5)

In both countries, teachers are expected to ensure that student diversity is represented in the curriculum content, that students are supported in the classroom, and that barriers or inequities are addressed. However, in Delhi—as in many parts of India—student diversity relates not just to the student population already in school, but to the difficulty of drawing the substantive out-of-school population into elementary education as well.

The noticeable increase in both countries of ITE agendas that emphasize preparing teachers to support plurality provides further rationale for my study. In both Ontario and Delhi, government and accrediting bodies have established professional standards that put equity and diversity at the forefront of teacher education. In India, a recent ITE reform calls for the preparation of more “professional and humane teachers” who can reenvision the curriculum and connect more meaningfully with students:

There is now a public acknowledgement that the current system of schooling imposes tremendous burden on our children. This burden arises from an incoherent curriculum structure that is often dissociated from the personal and social milieu of children as also from the inadequate preparation of teachers who are unable to make connections with children and respond to their needs in imaginative ways. Teachers need to be creators of knowledge and thinking professionals. They need to be empowered to recognize and value what children learn from their home, social and cultural environment and to create opportunities for children to discover, learn and develop. (NCTE, 2010, p. 4)

Similarly, the Ontario College of Teachers recently issued new guidelines for ITE stating that “prospective teachers will spend more time working with the Ontario curriculum...[and]...an increased emphasis on supporting students with special learning needs and those from diverse communities” (n.d, p. 2). In both countries, teachers and teacher education are viewed as key players in ensuring quality public education attuned to student diversity.

As democratic pluralist nations, India and Canada have placed diversity and inclusion at the forefront of their educational priorities. Recent reforms in policies and school programs have
identified teachers, teacher development, and their relationship to diversity and inclusion in
education as key. By studying Ontario and Delhi ITE approaches to diversity education, I offer
new scholarship to an important but under-researched area of professional learning.

Key Concepts

In 1925, Gandhi wrote to his fellow Indians: “Our ability to reach unity in diversity will
be the beauty and the test of our civilization” (Gandhiserve, 2014, p. 55). His words became the
cornerstone of modern India. They are still relevant today and have resonated with societies
around the world. Underlying his beliefs is a positive view of diversity and inclusion. In other
writings, he emphasizes that education provides the foundation for future generations, but also
acts as a mirror of societal values.

Gandhi’s promotion of ‘unity’ and caution of ‘societal values in education’ represent
some of the complexities of diversity. His attention to education reinforces the significant
responsibility teachers have for fostering positive attitudes and actions towards diversity. In
recognizing that some societal values can lead to inequity, questions arise as to how teachers
help students address the beliefs underpinning their own education. Thus, how diversity,
diversity education, and diversity education in ITE are defined is significant. In this section, I
discuss these three concepts, their relationships and how they act as a frame for my study of ITE
in India and Canada.

Diversity

In this study, I focus on the diversity among people, specifically as it relates to variations
in social identity. Diversity is a nuanced and complex view of social identities that can hold
positive or negative connotations. I see diversity as a human reality influenced by: cultural
context; socially constructed identities, ideas, and beliefs; and power differentials. How diversity
is understood is shaped by several key ideas including its core attributes and their links to various
social conditions. These ideas in turn influence what is addressed in diversity education.

The first idea is that diversity is a societal construct. It relies on the premise that people
can be grouped according to their culture, traditions, beliefs, and values. Collective or group
identities are often categorized along the lines of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual
orientation, age, ability, and socioeconomic class. The boundaries between these classifications are defined by socially and intellectually created beliefs (Hollins, 2011; Bucher, 2010).

The second idea focuses on how social identities relate to one another. Social identities intersect within groups and individuals as intragroup differences; for instance, in the convergence of gender and ethnicity (Collins, 1993; Weber, 1998). Many of these differences cannot be assessed by first glance nor are they confined to solely visible characteristics because a group or collective is itself a spectrum of beliefs or ascriptions (Sumara, 2007; Ophelian, 2009; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

The third idea relates to identity formation. Benedicta Egbo (2009), author of *Teaching for Diversity in Canadian Schools*, provides a comprehensive framework of subcultures that influence an individual’s identity. For Egbo (2009), context, beliefs, upbringing, life experiences, interests, intellect, and genetic dispositions are all part of how identities are constructed. Some of these attributes are inherent, some are developed over time, some are cultivated, and others are imposed. Some markers like religion and gender are ‘changeable,’ thereby making difference and diversity non-static. Other markers are situational (e.g., Canadian, Indo-Italian), meaning they are present in particular contexts but can be suppressed in others (Norquay, 2000). These same characteristics—inherent, changeable, situational—can also apply to discussions about the formation of group identities.

The fourth idea refers to the relationship between power, status, and the negative treatment of individuals or groups in socially diverse contexts. Not all social identities have equal recognition; some are hierarchically categorized as more desirable or powerful than others. Diversity as a concept is thus intertwined with individual/group positions of power, privilege, and subordination (Blum, 2008; Gorski, 2010; Hollins, 2011; Kassam, 2007; McIntosh, 1998). Discussions of difference and diversity can be framed through the “negative experiences” or “harmful treatments” of others in the form of prejudice, and discrimination (e.g., xenophobia, islamophobia; Kumashiro, 2000). Such treatment of differences in society can then lead to the social exclusion, oppression, and/or marginalization of a group.

---

7 The term identity marker refers to one’s social identity and ascription to a particular group such as mother, Indian, teacher, and Hindu.
The fifth idea focuses on how diversity is linked to social inclusion. Social inclusion is negotiated within society (Jensen, 2011). Many factors inform how individuals negotiate their social identity with others: one’s sense of belonging, which includes an emotional resonance and sense of safety (Nakagawa, 2005; Norquay, 2000); the degree to which one conforms to the standards and social norms of a particular identity (Jensen, 2011); one’s sense of being true to oneself (Levine, 2005); and how one sees oneself as similar to and different from others (Kumashiro, 2000).

The sixth idea connects diversity to education. Schools play an important role in the formation of students’ multiple identities, selves, and understandings of others (Hébert, 1997; Kumashiro, 2000; Lupart, 2009). Schools are also places where students are socialized into ways of thinking about diversity and experiences of inclusion. For instance, school practices may perpetuate or support binary views of gender; socialize individuals to conform to these views; and/or exclude those who do not conform. At the same time, schools can be sites where content and pedagogy focus on critically questioning classifications, inequities, and social practices toward individuals/communities. As professionals in schools and citizens in society, teachers are profoundly implicated in students' understandings of diversity.

The discussion above summarizes some of the ways in which diversity is used in diversity education. For instance, Kumar’s (2006) approach to diversity education studies the experiences of dalits in India and the inequities they face. This community is constitutionally protected because of the marginalization it faces in society (Government of India, 1950). Kumashiro’s (2000) approach to anti-oppression education focuses on relations of power. Intersectionality studies, like McCready’s (2010) work on black masculinities, examines how social identities (i.e., race and gender) are experienced. Culturally responsive education focuses on personal identity formation and helping students understand diversity as a strength (Gay, 2010). Inclusive education focuses on developing a student’s sense of belonging in the classroom and/or in society (Beck & Kosnik, 2006). All of the above can be considered part of the mandate of diversity education (Jones, 2014).

**Diversity Education**

Diversity education is broad and versatile; I use the term as an umbrella concept for the study of difference and inclusion in schooling and society. Diversity education includes a range
of approaches that focus generally on fostering positive attitudes to diversity and challenging negative attitudes (Bierema, 2010). Broadly defined, diversity education is curriculum and practice that fosters inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation, and respect for others (Booth, Nes & Stromstad, 2003). As Dei and Kempf (2013) point out: “Inclusion is not about bringing people into that which already exists. Instead, it is about forging new educational spaces and pedagogical approaches that centre the learner and the work with the knowledge and experiences of the student and her community” (p. 39). Implied in my definition is that diversity education leads to sensitivity, action, personal change, and social change.

In my view, social change is core to all forms of diversity education. Despite differences, these forms all emphasize the need to make decisions for positive pluralism and inclusion. Social change means the ability to take social action as citizens, humans, professionals, and/or learners (see e.g., Banks, 2004b; Gay, 2010; Merryfield, 1997; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006; Winter, 2009). Comparative international scholars Bainton and Crossley (2010) argue that social change in education is a process “where the world is made anew” (p. 19). For educators, social action for change can manifest in various ways: with a learner (e.g., supporting first language use for an ELL student); in the classroom (e.g., using texts to explore a social identity); and in the broader society with or without students (e.g., demonstrating against military intervention in a country). The aim of these actions is to foster positive views and experiences of diversity, inclusion, and pluralism.

In pluralist contexts like India and Canada, multiple orientations can inform a single policy or strategy. For example, Indian and Canadian curricular reforms and teacher education policies draw on literature from a range of disciplines to outline their priorities for diversity and social inclusion in education. This literature includes global education, multicultural education, antidiscrimination studies, aboriginal education, inclusive education, peace education, and gender in education (see e.g., OME, 2009a; NCERT, 2005).

The literature on elementary and secondary education shows that the term diversity education is used in many pluralist contexts including Australia, Canada, India, Ireland, Portugal, and the United States (Banks, 2012; Clauss-Ehlers, 2006; Egbo, 2009; Oliveira-Formosinho & Araújo, 2011; Richardson & Gallagher, 2010; Wircenski, Walker, Allen, & West, 1999). Part of
the international appeal of the concept is its perceived neutrality. Nieto (2013) explains that, in some contexts, diversity education is preferred over other terms like intercultural or multicultural education that have been criticized for their Western, development, and colonial orientations. As Platt (2002) argues: “While we live in an increasingly globalized economy and hybrid world, most multicultural education operates within the borders and assumptions of American nationalism” (p. 44).

Nieto (2013) maintains that although diversity education has many orientations, it has a singular agenda in schools and education:

Although it may go by different names and speak to stunningly different conditions in a variety of sociopolitical contexts, diversity education attempts to address such issues as racial and social class segregation, the disproportionate achievement of students of various backgrounds, and the structural inequality in both schools and. (Nieto, 2013)

I agree with Nieto that all forms of diversity education are shaped by context, address demographic needs, and challenge inequitable practices.

Some of the specific orientations of diversity education connected both to schooling and teacher education can be seen in this list:

- **Anti-oppressive education** (Kumashiro, 2000)
- **Anti-racist education** (Dei, 1996, 2003; Mansfield & Kehoe, 1994)
- **Afrocentric education** (Dei, 1996; Dei & Kempf, 2013; Wane, 2011)
- **Character and moral education** (DeVitis & Yu, 2011)
- **Citizenship education** – democratic or global forms (Banks, 2007; Evans & Reynolds, 2004; Osler & Starkey, 1996; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004)
- **[Contemporary] inclusive education** (Beck & Kosnik, 2014)
- **Cross-cultural education** (McGee-Banks, 2001)
- **Culturally relevant or responsive pedagogy** (Gay, 2000; Ladson Billings, 2001)
- **Dalit studies** (Krishna, 2012; Thorat & Neuman, 2010)
- **(Dis)Ability studies** (Hehir, 2007; Nocella, 2008; Titchkosky, 2008)

---

8 Appelbaum (2002) sees diversity education as a way to overcome the challenges associated with a traditional American multicultural education model. This model is described as “foods, festivals, and folklore” education (Gorski, 2010) or “holidays and heroes studies” (Banks 2003). Representations of multicultural education are criticized for lacking critical or social justice approaches to diversity education (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Grant & Khurshid, 2009).
Education for diversity and mutual understanding (Richardson & Gallagher, 2010)

English language learner education (Coelho, 2004)

Global education (Merryfield, 1997; Selby & Pike, 1998)

Gender studies (Spivak, 1978)

Human rights education (Cole, 2000; Bajaj, 2011)

Indigenous or tribal education (Battiste, 2009; Smith, 2003; Mishra, 2012)

Intercultural education (Cushner & Brennan, 2007; Gorksi, 2010; Jokikokko, 2005)

International education (Hayden, Thompson, & Levy, 2007)

Intersectionality studies (e.g., black masculinity studies: McCready, 2010; sexual orientation, religious studies: Callaghan, 2006)

Multicultural education (Banks, 2004a; Cummins, 2006; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Grant & Lei, 2001)

Multilingual education (Goldstein, 2003)

Muslim education (Niyozov & Pluim, 2009)

Peace and conflict education (Bickmore, 2008; Cook, 2008)

Queer studies (Sumara, 2007)

Social justice education (Anyon, 2009; Cochran-Smith, 1991)

*Special education and/or inclusive education (Ghai, 2005; Hutchinson, 2010; Timmons, 2009)

Urban education (James, 2004)

*Note. Inclusive education is also historically known as special education and addresses learners with cognitive, behavioural, or physical needs. The contemporary form applies to a broader concept of diversity as learners from many social identities.

Although these orientations share some key interests and pedagogies, they vary in their underlying theoretical assumptions and practices. Further adding to the complexity is the fact that although an orientation may seem discrete (e.g., peace education), in reality there can also be considerable variation within it (Ainscow, 2008; Banks, 2007). Several scholars in the field of multicultural and inclusive education have tried to capture this variability across and within orientations through umbrella constructs such as disciplinary perspectives (DeLuca, 2013) or sociopolitical changes/stages of attitudes towards diversity and inclusion (Banks, 2004b;}

---

9 For example, one view of multicultural education focuses on pride of heritage, equality of opportunity, and harmony among groups (Mansfield & Kehoe, 1994). In social justice, anti-racist, and critical multicultural approaches, teachers and learners are also expected to take on advocacy roles to instigate and support social change (Dei, 2003; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Banks, 2004a).
Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2008). Although these authors offer insights on the theoretical underpinnings of various orientations, they do not emphasize curriculum content or teaching strategies.

In 1988, Sleeter and Grant first published *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender*, a typology for educators in America that connects theory to classroom practice. The book is widely recognized for the way it captures sociocultural approaches to diversity education and has been used in Eastern and Western contexts (Appelbaum, 2002; Bierema, 2010; Cockrell, Placier, Cockrell, & Middleton, 1999; Gorksi, 2009; OECD, 2010; Zeichner, 1996). The authors present multicultural education as an umbrella concept for a range of orientations that address issues of diversity, inclusion, and equity in education.

Sleeter and Grant’s (2009) typology is a valuable framework for this study for several reasons. It allows me to consider the differences among theoretical approaches and their representation in ITE. Their typology attends to orientations that address individual, intergroup, and collective differences. In their most recent edition of the book (2009), and in recognition of increasingly diverse student populations, they expand their categories to include language, disability and sexual orientation. In addition, the examples illustrating the five approaches stem from a wide body of literature including queer studies, gender studies, urban studies, race and ethnicity studies, multicultural education, social justice education, second language education, and peace and conflict education. As Sleeter and Grant (2009) argue: “Responding to somewhat different issues in different schools, employing different conceptual views of school and society, and holding somewhat different visions of the good society, educators over the years have constructed different approaches to multicultural education” (p. 33). I argue that the same applies to diversity education.

Sleeter and Grant (2009) define their five approaches as: teaching the exceptional and culturally different, human relations education, single-group studies, multicultural education, and multicultural social justice education. Table 1 provides a brief overview of the aims of each approach. I address each in more detail in Chapter 2.
According to Sleeter and Grant (2009), these orientations can overlap. For instance, educators may include classroom strategies from human relations education as part of their approach to social justice education. However, social justice remains the priority and “starts with the premise that equity and justice should be the goals for everyone and that solidarity across differences is needed to bring about justice” (p. 197).

Overall, the ‘Five Approaches’ offer a way to categorize the range of orientations and teaching practices included in an umbrella concept like diversity education. In my study, I use Sleeter and Grant’s work as a tool for comparing the practices of diversity education documented in the literature. Their framework also becomes my reference point for considering the distinct features of the ITE approaches in this study.

**Diversity Education in ITE**

Although the concept of ‘diversity education in ITE’ is explored in detail in Chapter 2, I use this section to consider how diversity education is situated in ITE. In Canada and India, initial teacher education is part of a continuum of professional learning (Gambhir & Broad, 2010). ITE programs are the first stage of the continuum—the point at which pre-service
candidates are exposed to courses, field experiences, extracurricular activities, and a knowledge base about diversity and social inclusion (Gambhir, Broad, Evans, & Gaskell, 2010). Similar to many professional programs, the purpose of diversity education in ITE is to prepare practitioners for pluralist contexts, local schools, and/or a global workforce (Farrell & Fenwick, 2007; Van Soest & Garcia, 2003). Teacher education is unique because it straddles both K–12 schooling and higher education. Consequently, diversity education in ITE draws from pedagogies popularized in schools as well as in tertiary education (DeLuca, 2012a).

In general, diversity education can be seen as curriculum that prepares and develops a teacher’s professional capacities for diversity and social inclusion. ITE literature elaborates these curriculum intentions as: teaching professionals to acknowledge broader forms of difference and their impact on schooling (Henkin & Steinmetz, 2008); building community awareness and the ability to create connections (He, Phillion, Chan & Su, 2008; O’Hara, 2006); raising awareness of how to examine issues of intolerance and/or learn to challenge inequities (Parameswaran, 2007; Peterson, Cross, Johnson, & Howell, 2000; Schniedewind, 2001); and engaging subject-specific approaches to diversity education (Heilman, Amthor, & Missias, 2010).

Gorski (2008), in his work on multicultural education, criticizes research on diversity education in ITE for focussing on novice teachers instructional strategies for schools, but not necessarily its significance to ITE models and sociopolitical aims. From Gorski’s perspective, diversity education in ITE consists of curriculum, teaching, and program choices that prompt candidates to adopt particular views of diversity education. He identifies five views operating in American ITE programs: teaching the “other”: teaching with cultural sensitivity and tolerance, teaching with multicultural competence, teaching in sociopolitical context, and teaching as resistance and counter-hegemonic practices. His work represents one of many ways to conceptualize diversity education in ITE.

Diversity education in ITE is phrased variously as: teaching to diversity, diversity and teacher education, diversity in teacher education. These phrases focus on professional responsibilities for diversity or highlight areas for reform in ITE. For instance, teaching to diversity points to conversations about the inequities particular groups face and the need for teacher action to change the experiences of these groups in education (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007).
Ball and Tyson (2011) use diversity and teacher education to connect scholarship on underserved students with teacher practice in the classroom. They see diversity education as a way to build teachers’ capacities to work with these students. They also see it as an opportunity to address the concerns of diverse candidate populations in ITE. They posit diversity education in ITE holds multiple agendas such as responding to learners' needs, candidates' needs, and foundations of teacher education.

The British Columbia Teacher Education Federation (2013) uses diversity in teacher education to refer to policies and practice in which teachers target the needs of particular groups in the education system. Banks (2012) uses in to define initiatives in schools and teacher education that “respond to ethnic protest and revitalization movements and…increase educational equality, recognition, and structural equality (p. xlviii). Gagné and Schmidt (2013) use in to refer to a global coalescence of educators who support “teaching diverse learners” and “diversifying the teaching force” (para. 2). In my study, I favour the phrase ‘diversity in teacher education’ because it is the most expansive while also focusing on how ITE engages diversity education.

In summary, the concept of diversity education in ITE applies to pedagogical and structural responses to diversity and inclusion situated in sociocultural context. In Chapter 2, I use Sleeter and Grant (2009) as a starting point for discussing different approaches to diversity education in ITE. In Chapters 5, 6, and 7, I use the key concepts presented here to examine the manifestations of diversity and diversity education in the various ITE programs.

Research Questions

As briefly discussed above, my research is inspired by my own interests in supporting diversity in education; global and local expectations that teachers should be able to address diversity in practice; and the reality that empirical research on diversity education in ITE is limited. Consequently, the main question guiding my study is: What are the similarities and differences in diversity education in select initial teacher education programs in India and Canada? In this next section, I elaborate the intent of my core question by outlining its focus and boundaries. I do so by first clarifying my sample and then briefly discussing the four subquestions that establish the areas for comparison.
Both India and Canada are pluralist nations that make commitments to diversity education as part of teacher knowledge. Within each country, I narrow my focus to a select region—the province of Ontario in Canada, and the National Capital Territory of Delhi in India. Both Ontario and Delhi seek to improve education for their diverse communities and student demographics (NCERT, 2005; OME, 2009b). In both regions, ITE is seen as key player in achieving these improvements (Childs, Broad, Gallagher-Mackay, Sher, Escayg, & McGrath, 2010; Ghai, 2005; Pandey, 2010).

I use qualitative case study methods to focus on two primary sites—Rani College at Sahara University in India and the Glebe Cohort at Stanton University in Canada. Both prioritize diversity education in their elementary ITE programs and offer candidates related courses or field experiences. As both universities offer multiple ITE programs within their elementary division, I selected Rani College and the Glebe cohort because the coordinators confirmed that diversity and social inclusion were part of their instructors’ priorities, and because both sites permitted open access to their programs, courses, and ITE participants. Over several months, I observed ITE classes, interviewed participants, and collected documents.

I also briefly visited two additional sites in each country—Forefathers University and the River Institute in India, and Baldwin University and Thomson University in Canada. I chose these sites because they included diversity and inclusion in their program visions or included diversity education in their ITE course descriptions. For the most part, these sites incorporate diversity education differently from Glebe and Rani. At each site, I interviewed a small number of candidates and teacher educators to learn about their perspectives on diversity education. In analyzing the data, I use the four sites to contextualize the assumptions, structures, content, pedagogy, and challenges to diversity education raised at the primary sites.

The subquestions of my study serve as a framework for investigating four points of comparison: concepts of diversity education, structures, pedagogy, and challenges. Collectively, they enable me to address the complexity of diversity education in ITE and the many forces shaping it. The first three subquestions—on concepts, structures, and pedagogy—are common areas in ITE curriculum research and in discussions of ITE programs. The fourth subquestion addresses the challenges that program planners, teacher educators, and candidates experience in implementing diversity education.
Subquestion 1: How is diversity and diversity education conceptualized in ITE programs?

With this question, my aim was to learn about the assumptions, beliefs, and conceptions underlying diversity education in the six programs in my study. The question allowed me to probe conceptions of diversity education in various ways: ITE policy and mission statements; the declared beliefs and practices of teacher educators and administrators; the classroom interactions between teacher educators and candidates; and the views of teacher candidates in light of their ITE experiences.

As I will explain in Chapter 2, I offer different ways of understanding diversity education in teacher education. One is to begin historically or from conceptual underpinnings, such as Sleeter and Grant’s (2009) typology that describes different purposes for diversity education based on its function in the education system. Cochran-Smith (2004), for example, frames diversity education in ITE by connecting program structures and values to sociocultural context and external policies like national teacher education reforms. A second way of focusing on diversity education is to understand the context in which candidates will be teaching, such as ESL communities or inner-city communities (Coelho, 2004; Dewan, 2009; Kincheloe, 2009; Solomon et al., 2007). A third way to conceptualize diversity education is to concentrate on the image of the diversity educator and who teachers are as individuals and practitioners (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Merryfield, 1997; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In this study, the conceptualization of diversity education in ITE is an important starting point for considering the similarities and differences in the cases.

Subquestion 2: How is diversity education addressed in the structure of ITE programs?

Using program documents and interviews with administrators, I explore the structural strategies used to design ITE for diversity education. I seek to learn more about the policies and procedures, components, field experiences, and extracurricular activities in the six ITE programs. Research on diversity education in ITE often addresses structural elements such as course syllabi (Gorski, 2008), partnerships (Scholefield, 2006; Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly, 2007), and admissions processes (DeLuca, 2012b; Childs et al., 2010). By comparing the structural
strategies used at the Indian and Canadian sites, I want to identify the extent to which diversity education is a priority and supported by infrastructure in each program.

**Subquestion 3: What is the pedagogy of diversity education in ITE programs?**

This question focuses on the content and pedagogical strategies of the enacted diversity education curriculum. In particular, I hope to learn how pedagogy shapes teaching and learning, and is taught as part of the content in one or more courses. In the literature, pedagogical strategies are evident in interpersonal activities among candidates (Beck & Kosnik, 2001), community placements (Solomon & Sekayi, 2007; Stachowski & Frey, 2003), and dialogic activities (Fine, 1997; Gay, 2002; Kelly & Brandes, 2001). The literature demonstrates that examining pedagogical activities is vital to understanding how the learning of beginning teachers is framed and how it occurs (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Tisher & Wideen, 1990). In this study, I explore the unique, shared, and varied ways in which teacher educators engage diversity education.

**Subquestion 4: What are the challenges of diversity education in ITE programs?**

This question brings together the previous three questions by probing some of the challenges posed by ITE program approaches to diversity education. The literature shows that challenges arise from candidates’ resistance to critical pedagogies (Kelly & Brandes, 2001; Han, 2013; Levine-Rasky, 1998; Solomon & Daniel, 2009), the lack of opportunity to practise diversity education in field placements (McDonald, 2005), and insufficient teacher educator expertise (Caouette & Taylor, 2007). In my study, I use observations and participant comments to identify tensions between the aims of diversity education and how it is practised and experienced. These tensions bring to light the unique and shared challenges of diversity education practices in ITE.

The four subquestions allow for both openness and direction in the research design. The openness allows me to explore programs in their contexts from many angles. The subquestions also guide interview schedules providing space for participants to comment on the many dimensions of diversity education in their own programs. At the same time, they create a focussed framework for generating comparisons, a necessary attribute when studying the similarities and differences in how ITE prepares teachers to serve diverse and changing school contexts.
The study is designed as a grounded and emergent form of comparative research. It situates the respective cases within the regional and national conditions, and policies that define and influence teacher education in India and Canada. However, the focus of this study is on the microcontext of the six ITE programs. This inquiry aims to generate rich comparisons of the two primary cases and, based on these comparisons, to examine the implications for further development of diversity education in teacher education in these sites and, where applicable, in other teacher education programs in their respective regions. The stories and experiences of the participants in this study may provide insights into the distinct national understandings of diversity, diversity education, and diversity education in ITE. Although the purpose of this research is not based on the development of an in-depth, macrocomparative analysis of ITE, these wider insights may prove illuminating. The occasional references to such areas as the global dimensions of Eastern-Western, Indian-Canadian differences are thus usually embedded in comments of participants and subsequently analyzed in relation to the local and distinct practices of the ITE programs involved. As a multiple case study, this form of comparative research is grounded in the participating sites. Consequently, through the research questions and the overall design of this study, I seek to elicit glocal experiences of diversity education in ITE.

**Structure of Thesis and Summary**

The thesis is divided into eight chapters, beginning with this introduction. Chapter 2 introduces various models of diversity education in teacher education; identifies structural and pedagogical factors that have an impact on approaches to diversity education; and reviews studies in the field of international and comparative education. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology of the study and the conceptual frames that shape it as a qualitative comparative international case study.

Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 present and discuss my research findings. In Chapter 4, I present the landscape for the study based on my research of the school system, the teacher education system, and the policies and reforms shaping the preparation of elementary teachers in each country. In the subsequent chapters I draw on my findings in more detail. I paint portraits of the programs at the two primary sites and then provide a cross-case analysis that also includes the secondary sites. Chapter 5 presents a case study of the Rani College program at Sahara University. It documents the experiences of teacher educators, candidates, and administrators in
the Faculty's 4-year Bachelor of Elementary Education program. Chapter 6 is a case study of the Glebe cohort at Stanton University. I investigate the experiences and practice of participants in the Faculty's 10-month Bachelor of Education program. In Chapter 7, I present a cross-case analysis with a particular focus on how the programs in each country approach diversity education through images of the diversity educator. The final chapter considers the research and its significance to the field of ITE, diversity education, and my own practice.

India and Canada have made concerted efforts in the last decade to prioritize diversity education through educational and social reforms, with a particular emphasis on the responsibilities of teachers. Among its aims in India and Canada, diversity education strives to improve the conditions of education, support children in their learning, challenge social inequities, and bring about social change within and beyond the school system. ITE programs are thus perceived as integral to preparing candidates to respond to regional and national mandates for respect, diversity, and inclusion in the classroom.

Very few ITE studies offer insight into diversity education from a combined policy, practice, and participant perspective. Even fewer attempt comparative international discussions of approaches to diversity education, particularly between India and Canada. This study contributes to the field of diversity education in initial teacher education programs, as well as to the field of comparative international studies of teacher education. It offers an image-based framework for understanding program approaches and the challenges in diversity education in ITE. The shared and distinct features of the programs in India and Canada contribute to global discussions on diversity education in ITE, suggesting how convergences and divergences occur between programs. The case findings provide an important comparison between Eastern and Western approaches to teacher education. If diversity education is indeed becoming an essential part of ITE curriculum worldwide, this research provides insight on how to best understand and improve diversity education in any context.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW:
DIVERSITY EDUCATION AND INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

This chapter elaborates the conceptual foundations of the study and introduces literature on how ITE programs approach diversity education. It locates the study in the fields of diversity education, teacher development, and comparative international studies in teacher education. My study is based on the understanding that: a) the concept of diversity is complex and context bound, b) diversity education in ITE offers multiple responses to the call for social change actors in education (Gopinathan et al., 2008; OECD, 2010), and c) integrating diversity education into the structure and foundations of ITE is a challenging task.

Diversity is a social, political, and economic construction. While some scholars see diversity as based on differences of culture, religion, language, ability, and gender (Banks, 2012; Eberly, Rand & O’Connor, 2007; Ellis & Forrest, 2000; Gay, 2002), others see it in terms of power where differences are based on dominance, subordination, and oppression (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Ng, Staton, & Scane, 1995; Osler & Starkey, 1996). Some scholars focus less on large group categorizations and more on human difference based on individual multiple identities (Canetto et al., 2003). Still others argue that diversity is the aggregate of diverse ideas and opinions (Goodlad, 2004). In my study, I see diversity as a human reality influenced by cultural context; socially constructed identities, ideas, and beliefs; and power differentials. I see diversity education as fostering inclusion and promoting understandings of diversity based on equity, equality, entitlement, community, and respect for others.

Many orientations like global education, inclusive education, and anti-oppression education contribute to the scope and range of diversity education in ITE. However, each orientation differs in its approach to particular aspects of diversity and its proposed actions for social cohesion. In this chapter, I begin by discussing Sleeter and Grant’s (2009) typology of orientations to multicultural education in order to illustrate the range of approaches that contribute to diversity education, the philosophical underpinnings of each approach, and how they apply to the curriculum and pedagogy of ITE. Next, I turn to teacher education literature and explore other possible frames that guide how diversity education in ITE is conceptualized.
Each framework suggests a different point of entry for considering how programs approach what teachers need to know or be able to do in the classroom. The various frames also offer insight into how ITE can integrate diversity education across structure, content, and pedagogy.

Issues of access, equity, equality, and quality in education are the impetus for diversity education in ITE. In the second section of the chapter, I discuss these issues in relation to curriculum content in ITE. I also address the many pedagogical activities, program features and challenges associated with diversity education. Although the literature offers many possibilities for teaching about diversity and social inclusion, it also demonstrates a lack of consensus as to how diversity education should be fostered in ITE.

In the third section, I discuss international comparative studies on diversity education that focus on policy, practice, and participant perspectives. Researchers around the world are calling for greater comprehension on how diversity education is conceptualized, negotiated, and experienced in contemporary ITE programs. Specifically, the literature points to the need for more research on how ITE programs approach diversity education in practice and from different actors’ experiences. Only a handful of studies offer Indian and Canadian perspectives on diversity education in ITE. This indicates a significant gap in the intersecting worlds of diversity studies, teacher education, and development and comparative education.

**Conceptions of Diversity Education in Initial Teacher Education**

Diversity education in ITE can be conceptually framed in different ways, providing various lenses for considering how it transpires in programs. Derived from diversity education and teacher education literature, each framework provides a vantage point for how curriculum can be understood. For example, some scholars examine it as a function in school and society (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Other scholars concentrate on specific dimensions such as program structures and their links to sociopolitical context (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Zeichner, 2011) and/or models of teacher learning (Beck & Kosnik, 2006). Frequently, diversity education in ITE is conceptually framed as professional capacities (Bierema, 2010; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). A few scholars have used images of the diversity educator (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Kumashiro, 2009; Merryfield, 1997; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
Sleeter and Grant’s Five Approaches and their Application to ITE

Sleeter and Grant’s book *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class and Gender* (2009) is an enduring representation of approaches to diversity education. This work is widely cited, influential, and a useful entry point for considering my first research question, the concept of diversity education in ITE. Their typology addresses foundations, theories, and practices of diversity education that can be applied both to India and Canada. The most recent version has been expanded to a range of social identities and lifestyles, recognizing the need in education to address the diversity and ongoing struggles of a pluralist context. It also draws on multiple settings—a significant factor as ITE operates both in school settings and higher education. Sleeter and Grant’s typology has also been sourced as a key concept of how diversity education manifests in ITE (Cochran-Smith, 2004; DeLuca, 2013; Gorksi, 2009; Grant & Gibson, 2011; Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol, 2001; Kim et al., 2010; OECD, 2010). In this section, I describe the five approaches presented by Sleeter and Grant—1) teaching the exceptional and culturally different, 2) human relations education, 3) single-group studies, 4) multi-group or pluralist studies, and 5) social justice education—and how these approaches apply to practice and curriculum in ITE. Given the focus of my study, I describe each approach by framing its implications for ITE.

1. Teaching the exceptional and culturally different

The first of Sleeter and Grant’s (2009) five approaches is teaching the exceptional and culturally different. This form of diversity education targets particular populations—for example, girls, ESL learners—that are marginalized or at risk of not completing school. The goal is to provide these students with tools to access dominant schooling and achieve in education. Although diversity is viewed as a naturally occurring phenomenon in this approach, students who do not fit social norms are considered to need remediation. Social inclusion focuses on bringing marginalized learners into the dominant structures of education and society. As Sleeter and Grant point out: “[Teachers] believe that students who do not readily fit or test well in education because of cultural background, language, learning style or learning ability require

---

10 “At risk” has become a contested term. Educators argue that it should only be applied to already marginalized students in education as opposed to being applied to all students who are in jeopardy of not completing K-12 schooling (Dei & Kempf, 2013)
teaching strategies that remediate deficiencies or build bridges between the student and the school” (p. 43). In contrast to this perspective, other approaches to teaching the exceptional or culturally different see groups and individuals as having strengths that teachers should capitalize on.

The goal of ITE in this approach is to prepare educators who recognize and support the needs of different learners. The underlying belief is that, in order to teach effectively, teacher candidates must overcome or suspend deficit-thinking toward an individual or group. Thus, the discourse of ITE would centre on exceptional and culturally different learners as contributors to society who have the right to learn and have educational and social agency. Professional foundations for teacher knowledge would centre on the needs, backgrounds, cross-cultural transitions, and language development of particular learners. For example, an effective pedagogy for English language learners requires knowledge of learners’ home cultures, countries, or regions (Cummins, 2006; Gagné, 2006; Giampapa, 2010). A teacher's awareness of these aspects leads to learners' engagement in the classroom and greater chances of success in education. As Coelho (2004) maintains: “Students who see their previously developed language skills acknowledged by their teachers…are also more likely to feel confident and to take the risks involved in learning in their new school environment” (p. x).

In this approach to diversity education, the ITE curriculum is structured to provide teacher candidates with an understanding of the official curriculum and with strategies they can use to adapt this curriculum to students' needs. Ideally, ITE courses and field placements would focus on how to plan and implement strategies for students with exceptionalities or cultural differences (Chambers, 2014; McDonald, 2005). Pedagogies could include case studies of learners, guest speakers who share insights on their experiences in education, and one-on-one tutoring with particular groups. Assignments could include planning lessons with accommodations for a particular need and generating individual education plans (Timmons, 2009). In addition to creating accommodations, beginning teachers can learn to use the whole class to support students who are exceptional or culturally different. ITE would then focus on helping candidates to create, for example, identity texts that value both the class community and each student individually (Coelho, 2004; Giampapa, 2010), use the cultural codes of the students in the classroom (Gay, 2002), and teach their future students to understand the needs of their peers (Loreman, 2010).
A disadvantage of this approach is that it can perpetuate the labeling of learners and prevent teachers from seeing practices as benefiting all students. According to Timmons (2009), category-based forms like English language learner education or downs syndrome education reinforce the idea that children are and should be labeled to be taught effectively. They also perpetuate the stereotypes of the labeled children and do not focus the preservice teacher on essential areas, such as learning needs, attitudes and different approaches to teaching all children. (p. 96)

This approach also risks perpetuating systemic practices of seeing the exceptional or culturally different as deficient. As Loreman (2013) argues, although candidates learn to create equal opportunity in the classroom, they may fail to challenge exclusionary views of these students in society.

2. Human relations education

Sleeter and Grant (2009) see human relations education as teaching students how to communicate with others and develop positive relationships. The aim is to reduce stereotyping, enrich students’ concepts of self, and promote peace, unity, tolerance, and acceptance (p. 88). “This approach is aimed mainly at the affective level—at attitudes and feelings people have about themselves and others” (p. 88). They also posit that human relations education in pluralist contexts is not a luxury but a necessity. In this approach to diversity education, diversity is defined by social categories of difference such as beliefs, traits, and lifestyles. Social inclusion is less about assimilating others into the dominant culture and more about developing mutual understanding at the individual level. For example, the University of Aberdeen’s (2012) approach to inclusive education in ITE incorporates human relations studies “in order to make the point that difference is part of the human condition” (p. 16).

According to Sleeter and Grant (2009), human relations education centres on skills-based theories of diversity education that help people recognize, communicate, appreciate, and connect with difference while also supporting a common humanity (p. 88). The approach is also founded on cognitive development theory from general psychology and social psychology. Cognitive development theory focuses on why individuals are prejudiced, the age at which children first know difference and in what forms, and how one challenges prejudiced beliefs. In the process of
exploring their beliefs, individuals begin to experience conflict or contradictions. This dissonance leads them to confront the fact that their beliefs are being challenged (p. 94).

Human relations curriculum puts students and teacher candidates in the active role of teaching and interrogating how they become who they are. For example, candidates must learn how to express themselves, be reflective practitioners, understand the fundamentals of identity development, and practise building positive relationships with others. They must take risks in exploring their own identity and socializations in order to develop intercultural and intergroup understandings (McGee-Banks, 2012). To facilitate this, teacher educators encourage candidates to engage in autoethnographic activities such as portraits, life history books, and identity masks (Armstrong, 2008) or role plays and film viewing that focus on valuing diversity, building empathy, or developing relationships with others (Sleeter & Grant, 2009, p. 92). Other scholars like Bickmore (2005) and Bartolome and Smyth (2009) point to the use of conflict and communication-oriented pedagogies in which candidates engage in collaborative problem solving of educational dilemmas.

Sleeter and Grant (2009) argue that educators who adopt a human relations approach “often do not address issues of assimilation versus pluralism. Cultural differences are addressed only as much as necessary to improve feelings towards self and others” (p. 116). Gérin-Lajoie (2012) also posits that intercultural education can be a code for assimilation, thereby undermining opportunities for individual cultures to flourish. Several recent approaches to human relations education in ITE (e.g., Bartolome & Smyth 2009; MacPherson, 2010; Santos-Rego & Nieto, 2000; University of Aberdeen, 2012) include discussions of justice and the role of the teacher as an advocate for the rights of others. These approaches support Sleeter and Grant’s argument that orientations to multicultural education can overlap depending on how they are applied.

3. Single-group studies

A third approach to diversity education focuses on the empowerment of a socially marginalized community.11 Sleeter and Grant (2007) refer to this as single-group studies. The

---

11 This approach is different from teaching the exceptional and culturally different because the goal is not to assimilate groups into the dominant culture. Single-Group Studies is an “in depth, comprehensive study of a group” whose aim is curriculum reform rather than curriculum accommodation (p. 156).
aim is to promote willingness among students and candidates to work toward social change for a particular group by challenging dominant discourses. In ITE, the goal is to raise beginning teachers’ awareness of the needs, contributions, and/or barriers facing a marginalized group. When the teacher candidate population is the focus—for example, teacher education programs for indigenous communities—the aim is also to honour the knowledge and practices of the community for the communities’ growth and sustainability.

In a single-group studies approach, diversity is seen critically in terms of a group’s location in society. In Afrocentric education (Dei, 1995), culturally relevant urban education (Ladson-Billings, 1995), and tribal education (Gautam, 2003), this approach can empower members of a group and create a sense of collective. This is extremely important in communities that have been cognitively colonized, a process in which members view themselves from the dominant society’s deficit perspective (Battiste, 2009; Nocella, 2008). Social inclusion is thus seen as a political process of redressing socializations. Education can have a positive or negative impact—in other words, it can either positively change a group's position in society or exacerbate it.

The philosophical foundations of single-group studies include studying the social purpose of schooling, seeing education as non-neutral or value-laden, and emphasizing consciousness raising through feminist and liberatory pedagogies (Sleeter & Grant, 2009, p. 125). The focus is on cultural knowledge drawn from a group’s history, experiences, and contemporary community.12 Ladson-Billings’ (1995) study found that teachers using this approach saw their students as sources of cultural knowledge and recognized their authority as members and observers of a particular culture. The value of cultural knowledge also ensures that multiple perspectives are included in the curriculum and that these perspectives reflect the learner and community population. Gay (2002), a proponent of culturally responsive teaching, stresses that a teacher’s understanding of cultural knowledge should be based on facts rather than assumptions about a community. Group liberation becomes a guiding tenet because members have ownership over the stories that are told about them (Sleeter & Grant, 2009, p. 143).

---

12 In this case, the concept of culture is broad and could be based on abilities, socio-economic status, ethnicity, religion, or a subset of a population such as black male youths.
Single-group studies differ in the extent to which a community’s cultural knowledge permeates school education. This has implications for ITE foundations and the degree to which diversity education is part of the core curriculum. For example, in a content-based ITE approach to diversity education, the resources and artifacts used in the program are culturally relevant or community sourced (Gay, 2002). ITE focuses content and pedagogical activities on learning about the community. An example in the Ontario context is integrating community events like South Asian week in the school curriculum. In a whole program approach, candidates study language, culture, and pedagogy from authorities on or in the community. For example, York University offers a Jewish teacher education program in partnership with local Jewish day schools. In other versions of ITE, group-specific instruction could also involve exposing candidates to particular instructional strategies. For example, many African and Aboriginal communities use oral traditions to pass down wisdom (Timmons, 2009; Wane, 2011). In this case, candidates learn to use culturally relevant practices such as storytelling, service learning, and communal learning in their future classrooms (Restoule, Nardozi, Steele & James, 2014).

A teacher’s ability to connect to the community is an important part of this approach (Dei, 1996; Gautam, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1995). In ITE, instructors would help candidates learn how to access the community and create opportunities for community interaction (Restoule et al., 2014). They may bring in ‘silenced’, under-represented, or exemplary voices in the form of guest speakers, media, and literary texts to help candidates learn more about the community. In other cases, the community is the site for learning and its members define the curriculum. The goal is to provide candidates with a foundation in critical thinking that recognizes power, personal bias, and deficit-thinking, and challenges stereotypes from a community’s perspective (Dei, 1996; Niyozov & Pluim, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009).

One of the challenges of single-group studies is to create a positive learning experience for candidates. Although intended as a form of inclusion, this approach may inadvertently foster exclusion (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Teacher candidates who are not members of the community or are members of the dominant group may find themselves uncomfortable with the content (Robinson & Ferfolja, 2008). In other cases, candidates who are members of the community may feel inferior because of accommodations or modifications made on their behalf or because their perspective has been ‘added’ to the curriculum rather than being a core element (Battiste, 2009; Finney & Orr, 1995).
Another challenge is that educators may settle for a tokenistic or celebratory teaching of groups when they find these groups difficult to ‘fit’ into the prescribed curriculum. Sleeter and Grant call this ‘superficial rendering’—that is, limiting content to a single day or to a culture’s “fairs, festivals, food and folk tales” (p. 148). According to Dei (1996), unless group studies are applied holistically to the curriculum, they create only pockets of awareness and leave the broader curriculum unreformed. Even if cultural knowledge does find its way into the curriculum, it may be thwarted by other actions (Niyozov & Pluim, 2009). Many scholars call into question the authenticity of resources and lessons, especially if they perpetuate static and monolithic views of a group’s culture. Repeatedly noted in the literature is that hegemonic discourses such as Eurocentrism in Canada and Hindu and colonial perspectives in India permeate education. Authors such as Niyozov and Pluim (2009) and Battiste (2009) also caution that defining a group can be problematic if the perspective is based on patriarchal, colonial, or dominant discourses of who the ‘other’ is, what elements constitute culture, and whose perspective within a group is being taught.

4. Multi-group or pluralism studies

A fourth approach to diversity education is what Sleeter and Grant refer to as multicultural education or, from my perspective, multi-group or pluralism studies.13 This approach focuses on inquiry into “policies and practices that recognize, accept, and affirm human differences and similarities related to gender, race, disability, class, and (increasingly) sexuality within the same context” (2009, p. 161). An underlying premise is that individuals are able to participate in society and education without having to give up their unique identities. In this case diversity is the norm and social inclusion is about harmony and co-existence. At the same time, underlying the concept of diversity is the belief that if differences cannot be respected, they should at least be tolerated. In his work on diversity education, Appelbaum (2002) points out that “sometimes people view multiculturalism as a harmonizing agent, rather than a democratizing agent. Conflicts arise, and they should be expected and respected as part of cultural pluralism” (p. 57).

13 Sleeter and Grant identify their last two approaches as multicultural education and multicultural social justice education. However, I find Appelbaum’s (2002) relabeling of the categories as pluralist studies and social justice education more accessible in terms of ITE.
Several authors make a connection between multiculturalism of the past and multiculturalism of the future. They argue that concepts of global pluralism and interdependency are key to understanding diversity both locally and in the world (Egbo, 2009; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Gollnick & Chinn, 2009; Merryfield, 1997). Sleeter and Grant’s definition of pluralism alludes to teaching and learning shared identities. Shared identities can be seen in terms of nation-state contexts (Banks, 2007), international contexts (Hayden, Levy & Thompson, 2007), global contexts (Selby & Pike, 1998), and metro or urban contexts (Kincheloe, 2009). According to Ghosh and Abdi (2013):

Transculturalism and a cosmopolitan citizen with multiple identities and a common culture is the next step. It would create a third space, a third culture evolving from the shared experiences of people from various ethnocultural groups. ... It refers to the dynamic amalgam evolving out of common experiences of dominant and minority cultures. (p. 108)

As suggested in this quotation, diversity education would address hybrid, mixed identities that are the product of multi-group integration. This is a significant but under-recognized form of multicultural education that targets mixed-identity populations like bi-racial, multilingual or multinational communities (Mohan, 2009; Nakagawa, 2005, personal communication David Montemurro, 2013).

The guiding principles of multi-group or pluralism studies are cultural transmission, social learning, and modeling theories. Combined, these principles are founded on the belief that children learn at a young age how to negotiate their identities as they move through different contexts and come to understand the social, linguistic, and power codes governing society. This knowledge allows them to be part of a pluralist community and become global citizens (Sleeter & Grant, 2009, p. 185). In this approach, students are not expected to challenge existing structures or memberships but rather learn to operate within them.

Authors like Bennett (1995) argue that in a global approach to multi-group studies in ITE, candidates learn to teach “multiple perspectives and multiple loyalties, strengthen cultural consciousness and intercultural competence, respect human dignity and human rights, and combat prejudice and discrimination” (in Merryfield, Jarchow, & Pickert, 1997). Teacher educators use readings, role play, community collaboration, reflection activities, and media to have candidates learn content and pedagogies for a global perspective (Merryfield Lo, Po, &
Kasai, 2008; Stewart, 2008). In many cases, ITE also offers intercultural experiences in which candidates learn in or from communities (Longview Foundation, 2008).

A culturally responsive approach to multi-group studies “teaches students to know and praise their own and each others' cultural heritages” (Howard, 2012). The educator unmasks codes and promotes self-concept and community in the classroom (Gay, 2002). As in human relations and single-group approaches, ITE helps candidates learn how to adapt to their students’ needs, use their students as a source of curriculum, and make the content relevant and meaningful to students. Gay (2010) provides an example of a culturally responsive ITE classroom and how candidates learn to draw on their own identities as part of their professional learning. She quotes an ITE instructor saying to the candidates in her course: “You are questioning, critiquing, deconstructing, evoking a variety of points of reference, and seeking out specific cultural grounding of applicability of general pedagogical ideas” (p. 41).

Sleeter and Grant list several critiques of multi-group studies that are applicable to ITE. First, teachers are in danger of representing groups incorrectly, essentially, or in unbalanced ways that can result in attention to some groups but not others. Second, because educators are unskilled or unclear on how to implement this approach, it can result in limited attention to issues of social class and inadequate emphasis on affective or interpersonal skills. Third, the most pointed criticism is that although students are made aware of differences and inequitable experiences, they are not taught how to challenge these inequities (Appelbaum, 2002).

5. Social justice education

Sleeter and Grant’s fifth approach is multicultural social justice education. This approach also attends to diversity but is distinct from multicultural education because it centres on justice and the elimination of oppression: “The notions of equity and justice point to not just a goal of equal opportunity but also to one of equal results for communities” (p. 184). Diversity is part of plural citizenship and subject to negative or positive treatment in society. As members of groups, individuals are either given or denied social privileges. Scholars argue that modern democratic systems like Canada and India tend to see diversity as rooted in binaries of dominance and marginalization where the oppression of others is the status quo (Dei & Kempf,
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14 I use Appelbaum’s (2002) simplified label for this approach and refer to it as social justice education rather than multicultural, social justice education.
Social inclusion in this approach is seen as individuals “organizing and working collectively” to make current structural systems more equitable (Sleeter & Grant, 2009).

The social justice approach stems from political liberation theories in which education is seen as consciousness raising, questioning ‘truth,’ and empowerment for a more humane society (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Freire 1970/1986; Greene, 2004). Beyond this is the belief that practising democracy—making decisions and exercising power—is a fundamental process of education (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). This approach also draws from theorists who ask individuals to question themselves and their social memberships in relation to power and privilege (Apple, Wu, & Gandin, 2009; McIntosh, 1998). The premise is that the self-aware individual has a sense of agency for participatory action in society. Although other approaches incorporate studies that unmask and challenge oppression, the distinction in a social justice approach is that issues of power, privilege and injustice become the principal agenda. The subject of oppression can differ depending on the group being studied, yet the fundamentals of power, privilege, inequity, and social hierarchy are the same. One could look at oppression from social identity categories like race, gender, sexuality, religion, ability, and citizenship or from discourses like human rights, intersectionality or anti-colonialism.15

In ITE the purpose of social justice education is to foster teachers’ capacity to use their agency. Niyozov and Pluim (2009) define agency as being part of the problem and the solution: “In other words, to repair something, both internal and external barriers must be identified. To that end, teachers, Muslim students, their parents, and their communities should see themselves as part of the problem as well as the solution rather than victims of external forces” (p. 668). In this approach, ITE centres on both oppression studies and teacher activism education. Preparing teachers for social change is about fostering their resilience for challenging norms in society (Cochran-Smith, 2004).

Sleeter and Grant (2009) maintain that social justice education has much in common with other approaches because of its emphasis on social issues, oppressed groups, mobility of the young, and cooperation. Gorski et al. (2013) describes ITE curriculum in this approach as course

15 Critical discourses focus on interrogating concepts towards diversity, inclusion and plurality (Banks, 2009; Bajaj, 2011; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2009), whereas social category specific ones centre on the treatment of particular groups or individuals in a context (Callaghan, 2007; Sensoy, 2009; Zine, 2009).
content on critical concepts such as intersectionality. Dudley-Marling (2013) describes it as challenging deficit thinking. Solomon and Daniel (2009) describe it as disrupting candidates' sense of privilege and power. Pedagogies stemming from these concepts could include service learning in which candidates are participants in marginalized communities (Solomon, Manoukian, & Clarke, 2007), challenging candidates' beliefs through classroom discussions (Kumashiro, 2001), having candidates shadow mentor teachers or create peer support groups (Cochran-Smith, 1991), and selecting course content on social issues and having candidates conduct an inquiry project in the community (Nganga & Kambuta, 2009).

Challenges to implementing social justice education in ITE stem from systemic practices in ITE as well as individual responses to social reconstructionism. For example in India, the Justice Verma Commission (2012) and Singh (2003) question whether an intellectual principle like justice for all is truly desired in current ITE practices. Both argue ITE is not about producing leaders or being a leader, but producing normative dispositions. In a sense, the authors are arguing ITE in its structure is the anti-thesis to reconstructionism:

The approach to the education of Indian school teachers has remained unchanged for over half a century in two crucial aspects: the institutionalized intellectual isolation of the school teacher and a circumscribed engagement with pedagogy as mere technique. The ‘institution’ of teacher education operates as a ‘system’ of well established conventions that structure social interaction, reproducing ‘shared habits of thought’ through the ‘conventions’ and the ‘rituals’ of teacher preparation. (GOI, 2012b, p. 12) [italics in original]

According to Panda (2005, 2009), ITE programs offer “diluted” versions of human rights education. Kelly (2012) uses her own large university program in Canada as an example of the vague interpretation of social justice used in ITE. This interpretation, she argues, “fosters the creation of silos rather than critical debate, both across and within departments or disciplines. It results in fragmentation and often token attention to “diversity” via some foundations courses or a special cohort within the larger teacher education program” (p. 136). In other cases the challenge is for teacher educators to find effective pedagogical strategies to have candidates embrace concepts of privilege, oppression, and the “messiness” of dissonance (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Gorski et al., 2013; Skinner & Schultz, 2011).

In ITE, social justice and anti-oppression approaches to diversity education have been rejected by Beck and Kosnik (2014) and Dolby (2012) as too radical or indoctrinating forms of
diversity education. St. Denis and Schick (2003) suggest that candidates also reject these approaches. The candidates feel they are not relevant to their own beliefs, resent having to take “a mandatory study” of anti-oppression, or see them as “implying a moral deficit.” Gorski et al. (2013) maintain that the rejection of social justice education is inherent in a process that asks teacher educators and candidates to unlearn their socializations. In Sleeter and Grant's view, social justice education is the best approach, yet not always welcome. Since the publication of their book in 2009, teacher education literature continues to show that social justice approaches are poorly received by teacher candidates (Dolby, 2012; Kitchen & Bellini, 2012). This poor reception includes many of the other approaches for diversity education in ITE that advocate for values of equity and social justice as part of their pedagogy (Ladson-Bilings, 2001; Loreman, 2010; Merryfield et al., 2008).

In summary, while Sleeter and Grant’s typology offers multiple possibilities for diversity education, these possibilities range in who they serve and how they are engaged in education. Each approach varies in the form of diversity addressed, the purpose of studying diversity education, and the curriculum content and pedagogy. These variations raise questions as to which aspects of diversity education are most important in ITE. Diversity education content can be about identity formation, conflict resolution, social inequities, and citizenship values. In terms of pedagogy, it can be about content integration, prejudice reduction, equity building, knowledge construction, empowerment, or changing social structures (Banks, 2009). It could focus, for example, on studying the communication practices of different cultures or studying the roots of exclusion of a particular group.

Sleeter and Grant's work is a rich conceptual tool, but it also has limitations. The five approaches are presented as an evolution of practices from the 1960s to 2009 as though all five still operate in the same ways in contemporary American education. The authors take a political stance on each approach, arguing that the first two—teaching the exceptional and culturally different, and human relations education—focus on assimilating differences while the final approach, multicultural social justice education, is the one that is most geared to social reconstruction in education (Gorski, 2008). In turn, they rank the social justice approach and its curriculum as the best form.

---

16 In the Diversity Education Curriculum in ITE section, I elaborate on why this approach can be poorly received.
Despite these limitations, Sleeter and Grant’s typology helps us to understand some of the ways diversity education applies to ITE. A more concrete exploration is required of the relationship between diversity education and the professional foundations, program features, curriculum, and pedagogy in ITE. These relationships allow one to consider how intentions manifest in program actions and within sociocultural contexts.

**Teacher Development Based Approaches to Diversity Education**

Teacher education and development literature also offer some insights into how programs conceptually approach diversity education and the implications these approaches have for ITE. In these instances, the focus begins with scholars’ perspectives on how programs facilitate novice teacher development in this area. Underlying some of the approaches are beliefs of what teachers need to know and/or to be able to do as diversity educators. Conceptually, diversity education is presented as a professional and programmatic response in ITE. In the next section, I briefly focus on four frameworks: program structure and sociopolitical context; teacher learning models; professional knowledge; and images of the diversity educator.17

**Program structure and sociopolitical context**

Several scholars have conceptualized diversity education in relation to structural dimensions within programs (e.g., program policies, procedures, processes) and sociocultural forces shaping programs (attitudes towards diversity). Zeichner and Conklin (2008) argue “that the meaning of a teacher education program is to be found in its substance as well in its structural characteristics” (p. 285). Cochran-Smith (2004) designed the *Multiple Meanings of Multicultural Teacher Education* framework. In her view, it is intended “to interrogate underlying assumptions and local practices” (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p. 154). She sees diversity education created by a program’s response to the following key questions: paraphrased?

1. The diversity question: How is diversity conceptualized?
2. The ideology question: What is the purpose of diversity education – the ideals, values and assumptions?

17 In this instance, the term frameworks refers to both comprehensive conceptual organizers as well as other ways of guiding program approaches such as professional knowledge.
3. The knowledge question: What knowledge interpretive frameworks, beliefs, and values, and attitudes are necessary?

4. The teacher learning question: How do teachers learn to teach diverse populations, and what, in particular, are the pedagogies of teacher preparation that this learning possible?

5. The practice question: What are the competencies and pedagogical skills teachers need to teach diverse populations effectively?

6. The outcome question: What should the consequences or outcomes of teacher preparation be, and how, by whom, and for what purposes should these outcomes be assessed?

7. The recruitment/selection question: What candidates should be selected for teaching? Drawing on recent work on selecting candidates open to diversity education admission processes (Childs et al., 2010; DeLuca, 2011b). I would add to this question, how should candidates be recruited into programs?

8. The coherence question. She sees this final question as enclosing and centering the seven questions. Coherence refers to diversity education’s location in the program and the degree to which the responses to 1-7 indicate their priority within the programs.

In addition to these questions, diversity education is influenced by the systems, structures, policy, and societal culture surrounding ITE. Key determinants are social reforms and external forces such as field partnerships, program regulations and institutional capacity. Other scholars Gorksi (2009), Jenks et al., (2001), and Zeichner (2011) also argue that one cannot underestimate the relationship between the social context, political context, institutional context and ITE’s approach to diversity education. Particularly relevant to this study are these scholars’ arguments that diversity education is shaped by both forces within and outside the ITE program. Their work also suggests that multiple approaches to diversity education can emerge even amongst programs in the same region.

---

18 Chapter 4: Setting the Context: Schooling and Initial Teacher Education in India and Canada provides an overview of the external sociocultural and policy forces influencing diversity education in ITE in Ontario and Delhi.
Teacher learning

Another framework for conceptualizing diversity education in ITE focuses on models of how teachers learn and develop. Although rarely presented this way, I argue that ‘teacher learning models’ can frame ITE’s aims and their engagement of diversity education purpose and pedagogy. This model also becomes particularly useful for comparative studies that need to be mindful of the various approaches to teacher learning which may be operating in a given context.

The literature on teacher education shows that the emphasis in ITE has shifted from traditional to more holistic models of teacher learning (Ashton, 1991; NCTE, 2010; Shulman, 1987). In traditional models, teaching is mechanical and teacher learning is viewed as the consumption, storage, and recall of information (Horton & Freire, 1990; Villegas, 2008). Transmission models in many programs in India tend to be guided by lectures, and measure teachers' capacities through exams (Batra, 2009; Singh, 2003). In this model, diversity education is primarily enacted through subject studies (e.g., gender education) and then reproduced for qualification purposes (e.g., content on exams). Somewhat linked to the traditional model of teacher learning are competency-based models. Teacher education “isolates the specific abilities that appear requisite to effective teaching, then designs instructional packets, described as learning modules, to elicit these specific abilities as terminal behaviors” (Bowles, 1973, p. 511). In this model, learning is based on the candidate’s technical performance on particular tasks (Houston, 1987; Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Underlying both models are correct responses to diversity and social inclusion that can be measured by a candidate’s performance in a formal evaluation.

Recently, constructivist and social constructivist models of ITE have become more common in Canada and are gaining popularity in India. These models see ITE as creating meaningful connections between candidates' new knowledge and their existing ideas, values, social interactions, emotions, and sensibilities (Barnes, 1989; Chou & Sakash, 2008; Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). They develop inquiry skills and use case studies as part of their own diversity education. In constructivist teacher education, “student

---

19 In both models, the focus in the classroom moves away from the teacher educator to centre on actively engaging candidates in meaningful learning (Richardson, 2005).
teachers should have time and encouragement to reflect on what they are learning” (Beck & Kosnik, 2006).

In social constructivist approaches, part of teacher learning is gained through interactions with others. In some forms of constructivism, ITE focuses entirely on the affective development of candidates’ interpersonal skills, relationships, and self-awareness (Anderson & Ching, 1987; Leblanc & Gallavan, 2009).

ITE thus involves sharing interests and life histories, and creating collective experiences. Values of equity and inclusion are part of the epistemology, and the aim is to create safe and supportive learning communities. Diversity education addresses issues that are relevant to candidates’ future practice and builds on their understandings of diversity and diversity education in the classroom. Learning and teaching models can also be challenging, particularly for “students who have not experienced constructivist classrooms in their own education” (Richardson & Placier, 2001, p. 913). This challenge can also extend to how candidates learn and teach diversity education.

In social reconstructionist approaches to ITE, professional learning is aimed at transforming education. It is defined by program and teacher educators commitments to “both social justice and to an ethic of care” (Gore & Zeichner, 1991, p. 119). Diversity education within this model takes on similar commitments. The goal is to foster a radical change both in society and the education system (Liston & Zeichner, 1991). An ITE program can centre on new forms of schooling, challenges to inequities, or the teacher’s identity as an activist (Giroux & McLearn, 1987; Solomon, 2011; Wilson, 1981). In this model, ITE can adopt various social justice lenses like activism (Cochran-Smith, 2004), empathy (Dolby, 2012), or community (Skinner & Schultz, 2011). For example, Gandhi (1932/2008) saw ITE as an opportunity to reclaim lost knowledge in postcolonial India. In his view, the medium of instruction in ITE should be in the mother tongue, programs should include both Hindus and Muslims, and the curriculum should focus on subject knowledge as well as on crafts and agriculture.

Although reconstructionist teacher education has been promoted in recent calls for quality education in India and Jamaica (Mayne, 2014; NCTE, 2010), it is the least prevalent form of teacher education in the West (Gore & Zeichner, 1991). The ability to successfully base a whole teacher education program on social reconstructionism is contested in the field, with some
scholars having more optimism (Mayne, 2014; Lea, 2009; NCTE, 2010) than others (Tom, 1997; Wilson, 1981). Indeed, part of the challenge is that teaching is a situated profession and for the most part candidates are trained to serve in an established system. Pedagogies that seek to transform and reconstruct the system can conflict with people’s strongly established values or practices in ITE.

**Professional knowledge**

There is little consensus in the literature as to which forms of professional knowledge are most vital for beginning teachers (Ball & Tyson, 2011; DeLuca, 2012a; NCTE, 2005; Solomon et al., 2007) and which skills and dispositions should be fostered in ITE (Banks et al., 2005; Grant & Gibson, 2011; Howard & Aleman, 2008). A robust body of literature provides ITE program and policy recommendations for diversity education. Scholars base their recommendations on understandings of the essential professional capacities for teaching diversity and inclusion—what teachers should know and be able to do.

Professional knowledge related to diversity and social inclusion in ITE is expansive. Other foundations for ITE relate to what teachers should be able to do—for example, culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000); differentiated instruction (Beck & Kosnik, 2014), or adaptive teaching (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). All three relate to teachers' capacities to use “a range of pedagogies and restructure, modify and accommodate curriculum and assessment practices for particular learners” (Banks et al., 2005). Scholars like Florian (2012) refer to interpersonal communication skills, while Cochran-Smith (2004) refers to leadership skills. Equally important to the development of professional knowledge is the need to foster teachers' attitudes toward, for example, social justice (Grant & Agosto, 2008), worldmindedness (Merryfield et al., 2008), caring (and the distinction between caring as concern), and caring as holding high expectations (Nieto, 2006), flexibility and empathy (Banks et al., 2005), moral and social responsibility (Batra, 2009; Ghai, 2005), a sense of mission (Nieto, 2006), and respect (Beck & Kosnik, 2014; Florian, 2006; Gay, 2002). In Table 2, I build on Bierema’s (2010) characterization of diversity educators to illustrate commonly cited skills and attributes.20

---

20 Bierema’s research is not situated in ITE, however she addresses extensively the capacities of the effective diversity education instructor in higher education. Her list mirrors the literature on professional knowledge in ITE.
Table 2

Skills and Attributes for Teaching Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills for Teaching Diversity</th>
<th>Attributes for Teaching Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>Resilience (“take it on the chin”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking tough questions</td>
<td>Belief in what you are doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Mental agility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in the community</td>
<td>Deep understanding of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beck &amp; Kosnik, 2006; NCTE, 2005)</td>
<td>Positive outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing group dynamics</td>
<td>Recognize own limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of law</td>
<td>Been through the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing resistance strategies</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of policy issues</td>
<td>Sensitive to people’s needs and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of own prejudice</td>
<td>Nonneutral talk in facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of own attitudes, values, and belief</td>
<td>“Walk the talk”/“Own the ethos”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation in the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to engage in professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villegas &amp; Lucas, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well trained in constructions of diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the United States, Banks et al. (2005) brought together scholars from a range of discipline areas to outline their recommendations for national teacher education guidelines. They present diversity education in ITE as knowledge of self, knowledge of learners, and knowledge of how to continue to learn in teaching. Grant and Gibson (2011) extend Banks' categories by adding propositional knowledge as “generativity;” that is, the ability to produce new knowledge and see classrooms as sites of transformative change. They also argue that ITE needs to develop candidates’ “habits of mind:”

Preservice teachers need to be taught to face and accept their own identities, become learners of their students' realities, develop strong and meaningful relationships with students, become multilingual and multicultural, learn to challenge racism and bias, and develop a community of critical friends in order to refocus attention to issues of access, equity, and social justice. (Nieto, 2003, as cited in Grant & Gibson, 2011, p. 31)

Evident in this passage and common to nearly all forms of professional knowledge is the idea of developing a candidate's consciousness. Consciousness consists of both awareness and action. According to Merryfield et al. (2008), global educators have civic consciousness of their
responsibilities beyond national borders. Villegas and Lucas (2002) define consciousness as an educator's ability “to recognize that there are multiple ways of perceiving reality and that these ways are influenced by one’s location in the social order” (p. 21). Freire sees consciousness as the ability to recognize and take action against social, political, and economic oppression (Freire, 1970/1986). Howard and Aleman (2008) define it as the shift from seeing “individual prejudice or ignorance as the problem in education,” to seeing “the systemic institutionalization of such prejudice that allows it to remain hidden and thriving” (p. 166). Ghosh and Abdi (2013) see sociopolitically conscious educators as those who are aware of the history and realities of peoples in a nation, have positive values of pluralism in democracy, and have the drive to work toward the interdependence of humanity. The broadest concept is offered by Bucher (2010). In his view, diversity consciousness is “having respect for diversity and the skills to include and empower others.”

By cultivating particular areas of professional knowledge, ITE defines what constitutes diversity education in their programs. As in all teacher education programs, ITE programs in India and Canada face difficult decisions as to which knowledge and teaching practices to prioritize in the curriculum. “It is clear,” as Forlin (2012) explains, “that teachers have to be prepared in pedagogy, psychology and discipline content.” However, he also states:

they [also] need to be able to understand and implement a range of other areas. These include but are not limited to the use of interactive learning, new technologies, collaborative teaching, diagnostic assessments, a learning-outcomes focused approach, response to intervention, referrals, multidisciplinary learning, school-based curricula development and assessments, social skills training, differentiating curricula, universal design, etc. The challenge of the teacher educators is to determine how many of these to include in their courses, and how they will assess the effectiveness of these in facilitating the development of inclusive teacher practitioners. (p. 87)

Forlin captures many of the dilemmas of ITE and what is deemed foundational. The capacities that teachers need to demonstrate are vast—a reality supported by scholars who lament the complexity of preparing candidates for their numerous professional responsibilities. Programs and teacher educators also face the challenge of which areas to address in the timeframe of their courses, marking their choices as a significant part of how diversity education is approached in ITE. Yet, little research is available on how teacher educators make these decisions—not only in
general, but also in relation to facilitating the development of professional knowledge in this area.

**Image of the diversity educator**

Scholars on ITE pedagogies also present in the literature particular images and identities of the diversity educator. A powerful framework for considering approaches to diversity education and how the intersection of various capacities, expectations and expertise generate teacher identities and ideological stances (Thiessen & Pike, 1992). Many of the qualities within an image overlap with traits of good and effective teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Anderson & Marshall, 2006; Murray, 1996), but in the context of this study they are central to understanding the diversity educator. The literature on diversity education gives us multiple portraits of the effective diversity educator from different theoretical perspectives: the culturally responsive educator (Gay, 2000); the cross-cultural educator (McGee-Banks, 2001); the multicultural educator (Levine-Rasky, 2001; Nieto, 2006); the anti-oppressive educator (Kumashiro, 2004); the social justice educator (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Kumashiro, 2009); and the globally minded educator (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, & Weber, 2009). These images are different than orientations because they represent who programs want candidates to be as individuals or become as practitioners in the classroom.

Images can include professional knowledge discussions, but they also suggest particular structures, outcomes, and learning opportunities in programs. Villegas and Lucas (2002), for example, portray the culturally responsive educator as someone who possesses the following traits: is socioculturally conscious; affirms students; has a sense of responsibility for educational change; builds on students’ prior knowledge; and uses constructivist teaching and learning methods. In their view, ITE is designed to develop these traits in candidates. For instance, candidates learn how to affirm students from culturally diverse backgrounds by studying deficit theory, cultural difference theory, and structural inequalities, and by critically analyzing the K–12 curriculum. Teacher educators might also have candidates learn what it feels like to be affirmed through simulation games of power differentials or case studies of experiences of oppression in education.

Scholars also connect images to the types of field placements and program processes candidates undertake (Cochran-Smith 2004; Gorksi et al, 2013; Merryfield et al, 1997; Villegas
& Lucas, 2002). For the global educator, Merryfield (1997) advises that ITE must include cross-cultural field placements locally or internationally. For the urban educator, programs need to ensure representation of candidates from the relevant communities and foster partnerships with inner city communities (Solomon et al., 2007).

Images seek congruence between approaches to diversity education in schools with the aims and outcome of ITE. They can also help identify areas of improvement in teacher education practices and who we want teachers to be and/or become. To quote Thiessen and Kilcher (1992): “If our fundamental focus is on this visionary purpose, then our functional and structural moves will have a greater chance of coherence, articulation, and success” (p. 79). According to these scholars, the structural refers to the environment in which candidates learn. The functional refers to the strategies used to facilitate and improve teacher education. Thus, images are a metaphor for the diversity educator and a tool for probing views of diversity, inclusion, the educator’s purpose and ITE’s potential for diversity education.

The conceptual frameworks not only provide insights on the underlying assumptions, but also address structure, content and pedagogy. Sleeter and Grant (2009) anchor their typology in the school context and provide insights into how curriculum practices are connected to broader educational agendas towards diversity and inclusion. Cochran Smith (2004) and other scholars suggest that diversity education can have multiple forms, reinforcing the importance of exploring program choices and sociocultural forces. Teacher learning models detail approaches to teacher development and how diversity education can be linked to each. Professional knowledge considers the discrete elements scholars deem necessary for teachers, whereas images consider the overall function of diversity educators and how it is applied to ITE. Ultimately, the various conceptual frameworks offer entry points for this study to consider how ITE prepares teachers for diversity education in theory and practice.

**Diversity Education Curriculum in Initial Teacher Education**

Evident in the literature are individual, institutional, and systemic choices on how diversity education is addressed in ITE. Pertinent to this study are understandings of diversity as multifaceted and contextually derived. Sleeter and Grant’s typology and the other conceptual frameworks capture distinct approaches to diversity education, each resonating with concepts and practices found in Canada and India. In this section, I focus on how curriculum is engaged or
integrated based on literature on teacher education. The first part discusses how ITE policies and procedures are structured to support diversity education and address inclusion issues within programs. The second part considers curriculum in diversity education and how access, equity, equality, and quality establish the agenda in ITE. The third focuses on the pedagogical activities and the strategies teacher educators use to enact diversity education. Within the accounts of each section, I also identify some of the challenges and tensions facing diversity education in ITE.

**Structural and substantive features of diversity education in ITE**

Numerous scholars call for increasing attention to diversity education in the foundations of ITE programs (ACDE, 2005; Ball & Tyson, 2011; Childs et al., 2010; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Longview, 2008; OECD, 2010). Structural characteristics and substantive features within programs include: visions and views of teaching; the location of diversity education in specific programs; instructional strategies; as well as program evaluations (Zeichner & Conklin, 2008). The following section considers how diversity education-related practices inform substantive aspects of ITE such as admissions and recruitment; program components; field partnerships; institutional type, candidate support programs and teacher educator capacity.

The literature shows that the purpose and foundations of diversity education can shape ITE admission and recruitment practices (Cochran-Smith, Davies, & Fries, 2004; Lea, 2009; Solomon & Daniel, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). Programs can use specialized admission processes that filter for individuals predisposed to diversity education. Some ITE programs use diversity policies to target admission of individuals predisposed to social inclusion or to attract a greater number of male, visible minority, and ability minority students to ITE. Others use interviews as a way of identifying candidates’ dispositions and attitudes. In spite of these policies, program populations in Canada tend to be largely female, middle class, and able bodied and, in both countries, reflect the dominant groups. Diversity education in ITE is thus tasked with teaching them about others and inspiring them “to become change agents” for populations that “they may not have sufficient awareness of” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 57). A program’s ability to recruit candidates with the desired dispositions is also seen as highly subjective, with each assessor interpreting qualities differently (Childs et al., 2010; DeLuca, 2012b).
Initial teacher education is operating in tandem with regional or national policies (e.g., the Ontario College of Teachers; the National Council for Teacher Education). These standards and regulations can influence if and what diversity education content is required for professional qualification in the region. ITE dedicates courses, components or internal policies to satisfy these requirements. Increasingly in Ontario and Delhi, these policies specify diversity/diversity education goals for pre-service programs. However, the regions in this study do not reflect what is happening world-wide; many countries are less prescriptive or consistent in this aspect of ITE (UNESCO, 2008). In Chapter 4, I discuss in detail the policies influencing diversity education for the programs in this study.

In most countries, initial teacher education consists of three components: subject studies, professional foundations such as child development, and field or practicum placements. However, programs vary greatly in the weighting, content, and organization of these components. For example, diversity education is often located as a discrete foundation course rather than integrated across both subject and foundations courses. Programs might offer specialized courses in multicultural education or special education; specific class assignments on diverse learners; extracurricular opportunities such as clubs, associations, and internships; or practice placements in marginalized communities.

In some cases, programs designate cohorts for diversity-focused education (NCTE, 2010). Others incorporate equity and diversity in their broader institutional vision (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Gambhir et al., 2010; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). Still others offer it through guest lectures (Schmidt, 2004), single courses (Brown, 2004; MacDonald, 2005), or field experiences (Wiggins et al., 2007). Scholars like Banks et al. (2005), Merryfield (1997), and Timmons (2009) argue that the most powerful forms of ITE explicitly integrate diversity education across all three program components.

The location and types of partnerships influence candidates’ opportunities to engage in relationships with certain communities. Researchers argue that diversity education needs to be tailored to the rural, urban, or international community the program intends to serve (Barter, 2011; Levine-Rasky, 2001; Scholefield, 2006; Tarc, 2009). The community is also determined by partnerships with particular schools such as NGO sponsored schools, state-funded schools, private schools, and religious-based schools. The degree of partnership between schools and ITE
programs can also determine the objectives and curriculum of diversity education. A cohort focusing on inner city schools may spend a substantive amount of time in the community and schools, whereas a non-specialized cohort may offer only a few or no placements in these same schools. Thus, candidates learning opportunities differ in each scenario.

The location of teacher education in universities can also determine how diversity education occurs. Particularly relevant in the Indian context is that ITE programs in university settings—the primary focus of this study—are seen as “insular organizations even within the university systems in which they are located” (Batra, 2005, p. 4349). Although researchers reinforce the importance of community involvement in diversity education, institutions like universities can become distant from community organizations and members. Sharma and Loreman (2014) argue that these programs are sites for exclusion and that “the lack of collaboration” with the community results in conflicting information about diversity education practices for candidates (p. 173).

Diverse candidate populations and their supports also influence diversity education in ITE. Programs and teacher educators are criticized for not sufficiently honouring candidates outside the dominant demographic (Quinn & Meiners, 2011; Uys, Reyneke, & Kaiser, 2011; Villegas & Davis, 2008). Although research in this areas is sparse, Canadian ITE has been reported as marginalizing candidates through the same practices plaguing K–12 schools such as perpetuating dominant representations in the curriculum and failing to access candidates’ cultures. In Canada and elsewhere, for example, research in ITE has focused on how to redress some of the shortcomings in serving aboriginal candidates, internationally trained teachers, and racial minorities. One response is to provide support groups and language development centres for candidates. Another response is to offer alternative (e.g., in the community) or modified models (e.g., additional courses) that tailor the program to the candidates’ needs.

The personal and professional qualities of the teacher educator impact how diversity education is enacted and experienced in ITE. “Part of the complexity of this work is that the institutions and the individuals who constitute them are inextricably linked” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 196). Like school-based educators, teacher educators draw on their knowledge, attitudes, and dispositions to teach effectively (Loughran, 2006; Schmidt, 2004; Sleeter & Grant,
Bierema’s (2010) work, defined in Table 2, can also be used to illustrate the desired capacities of the teacher educator.

Different sociocultural contexts can impact the skills and attributes teacher educators bring to diversity education. For example, in India, the majority of teacher educators do not have school-based experience (NCTE, 2003). Therefore Bierema’s (2010) attribute of “having been through the process” of engaging diversity would come from their life experiences rather than from K–12 teaching experience. In Canada on the other hand, many teacher educators have school-based experience. Differences also emerge in relation to the skill of “engaging the community.” For example, policies on traditional ITE programs in India cite the importance of the community to ‘feel engaged’ (Dewan, 2009) and the need for teacher educators to draw localities into the daily content (NCTE, 2010). Yet in the traditional B.Ed. curriculum, teacher educators engage community for the purpose of fostering interest in education, teaching about a particular group, and raising a group’s interest in the schooling of children. In Canada, James (2010) sees the diversity educator as engaging the community to provide a source for ITE programming and to help candidates learn about a group and develop critical reflexivity.

Beyond these differences, teacher educators face a common challenge of trying to master the multiple skills and attributes. The sum list can be daunting for some teacher educators, particularly when mandated by policy or programs. The limited research in this area demonstrates that teacher educators hesitate in taking on the role of diversity educator due to limited understandings of: a) their own identities and their experiences with diversity (Smolen, Colville-Hall, Liang & MacDonald, 2006), b) their ability to emotionally support candidates (Dolby, 2012), and c) their ability to cope with and learn from teacher candidate responses to their chosen pedagogies (St. Denis & Schick, 2003; Sumara, 2007). As a result, teacher educators require professional development within ITE to effectively enact diversity education. These activities can include but are not limited to opportunities to collaboratively plan lessons, discuss challenges, and be mentored.

In conclusion, many aspects like partnerships, location, and candidate population influence how diversity education is approached in ITE. Admissions, professional development opportunities, and candidate support are part of the necessary infrastructure for wide-spread engagement in programs. Scholars in the field also indicate that many of these areas have
become the focal point of research agendas, further demonstrating increasing acceptance that diversity education curriculum can have a wide impact on procedures and processes in a program.

**Access, equity and equality in education: Links to diversity education in ITE**

Earlier in this chapter, the Five Approaches typology was outlined to explain how an orientation to diversity education implicates content and teaching practices in the classroom. This also holds true for other orientations, such as peace education, global education, or anti-racist education. The relationship of teacher education to schools also suggests another important perspective to consider in how curriculum is defined and engaged. Curriculum in ITE is inextricably linked to societal attitudes towards the inclusion of communities in education. Further, international and regional policies view teacher practice as key to addressing diverse learner needs and overcoming social inequities in the classroom (Batra, 2006; OECD, 2010; OME, 2009c; UNESCO, 2014). Consequently, meaningful diversity education has to be mindful of issues of access, equity, and equality in education. Given the aims of this study, I consider how the three concepts link to India and Canada as well as establish curriculum priorities for diversity education in ITE.

Access refers to an individual’s right and ability to enter as well as be retained in the education system. In India, access is important considering that 20% of children do not attend school (Govinda, 2006; NCERT, 2005). In Canada, although access issues are less pressing, certain groups within the public system are disengaged or lack sufficient resources (Dei, 2006; Dhillon, 2011; Porter, 2008; Toohey & Derwing, 2008). Nearly half of the elementary principals in Ontario schools report that they have asked parents to keep their special needs children home due to a lack of qualified staff and resource support within schools (People for Education, 2013).

Equity refers to the idea that some people may need more or different forms of support to be treated fairly (McGee-Banks & Banks, 1995). In India, equity-based initiatives manifest as affirmative action policies for admission to school or the waiving of school fees for girl children (NCERT, 2005). In Canada equity-based priorities are exemplified through special education policies like the Individual Education Plan (IEP). In IEPs, teachers accommodate identified individuals by tailoring the curriculum to their specific needs.
Equality refers to being seen as and holding the same “status and opportunity” as others irrespective of individual needs (NCERT, 2005). In India, income and social class impact equality. The gap between rich and poor is stark (Govinda & Bandyopadhyay, 2011; Guha, 2007) and a deep-rooted, historical marginalization of certain groups continues to exist in some sectors of education (Ahmad, 2013; Joshee & Shira, 2009; Naik, 1978). The media regularly reports cases of children being beaten, ignored in lessons, and even barred from school because of their identity. Many victims claim that teachers are either instigators or complacent observers of these events (Nambissan, 2009; NCERT, 2005; NCERT, 2013). In Canada, cases exist of individuals who have been disenfranchised by the education system and those within it (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Callaghan, 2007; Rosen, 2014). For example, the suffering of Aboriginal communities at the hands of the state residential school system has only recently been acknowledged (Battiste, 2009). Students who identify as LGBQT have been pushed out of the Catholic education system (Callaghan, 2012).21

Global and national discourses on inclusion in education also center on issues of quality. In some cases quality is synonymous with equal opportunity in education, but in other cases it is a proxy for meeting high standards (Naik, 1979; UNESCO, 2014). In India, the two meanings are parallel. The country is striving simultaneously to increase access to education by placing the marginalized in elite schools and also achieving high standards within all systems. Quality is defined in relation to the health and well-being of learners, their learning environments, the content of the curriculum, the training and practices of teachers, and the expected educational outcomes of different groups (UNESCO, 2005; Kumar & Rustagi, 2010). In Canada, although enrolment in the education system is high, the poor state of some Aboriginal schools on reserves (Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, 2011), the lack of qualified teachers serving remote communities (Kitchenham & Chasteauneuf, 2010), and unsanctioned practices of streaming minority and low-income students in urban secondary schools (Clandfield, Curtis, Galabrazi, Livingstone, & Smaller, 2014; People for Education, 2013) all feature prominently in the national discourse. In addition, as reported in a 2010 OECD study, teachers are not well prepared to handle diversity issues in the classroom:

---
21 In Canada, LGBQT is considered an abbreviated acronym for LGBTTIQQ2S. In India, the most common reference in the literature is LGT.
For student teachers and teacher educators, this is not simply a result of the absence of training. The vast majority of the student teachers and teacher educators that responded reported that diversity issues (e.g., working with different languages, cultures, and religions) were covered in their teacher education programmes in some form. This suggests that there is a need to improve the design and development of the current training on diversity issues such that it better fits with the reported need. (p. 34)

In both Delhi and Ontario, ITE has been called upon to prepare teachers more adequately for issues of access, equity, equality, and quality in education. As Garnett (2010) argues: “Given that teacher candidates generally are from the dominant social groups themselves, [they] are often skeptical that oppression and discrimination still occur in our liberal societies” (p. 102). Teacher educators must draw in the realities, needs, and conditions of education faced by particular groups and communities. For example, in Canada, the lack of awareness of aboriginal issues and barriers to education has prompted curriculum reform in ITE that encourage culturally responsive educators (OME, 2009a; Restoule et al., 2014).

In India, questions arise about the school system’s ability to provide sensitive learning environments in which students' identities are valued and validated (Krishna, 2012). This is partly attributed to the poor quality of teachers in the system (Kumar & Rustagi, 2010) and persists despite the fact that Indian policies call for well-trained, socially sensitive, and engaged teachers in every classroom (Kumar, 2006; GOI, 2009; UNESCO, 2010). The country’s teacher education is tasked to build the novice professionals capacities to attend to the realities of various student needs (Nanda, 2008; Dreze & Sen, 2003; NCTE, 2010). For example, in response to disparities in Indian society, the new teacher education curriculum are encouraged to prepare candidates to take an advocacy stance for marginalized groups (NCTE, 2010). Thus, values and strategies used to foster inclusion and diversity education curriculum in ITE are either informed by or respond to access, equity, equality and quality issues in education.

Pedagogical strategies for diversity education in ITE

Flowing from the various perspectives on diversity education are a range of pedagogical practices that aim to build inclusive classrooms (Banks, 2004a). In my study, I concentrate not only on the pedagogical strategies in ITE but also identify when possible their connections to particular viewpoints. For example, case studies from a human relations view of diversity education may focus on communication practices of a culture; however case studies from a
single group studies perspective may focus on the roots of exclusion of a particular group. The next section provides an overview of the pedagogical activities connected to diversity education, and also the limitations and challenges that can ensue.

A key focus of this study is on teacher educators’ pedagogical choices, how they understand diversity education pedagogy in “their own minds”, and how they apply diversity education in different ways in the context of their ITE classes and programs. Teacher educators employ a range of pedagogical approaches to help candidates foster the necessary dispositions for teaching. The most widely cited practices in North American programs include microteaching, laboratory experiences, use of technology and hypermedia, case methods, portfolios, and practitioner research (Carter & Anders, 1996; Grossman, 2005). Practitioner research can include action research, theory-practice connections to personal experience, or apprenticeship inquiry (Banks et al., 2005). Other tools are reflective praxis, field experience journals, life histories and narratives (Banks et al., 2005; Knowles, Cole, & Presswood, 2009; Korthagen, Koster, Wubbels, Lagerwerf, & Kessels, 2001). In community-oriented programs, partnerships in learning are key and teacher educator pedagogy concentrates on establishing a professional learning community (Beck & Kosnik, 2006). In more recent times, the expansion of ITE distance programs and increased access to digital technology mean that more and more educators are using multimodal instruction as part of their courses (Kosnik, Menna, & Bullock, 2012).

In India, traditional ITE programs use several of the pedagogies listed above such as mentored placements, inquiry projects, and dialogues. However lectures, rote memorization, and exams are prevalent practices in many programs. Singh (2003), in describing the Indian system, states: “The entire school curriculum being examination-oriented and the society having increasingly become conscious of the value of excellence in the examinations results, we have, it would appear, ceased to possess the elan to suitably modify the purpose [pedagogies] of teacher education” (p. 375).

Diversity education in ITE intersects with the range of pedagogical approaches cited above. For example, several scholars present the benefits of strategic field placements, service-learning opportunities, and school–university partnerships in helping candidates connect to and learn from communities (Carrington & Saggers, 2008; Desrochers, 2006; Wiggins et al., 2007).
Garavuso’s (2013) self-study documented how she assigned field placements in working-class schools and how the candidates experienced these placements in an urban-focused ITE program. Candidates appreciate the opportunity to teach in communities unfamiliar to them and explore how educational opportunities are perceived in different schools.

Cochran-Smith's (1991) study of learning to teach “against the grain” emphasizes the need to place candidates in schools undergoing reform or restructuring. Candidates benefit from experiencing transformation in education, but also from witnessing how difficult the process is (Cochran-Smith, 2004). According to Cochran-Smith, these social justice oriented placements are structured to achieve two aims. The first is to create opportunities for “critical dissonance” pedagogy that disrupts candidates' beliefs. The second is mentored support sessions. When partnered with mentors who model practices of teaching against the grain, candidates feel supported in testing their role as diversity educators and are able to discuss their concerns with others. Cochran-Smith calls this “collaborative resonance.”

The literature on international teacher education also offers strategies for exploring diversity and building self-awareness. For example, in cross-cultural education, candidates do a portion of their studies in another country. Quezada & Alfaro's (2007) survey on the impact of out-of-country field experiences found that candidates advanced their knowledge in three areas: understanding inequities, learners and community, and the relationship between curriculum standards and various learner needs in different contexts. In the Canadian context, mentored intercultural field placements on an Aboriginal reserve drew out candidates' understandings of their own biases, cultural beliefs, and communication skills (Stachowski & Frey, 2003). Although several scholars (e.g., Bryan & Sprague, 2012; Cushner, 2009; Jiang & DeVillar, 2011) cite the benefit of overseas field placements in exposing candidates to learning about difference, very few discuss the moral and ethical challenges of these placements from the target population’s perspective. Unless teacher educators establish mutually beneficial and non-exploitative relationships through ITE programs, pedagogies that involve “crossing into a context” can be superficial or negative (see James, 2010, as an example; personal communication Kempf, 2013).

Macpherson (2010), an advocate for intercultural education in Canada, researched how to help candidates develop their skills in “minding” and responding. Minding refers to “enabling
cultures, respecting and sharing power” as well as deliberating and arbitrating for justice. Responding refers to a teacher’s abilities to create safe and open learning spaces and take action for students. In Macpherson’s study, the ITE curriculum was based on critical incident case studies that emerged from candidates’ practicum placements. In one example, a teacher chose to remove resources in her classroom that had stereotypical representations. Her decision was due to her evolving understanding of equity, diversity, and her students’ demographic.

Open discussions and dialogue are also pedagogical strategies used by instructors in diversity education programming. Through conversations, candidates learn how to communicate their ideas on sensitive issues and practice attentive listening (Bickmore, 2005). Discussions of controversial topics and debates can also be used to build conflict resolution skills. Discussions within race, class, ethnicity and gender frameworks can help illustrate multiple perspectives on a topic (Gay, 2002). Teacher educators who “offer ideas and strategies (fads and all)” can use discussions to help candidates think critically about content. As a result, candidates learn how to make autonomous decisions on the curriculum and apply this in their own teaching (Noddings, 2004). Participating in and leading discussions teaches candidates how to take up controversial issues in their own classrooms (Kelly & Brandes, 2001). Fine’s (1997) study found that dialogic pedagogy for peacemaking helped candidates think about their teaching practice and explore why some of their students remained silent in critical discussions.

There are also challenges to having meaningful discussions courses that address diversity and inclusion issues. Dudley-Marling’s (2013) research demonstrates that teacher educators may be looking for right answers to an issue rather than allowing multiple perspectives to emerge. Gorski’s (2013) research shows how he resists imposing his “ideological beliefs on candidates’ learning experiences.” Similarly, Sapp's (2013) self-study of his critical multicultural education practice cautions teacher educators that “the goal is dialogue, not conversion.”

Teacher educators also use collaborative and intergroup activities to create community or to problem solve issues related to social inclusion (Banks et al., 2005). The following examples are sourced from community, social justice and urban ITE programs. Beck and Kosnik’s (2006) research on their ITE cohort demonstrated that paired and group activities enabled candidates to develop bonds, take greater risks in their learning, support each other, and develop social skills. Candidates can also do collaborative activities in partnership with an associate teacher. Cochran-
Smith (2004), for example, documented the positive outcomes of a collaborative inquiry project on the rationale and challenges of transition classes. Teams worked together to generate problems, explore the context, and offer insights or solutions. Inquiry projects involving partners from the community can increase candidates’ understanding of how to be an activist for a group (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Intergroup activities like cross-dyad partnerships on race-based issues also allow candidates to learn from each other as they work together (Solomon, et al., 2007).

Prejudice reduction activities that promote critical thinking and self-inquiry can help candidates explore personal biases (Finney & Orr, 1995; Osler & Starkey, 1996). Provocative videos or readings on power can challenge candidates' understandings of the concept of privilege and social denial (McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001; Solomon & Daniel, 2009). Reflections, metaphor assignments, and poetry activities are a platform for candidates to “go deeper” into the concepts of privilege, denial, diversity and their own understandings (Gay, 2010; Grace, 2007). Student journals are a window into candidates’ struggles to connect theories from the literature to their own practice with students (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Fine, 1997). Many of the other pedagogies teacher educators use in ITE are identical to those used in schools such as hosting guest speakers, visiting communities, or critically analyzing texts (see Au, Bigelow, & Karp 2007; Clauss-Ehlers, 2006; Egbo, 2009; Selby & Pike, 1998; Richardson & Gallagher, 2010 for examples).

Although prejudice reduction or anti-bias education is associated with many of the approaches used in diversity education, some teacher educators resist implementing these approaches in their ITE courses. For example, in her self-study of anti-racist teacher education, Wane (2003) discusses pedagogical and ideological resistance. Pedagogical resistance refers to results from adding anti-bias studies “to an already crowded curriculum.” Ideological resistance refers to the feelings of “defensiveness, guilt, and shame” that candidates and educators can experience when asked to confront oppression. A significant body of research documents the reticence that occurs when ITE content and teacher educators' ideological stances challenge candidates’ beliefs and understandings of the world (Kelly & Brandes, 2001; Han, 2013; Levine-

---

22 When candidates study denial, they are exploring how individuals “socially disassociate” and “separate themselves from any personal responsibility for causing or correcting oppression or inequities” (Gay, 2010).
Rasky, 1998; Solomon & Daniel, 2009). Researchers like Au and Blake (2003) and McDonald (2005) found that candidates, even when exposed to oppression studies, left feeling unprepared to address it in their own classrooms. Teacher educators themselves struggle with or avoid addressing certain content in their courses (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Gay, 2010; Ghosh & Trarrow, 1993). The possibility that ITE practices dissuade future educators from addressing oppression is also a limitation given that the aim is to prepare candidates to challenge the negative repercussions of diversity in their own practice.

Some ITE diversity educators have been working on strategies to decrease resistance (McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001) while others attempt to sustain the desire of candidates to stay engaged in their courses (Levine-Rasky, 2001). Still others prefer to embrace and negotiate discomfort in critical pedagogies (Alejano-Steele et al., 2001; Kumashiro, 2004). Cochran-Smith (2001) argues that feelings of discomfort are not due to the explicitness of the content but rather to the dissonance candidates experience when they are exposed to inequities or implicated in the creation and perpetuation of inequities. Teacher education thus becomes a site for attending to several concerns: addressing both the emotional and intellectual experiences of novice educators (Caouette & Taylor, 2007), fostering ground rules for discussions and safety (Gorski et al., 2013), and creating a community environment where candidates are willing to take risks (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

Leland and Harste (2005) studied teacher candidates in an American urban ITE program. The teacher educators used literacy texts in their courses on difficult social issues such as homelessness. The authors found that the candidates initially resisted the curriculum, which was based on fostering critical literacy skills as well as on interrogating assumptions about poverty, power, biases, and the status quo in education. However, the candidates changed their perspectives over the course of the program. They attributed their repositioning to ITE activities, discussions, and field experiences in which they learned how to use their course literacy texts with inner-city students. The candidates were able to take risks in their own learning by exploring how ITE activities could be applied to their practice teaching classrooms.

Less articulated in the literature are strategies for ‘how’ to transact pedagogies of safety in teacher education and how to foster safe learning spaces in all areas of the program including courses and field experiences (Beck & Kosnik, 2006; Gay, 2002). In relation to diversity
education, safety means creating positive socio-emotional learning spaces (Parameswaran, 2007) that enable teachers to negotiate professional learning or dissonance in a supported way (Caouette & Taylor, 2007). Teacher educators ask candidates to take risks, whether the task involves entering a community in which they are the ‘other’ (Deer, 2013, Garavuso, 2013) or using a multicultural children’s book in the classroom (Han, 2013). Safety is an area of growing concern in the literature on diversity education in ITE, especially in relation to the feelings of exclusion marginalized candidates experience (Gambhir, 2008b; Lau, 2008; Levine-Rasky, 2000), the lack of mentoring, and candidates' resistance to pedagogies (Beck & Kosnik, 2006; Dolby, 2012; Lea, 2009). Connecting pedagogical practice to safety is a valuable part of understanding how to engage in meaningful diversity education in ITE.

Another challenge to practices of diversity education is that teacher candidates are reconciling two identities: learner and future teacher. Diversity education in ITE sometimes proposes ways of teaching and learning that are starkly different from candidates' own experiences in education. “If students do not earnestly buy in or feel a sense of ownership over this new and daring approach to learning, they are unlikely to practice it successfully or practice it all” (Lembo, 2012). Beyond new ways of learning, these practices may also promote new ways of seeing the world. Given that candidates are starting from different places, they “make meaning of texts based on their individual locations and lenses” (Dudley-Marling, 2013). The theoretical and pedagogical challenge in the ITE classroom is to effectively and explicitly connect diversity education to candidates’ own history of schooling and personal beliefs (Hammerness et al., 2005; Gay, 2002).

The literature on diversity education in ITE provides limited information on practices in Indian ITE programs. Although reference is made to content on human rights education (Panda, 2009), gender education (Ghai, 2008), and disability studies (Sharma, Moore, & Sonawane, 2009), no research is available on the pedagogical strategies used to transact this information in university-based programs. The aim of this study is based on the understanding that professional foundations and practices of ITE and diversity education differ from region to region. As Fang and Gopinathan (2009) explain: “Differences exist because teaching is deeply embedded in a cultural system and behind key differences in teaching practices lie fundamental differences in the cultural beliefs and values between and among countries in the West and East” (p. 2).
In summary, the literature demonstrates that diversity education in teacher education is responding to many variables and operating in a complex educational environment. ITE program design, epistemologies, location, partnerships, duration, and admissions are all determinants of diversity education. Equally important are programs understandings of access, equity, and equality issues. These key concepts alongside varied pedagogical strategies create opportunities for ITE to enact diversity education in meaningful ways. Participants' experiences also inform the context of diversity education in ITE, especially candidates' and teacher educators' readiness for particular pedagogies and the problematic resonance of some approaches to diversity education. Thus, a study on this nature is considering how programs contend with the many dimensions of diversity education from structural strategies to classroom practice.

**International and comparative studies on diversity education in initial teacher education**

In Canada, the scholarly literature for diversity education in ITE is predominantly centred on case studies of programs that prepare candidates for differences of race, culture, ability, and locality (see Deer, 2013; Katz, McCluskey & McCluskey, 2003; Mujawamariya & Mahrouse, 2004; Solomon & Daniel, 2009 as examples). Despite a growing interest in socially inclusive education in India, little has been published with respect to diversity education in ITE (Durga, 2008; Reddy & Manchala, 2008). Scholars from Bangladesh, Portugal, Turkey, Ghana, Spain, and China have recently published case studies; however, the literature on diversity education in ITE is predominantly from the United Kingdom, the United States, the Netherlands, Australia, Hong Kong, South Korea, and Israel. In all cases, comparative international researchers reported that social, political, and economic context are integral to shaping views of inclusion and diversity education (Bar-Shalom, Diab & Rousseau, 2008; Deering, 1997; Leeman & Reid, 2006; Mills, 2008; OECD, 2010; Young, 1995).

A sizeable amount of North American literature examines institutional commitments to diversity, the perspectives of a single group of ITE actors on programming, or suggestions for program design. Research has focused on the experiences of candidates in a single course (Brown, 2004; Dudley-Marling, 2013), on the connections candidates make between their program and their field experiences (Deer, 2013), or on particular content such as the impact of
identity education in ITE on LGBQT teacher candidates (Sumara, 2007) or anti-racist indigenous education on non-aboriginal candidates (Schick & St. Denis, 2005).

Yet research on whole program approaches to the integration of diversity education in ITE from multiple perspectives is limited. Particularly absent are studies that combine all three dimensions: institutional commitments, program structure, and the experiences of participants. When this does occur, as in case studies by Cochran-Smith (2004), McDonald (2005), Scholefield (2006), and Tatto (1996), the authors concur that the process of implementing diversity education in ITE is tension laden. In this section, I discuss research on diversity education in ITE through two Canadian, one American, and three comparative international teacher education studies.

Levine-Rasky (1998) investigated teacher candidates’ experiences in an urban Ontario ITE program that was committed to preparing teachers for social change in elementary schooling. The program did not offer specific courses on diversity education. She focused on why, despite supportive policies at the institutional level, beginning teachers had insufficient skills to negotiate social difference in their practicums and personal/professional understandings. In her analysis, she found that the barrier was partly due to hidden tensions between what ITE hoped to achieve through equity and diversity policies and the operations and design of teacher education. The program itself had long-established beliefs about teachers' understandings of difference, but it was falling short of its goals because it had not reformed institutional practices such as staffing, evaluation, and curriculum. Therefore, candidates who were unwilling to change their beliefs, as well as those seeking to actualize social change, were unable to so in the current program structure. Her study reinforces the need for research in ITE to consider what the authentic spaces are for supporting candidates to become social change actors. Her study is rich in describing candidates' perspectives, but her explanation of ITE policy on social change is less developed. This leads to questions in my own study of how ITE articulates diversity education for social change in discourse as well as in teacher educator practice.

Scholefield's (2006) study of a Canadian international teacher education program’s approach to diversity education from the perspective of policy, teacher candidates, teacher educators, and associate teachers shows the importance of context. The goal of the program was to better prepare candidates for diversity in Canadian classrooms by having them live and teach
in another country. The program included a semester in Canada and an off-campus semester in either Tobago or Mexico. Although the curriculum content focused on postcolonial discourses, Scholefield found that the program reinforced colonial patterns by having student teachers come in for short periods of teaching at marginalized schools. The Canadian candidates were seen as privileged entering into a marginalized context to learn. Some of the local citizens did not see themselves being able to either benefit from the content or be considered as equal to the visiting Canadians. In other cases, the local school children took risks by opening up to candidates and fostered an attachment that was then severed when candidates left. In a way, the program re-established colonial practices through its pedagogical choices to have candidates learn about ‘others’ by entering into their communities. Also, none of the communities were places that candidates would return to and none of the mentor associates from the schools were able to come to Canada. Schoefield’s work is one of the few in the field that call into question the morality of diversity education in ITE. Scholefield adds to an area of need in the literature by providing research that considers how program and pedagogical choices align not only with the intentions of the program, but also serves the needs of the local community.

McDonald's (2005) comparative ITE study addresses the tensions between program structure and practice, particularly in relation to the integration and content of diversity education, and candidates’ sense of preparedness. She explored two US elementary ITE programs—SJSU and Miller—focusing on how these programs approached equity and social justice education across courses and field placements. As in my own study, she compared institutions that varied in organizational context and program design. Based on surveys, ITE course observations, and candidate interviews, McDonald found that even though social justice and equity were clearly identified in program policy and faculty beliefs, the program’s abilities to help teacher candidates actualize their commitment to these objectives varied. Program and teacher educator choices hindered candidates in learning about equity and social justice in three ways: the program’s emphasis on conceptual tools rather than practical tools, the emphasis on some groups over others, and the limited discussions. For example, the SJSU candidates learned about English language learners in their course but never had the opportunity to work with or meet these students in their field placements. The Miller program, on the other hand, offered diversity education across its program as well as a specialized course on the needs of ELLs. In this course, candidates were able to make connections between theory and practice. They
reported feeling more confident in their abilities to take up the work in their future practice, signaling the importance of dedicated space for applying diversity education in ITE to practice.

McDonald also found that, across all the courses, more attention was given to ELLs and less to other populations like special needs students. The disproportionate attention to some groups left gaps in raising conceptual and practical awareness of social identities that face social justice and equity challenges in education. At both sites, even when “awareness” teaching was taking place, the candidates were limited in the degree to which they could engage in political debate of issues or see how information translated into their own practice. Even though opportunities are created within ITE, teacher educator actions can constrain possibilities for student engagement in higher order thinking.

Despite the programs shared mandates to address diversity and equity, the candidates' interpretation of working with diverse populations differed based on how the content was framed—in this case, through anti-oppression and second language education. In their view, the former reinforced their responsibility for students’ rights and being cognizant of how learners are treated in the system. The latter developed their skills on how to adapt instruction for learners. The programs also had different models for integrating diversity education, with one program infusing concepts across several courses, retreats, and field placements, and the other relegating the majority of content to a single Multicultural Education course and field placements. The across-program integration enabled candidates to see the pervasiveness of social justice and diversity in curriculum, practice, and theoretical choices.

Overall, McDonald found that candidate’s beliefs were impacted by the way programs interpreted diversity education in professional foundations, course content, and practice teaching opportunities. The degree to which foundations, content and field placements aligned corresponded to how candidates defined their confidence with particular social groups in their future classrooms. However, her study, although very rich, did not consider the relationship between teacher educators’ beliefs and their classroom practices, a key aspect of studying whole program approaches. Her study also did not account for the contextual factors of researching diversity education practices in a particular region of the US. In response, essential to this study are questions about the relationship between beliefs and practice, as well the influence of sociocultural context on ITE.
Research on stand-alone courses in diversity education has demonstrated that these courses vary in the types of interactions and experiences of diversity. Some pedagogies increase candidates’ diversity awareness and challenge their beliefs on inclusion, whereas others have less promising outcomes (Sharma et al., 2009; Brown, 2004; Niyozov, Pluim, & Macdonald, 2014). Brown (2004), for example, studied candidates’ experiences of a cultural diversity course at a US-based ITE program. The course was a required part of the curriculum, and was held in four concurrent sections, each taught by a different instructor. Collectively, the four instructors agreed on a list of core texts to choose from as part of their lessons. Brown then divided the participants into two groups. The instructors in the first group used passive participant pedagogy that offered limited interaction with diversity beyond texts or class discussion. For example, they taught histories of oppression or culture by showing candidates a video and then asking them to complete a worksheet on the role of culture in the classroom. The second set of participants took part in a more active pedagogy that included community field placements, experiential activities, and collaborative inquiry. The candidates also watched videos to learn about oppression but then interviewed and researched the history and contemporary realities of an ethnic culture in teams. Brown found that the active participants had richer and more meaningful ITE experiences. They were readily involved in classroom activities and saw them favorably. She also found that the less engaged candidates exhibited hostility and resistance to diversity education, and that they disengaged from the course by not completing readings. From her analysis of candidates’ reactions, the passive curriculum did not make equally substantial gains in raising awareness of diversity and social inclusion. Brown’s inquiry joins others in offering insight into the deep impact instructors' pedagogical choices have on candidates' experiences in a program (Gay, 2010; Gulati, 2013; Gupta, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2011; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). Her research is limited in that it relies on participant self-reporting, the agreed course syllabus, and survey responses rather than on observations or reactions to practices within courses.

Studies in the field of international comparative research have documented policies of inclusion in teacher education, the success and failure of components in ITE programs, and ITE candidates’ attitudes to aspects of diversity. Sharma, Forlin, and Loreman (2008) used surveys to research candidates' reactions in Hong Kong, Canada, Australia, and Singapore to two different
methods of integrating diversity education in ITE—stand-alone courses and infusion models. They found that both methods were effective in addressing candidates concerns with implementing inclusion in classrooms; the ITE “content and pedagogy of a programme are by far the most significant predictors of candidates' attitudes, sentiments and concerns about inclusion” (p. 783). The candidates who reported the most positive attitudes toward students with disabilities, and the greatest comfort working with them, were in ITE programs that addressed their individual concerns and encouraged connections to the community. As the authors explain:

Pre-service teachers who come into direct and systematic contact with persons with disabilities designed to enhance an understanding of various disabling conditions, are aware of local policies and legislation supporting inclusion and complete assignments dealing directly with their concerns are more likely to feel positive about including students with disabilities in their classrooms compared with their counterparts who lack such an education. (Sharma et al., 2008, p. 783)

The Canadian program in the study offered an infusion model and was the only one that did not provide opportunities for candidates to engage with the community directly. Although these candidates voiced confidence in the program, they felt insufficiently prepared to implement inclusive education in their classrooms.

Programs in my own study offer various approaches, including infusion and single course models of diversity education. Pertinent to this study is my use of candidates’ perceptions to comparatively explore the impact of diversity education and components in programs. As Sharma and colleagues suggest, perception feedback can provide insight into what aspects of programming could be improved within and across contexts.

Sharma et al. also found distinctly Eastern and Western attitudes to inclusion. They speculated that the difference was due to cultural context, absence or evidence of policies on inclusion, and the state’s position on including all learners in public education. Canada and India were reported as having equal status in terms of legislated commitments to equity and inclusion. The challenge of their research is that they did not observe classroom practices, thereby missing both formal and informal opportunities to study the tensions educators face in supporting candidates that have differing views of inclusion and a range of comforts with disability education.

---

23 Infusion refers to the integration of diversity education across courses and/or assignments in ITE.
Inbaraj, Kumar, Samili, and Scott-Baumann (2003) did a comparative case study of global education-focused ITE programs in three countries—England, Kenya, and India. They found that the program in England, although it provided more policy attention to global citizenship education, was lagging behind in ITE practices in comparison to its counterparts in Kenya and India. The authors concurred that the Indian inquiry-based pedagogies were very well-received by candidates and students. The Indian teacher educators helped the candidates focus on an issue of interest such as gender representations in textbooks or gender roles in the home. The candidates then explored the issue with students in their practicum placements. They designed sensitizing activities for the students and, in the process, learned how to translate one of the program’s goals into practice: helping candidates increase their students' awareness.

At the same time, the Indian coordinator reported that the candidates felt limited by the over-representation of gender in the program. The program’s focus was determined by the teacher educators and was in line with national policies. The candidates felt it was “outdated” and ignored other inequities in Indian society. The Indian context also exhibited “the least modesty” (least reservations) of the three countries in terms of addressing controversial issues in the classroom. Particularly insightful for this study are teacher educators’ strategies to help candidates connect diversity education in ITE to the school context. Also relevant are candidates’ responses to narrowed views of social inequities in society.

Sharma and colleagues (2009) study of ITE candidates in South India found that, midway in their pre-service programs, the candidates exhibited slightly negative, ambiguous, and apprehensive attitudes toward social inclusion in their future classrooms. However, exceptions were found with candidates who had family members with disabilities or experiences teaching children with disabilities. This reinforces the importance of exposure to communities as part of diversity education. Like Brown’s study, Sharma et al. found that meaningful connections with community members contribute to a greater sense of confidence and comfort with diversity. Once again, candidates’ beliefs shape understandings of effective components in ITE.

Attitudes are often used as an indicator of candidates' willingness to address diversity and inclusion in their classrooms. A recent Canadian study by Kitchen and Bellini (2012) on pre-
service teachers' attitudes towards inclusion of LGBQT identities reported that the candidates did not necessarily have negative attitudes toward these students, but felt uncertain how to incorporate relevant content into their future curriculum. This uncertainty can be compounded when perspectives on a social identity like LGBQT clash with the “doctrinal interpretations held by [candidates’] own communities” (Huerta & Flemmer, 2005). In Sharma’s 2006 study, the program content and pedagogy were seen as significant in changing and improving attitudes. However, in Canada, candidates are reported as “difference-blind” and unaware of the barriers to education facing some groups in the Canadian context (Levine-Rasky, 2000; St. Denis & Schick, 2003; Solomon & Daniel, 2007; Wane, 2003). Studies in both countries indicate that candidates’ experiences and attitudes are critical to how candidates interpret diversity education in ITE.

Comparative studies also offer insight on the conditions impacting teacher educators’ willingness to address diversity education in their ITE courses. Santos-Rego and Nieto (2000) examined orientations to multicultural/intercultural education in teacher education programs in Spain and the United States. Both countries have reforms targeting the challenges of diversity and social inclusion in their education systems. The authors reported that although policy movements in both countries confirmed the need for skills and knowledge associated with diversity education, the policy changes posed a challenge for teacher educators. For example, Santos-Rego explains that Spain is slowly accepting multiculturalism as part of its plurality. Somewhat like India, Spain struggles simultaneously with “co-existence and conflict.” Although some social identities have been accepted as the fabric of society, the country remains regionally divided. As populations move and the community sees itself as democratically and inter-regionally bonded, teachers and teacher educators are resocialized. In the United States on the other hand, where immigration has shifted demographics and impacted present views of plurality, the movement is from “assimilation towards inclusion.” However, according to Nieto, ITE is a slow responder to the needs of pluralist education systems. She sees the US commitments as “superficial add-on” courses. Teacher educators still fear addressing contentious issues within programs and avoid presenting schools as sites of inequity. Both countries are teaching only the “most concerned or interested” teachers equity-focused diversity education,

---

24 Ontario teachers have the legislated responsibility to affirm and protect the rights of students with different sexual orientations.
leaving the rest behind. The authors also signal a larger tension between diversity education and the broader purpose of ITE in general.

Santos-Rego and Nieto (2000) argue that although teacher education research and policy calls for changes in education, ITE practice is lagging: “In both the United States and Spain, specific initiatives have focused on raising sensitivity rather than challenged [programs] to transform pedagogy.” (p. 424). Moreover, Santos-Rego and Nieto question the lack of critical or social justice focus in ITE. Mills' (2008) comparative literature review of Australian and international research also supports Santos-Rego and Nieto’s conclusion. Mills argues that simple renditions of diversity education such as “human relations or democratic education” hinder diversity policies and responses to social needs. In his view, both fail to examine issues of privilege and inequity in society.

Repeatedly cited in the US literature is the argument that tokenistic or uncritical forms of diversity education in ITE can lead to beginning teachers practising the same forms in their own classrooms (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Gorski, 2010; Nieto, 2008; Shor, 1992; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This connection is not substantiated by practical evidence and requires longitudinal research on novice teacher practice. However, the question of how programs adopt and experience diversity education in less than tokenistic ways is relevant to the aims of this study. Inquiry into policy and practice can help move discussions away from arguments about “ITE’s failure to provide adequate diversity education” to more nuanced understandings of the motivations, decision-making processes, constraints, and tensions facing actors in diversity education. My research joins a line of inquiry on how ITE can support the development of diversity educators who bring affirming views of diversity and social change to education.

Conclusion

A growing number of theoretical and empirical studies are expanding understandings of diversity education in teacher education programs, particularly how policy and practice unfolds within ITE. Research from international scholars indicates that diversity education in ITE has relevance in multiple contexts. My own study interrogates Canadian and Indian perspectives, adding scholarship to a field that has rarely given parallel consideration to diversity education in ITE in these two contexts. I focus on how two programs’ conceptualizations, structures, content
and pedagogy define their approach. I also relate these dimensions to other programs in the region and abroad.

Sleeter and Grant’s five approaches offer a springboard from which to consider the many ways diversity education can be defined in ITE. The authors demonstrate how distinct views of diversity, social inclusion, and curriculum are embedded within each approach. The five approaches are also a valuable reference point for how I envisioned the two programs conceptualizing their own efforts. As I conducted the literature review, I was also mindful of the potential for other orientations to occur within the programs. I noted that policy, sociopolitical context, teacher learning models, professional knowledge and images of the diversity educator also influence diversity education in ITE.

This literature review reinforced my belief that diversity education in ITE is complex and can be integrated in many ways within a program. Policy, program design and components may dictate where and to what degree diversity education is located in ITE. Admissions processes, faculty complement, and the nature of partnership inform the types of learning opportunities and supports available. Evident within the literature is the possibility for diversity education to be seen as a substantive and pervasive feature of ITE.

Further, the literature review demonstrated that ITE curriculum is intertwined with broader concepts of access, equity, and equality in education. These concepts can inform both program content and the intentions of diversity education in ITE. The available literature posits that through diversity education, teacher candidates learn to bring about change in the experiences of learners, their attitudes towards others and in some cases societal reform. As a result, teacher educators can implement a range of experiential and analytical activities in their classrooms. The pedagogical choices in programs are influenced by many factors including teacher educators’ understandings of diversity education, the available resources, and the opportunities within programs. At the same time, candidates build understandings about diversity and their role as educators based on these activities.

The implementation of diversity education in ITE is not without challenges and tensions. Tensions can catalyze or hinder teacher learning and diversity education practice in ITE. They also shape the teaching and learning process—a process already informed by policy, attitudes, and perceptions of program readiness. For example, several studies showed that program
intentions do not always align with practice or vice-versa. Other studies suggest practices of including, accepting, or tolerating all students can pose challenges for the novice teacher. At times, critically oriented pedagogies create resistance and vulnerabilities that teacher educators need to consider how to address more concretely.

As well, many of the studies imply that ITE is struggling with a crowded ITE curriculum, competing priorities, and structural challenges that can impact diversity education. ITE is tasked with trying to make diversity education both conceptually and practically relevant for beginning teachers. The literature suggests this dual aim is not always apparent or achieved. Moreover, programs are also trying to negotiate diversity education within the broader purpose of teacher education in their specific contexts.

Although countries are responding to the call for preparing inclusive practitioners, little empirical data is available on ITE practices with respect to diversity education (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Gorski et al., 2013; OECD, 2010). Therefore, this research informs understandings, from multiple ITE actors perspectives, of how diversity education is engaged in programs. This study can also make an important contribution to capturing local and cross-national perspectives on diversity education in initial teacher education.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY:

EXPLORING TEACHER EDUCATION IN TWO WORLDS

This study investigates how initial teacher education programs in India and Canada prepare teachers for diversity education in elementary schooling. Based on qualitative case studies of three programs in each country, the research explores the following (sub)questions:

1. How are diversity and diversity education conceptualized in ITE programs?
2. How is diversity education addressed in the structure of ITE programs?
3. What is the pedagogy of diversity education in ITE programs?
4. What are the challenges of diversity education in ITE programs?

In this chapter, I present the design and methodology of the study. As the aim is to capture experiences of diversity education in two regions of the world, I begin by describing the methods I used from comparative international research. In terms of the overall design, I conducted the research in two phases. In the first phase, I visited two ITE sites that became my primary cases—Rani College at Sahara University in India and the Glebe Cohort at Stanton University in Canada. In the second phase, I visited two additional sites in each country—Forefathers University and the River Institute in India, and Baldwin University and Thomson University in Canada. These four sites became the secondary cases of my study. Through interviews and a review of program documents, I explored the significance of diversity education at each site from the perspective of ITE policy and actors. At the primary sites, I also conducted observations to investigate more deeply how diversity education is enacted and experienced by the participants.

In the second section of the chapter, I explain how I selected the ITE programs and study participants from each country. The third section describes the types of data I collected and the process I followed, and the fourth section discusses the data analysis. The analysis occurred at three points: after the primary site visits, after the secondary site visits, and after initial reporting. Collecting and analyzing the data were iterative processes; I went in and out of the field over a period of 2-years. In the fifth section, I discuss the ethics and validity of the research and, in the final section, the limitations of the study. The limitations transpired because of the complexity of
the research design and the logistical constraints of researching ITE in two parts of the world. The discussion includes how I learned to adjust the research design to meet the goals of producing a qualitative, comparative, international study. In the end, the study is a personal and professional journey of growth, complexity, and new understandings.

**Comparative International Case Study Methodology**

I designed my study to allow for depth and breadth of inquiry. Researching the curriculum and pedagogy of diversity education at the primary sites enabled me to see how ITE programs locate issues of diversity and social inclusion in their program visions, how teacher educators put diversity education into practice, and how candidates experience their learning. Comparing diversity education in ITE within each region allowed me to expand the focus and explore how programs differ in their goals, content, and structure. Finally, comparing the two countries enabled me to see how expectations of diversity educators as social change agents are similar and differ in both contexts, as well as how these expectations shape pedagogy and experiences.

By grounding my research in comparative international case study methods, I was able to join other scholars (Baveja & Shukla, 2003; Joshee, 2003; Singh, M., 2013) in seeing Eastern and Western cultures as having distinct views of education stemming from their respective histories and cultural values. India’s approach to diversity and social inclusion in education is different from Western approaches. In India, education focuses on overcoming societal divisions, building community, recognizing human rights, providing equal access to education, and what Ghai (2008) refers to as “celebrating the human potential.” In Canada, the approach can be described as appreciating diversity, increasing solidarity of groups, and redressing social inequalities through charity and social justice. The historical differences are based on varying experiences of colonial rule, immigration, and the time periods in which they became democracies. By locating the study in one of the most diverse regions in each country and analyzing the participants’ discourse on diversity education, my research brings out these international differences. However by focusing on initial teacher education, I centre the study in a common denominator between both countries—the preparation of professionals who have the potential to influence and maintain diversity and social inclusion in education.
The design of my study also allows me to disrupt the dominance of Western theory, policy, and practice in education. Research on diversity education and teacher education, though changing, remains situated in Euro-Western contexts and overshadows the intellectual and cultural contributions of countries like India (Crossley, 2000; Stephens, 2009). Sourcing Indian perspectives on diversity and teacher education is therefore important to identifying models of diversity education derived from and applicable to a local culture, and also to understanding how these models are tied to unique forms of pluralism and democracy.

The challenge to universalism also applies within the two countries (Khoi, 1992). Not only is Canada unique within the global West, but Ontario is also distinct from other regions in the country. Ontario has the most rapidly changing cultural demographic in the country, the second largest economy, and the largest number of schools. In spanning multiple sites, my research brings out definitions and practices of diversity education that are derived from local ITE policies, curriculum, and participants in each country.

I used case study methodology to explore diversity education in each of the six programs. Case studies are both a process and a product of inquiry (Newby, 2010). They are an appropriate methodology when the objective is “to develop a better understanding of the dynamics in a program” (Merriam, 1998, p. 39). According to Merriam (2009), case study research focuses on a particular situation, program, or phenomenon; provides contextually detailed descriptions; and promotes new understandings and meanings. In the next paragraphs, I discuss how my case study design is comparative, multiple, qualitative, context-bound, instrumental, and descriptive.

Bray, Adamson, and Mason (2007) outline three models of comparative international case study design. The first model compares two locations equally; each is given the same amount of attention throughout the research and reporting. The second model places a primary site at the heart of the study, which is then juxtaposed with other sites. The third model involves multiple locations with equal weight, an approach typically found in large-scale comparative international education studies. To capture a more complete picture of diversity education in each context, I used a hybrid of the first and second models. By building comparisons at both the international level (India and Canada) and the intranational level (within India and Canada), I create each country as a multiple case study that includes an in-depth exploration of a primary site and a shorter exploration of two secondary sites. Figure 3.1 shows how I designed the
research to compare two multiple case studies of diversity education within and across national contexts.

In Figure 1, the international cases (Multiple Cases 1 and 2) are divided by the dotted line. The cross-case comparisons between these two sites are indicated by the red arrow. Within each Multiple Case is a three box cluster and these boxes represent the programs in each region. The blue arrows indicate the possibilities for intranational comparisons between these cases.

**Figure 1. Research design.**

Each of the six case studies is grounded in qualitative research methods. Qualitative methods offer a holistic and naturalistic approach to “examining entire social entities such as schools or communities at many levels and along many dimensions” (Fairbrother, 2007, p. 43). In my study, I examined different dimensions of diversity education through the experiences and
beliefs of the participants in each program, as well as through the various program policies, admissions, and structures. The opportunity to spend time in several institutions in each country, observe the environment, and dialogue with members of the community allowed me to see the programs in action at multiple levels.

Qualitative methods in comparative international studies require that researchers spend significant time in each context (Adamson, 2012; Alexander, 2009). Although I had spent several 4-month periods in India over the previous 10 years as a visitor and worker, I still needed time to immerse myself in the culture of teacher education. The four visits I made to India during the research phase of my study were each 1 to 2 months in length. The visits enabled me to spend time at the three sites and understand local practices of difference and diversity. In Canada, I spent nearly 3 months at the primary site and then had several day trips to each of the secondary sites.

I bounded the context of my research in two ways—first, at the individual program level (who is involved and what is taught) and second, at the regional level. At the program level, the actors within each institution—administrators, teacher educators, candidates, associate schools, and program partners—play a significant role in framing diversity education. At the regional level, certification requirements stipulate the criteria and curriculum of ITE programs. Each case study presents a unique learning context defined by what is inside as well as outside each program.

I used an instrumental case study approach in my research. This means the various ITE programs are secondary to understanding how diversity education is part of pre-service training for teachers. In intrinsic cases the sites are chosen for their exemplary representation of a particular aspect (Stake, 2006). However, the two approaches can overlap in the same study (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006). In my research design, the primary sites satisfy intrinsic criteria that clearly orient them to diversity education. However, I did not choose the programs as exemplary cases to study, but rather as illustrations of different approaches with a declared commitment to diversity education in ITE.

Yielding rich and descriptive cases requires both a structured and flexible research approach. My data collection methods were analogous across the primary and secondary sites respectively, thereby providing consistency in the study. However, when necessary, I adapted my
research strategy to strengthen my understanding of diversity education or the particularities of an ITE program. For example, at the primary site in India, I observed a course requirement in the partner schools that gave me a better sense of the context in which the program was operating.

The multi-tiered design of my study yields detailed and comparative results on diversity education in ITE. By investigating several programs, I gain a holistic view of the forms of teacher preparation operating in each country as well as a detailed view of the perspectives of multiple stakeholders. I report my findings in two ways. In Chapters 5 and 6, I present the primary case studies of Rani College in India and the Glebe Cohort in Canada respectively. In Chapter 7, I present a cross-case analysis that weaves together the data from the secondary sites to support, contrast, or extend findings from the primary sites.

Selection of Programs and Study Participants

The complexity of engaging in international multi-case research led to particularities in the recruitment and selection of the programs and participants for the study. In this section, I begin by outlining the selection of the programs. In the second part, I focus on the selection and recruitment of the participants—administrators, educators, and teacher candidates. I also discuss the challenges I faced in implementing my plans and how I modified my approach to the sample. My aim was to create a sample that would allow me to examine programs that engage in diversity education in ITE and capture the voices of those who manage, teach, and learn within them.

Selection of Programs

To ensure comparability across the two countries, I used criterion-based purposive sampling to select the programs. I sought programs in India and Canada that were:

1. based in tertiary institutions
2. located in the same region in each country
3. focused on ITE in elementary education
4. involved in diversity education

In India, the Northern Regional Committee of the National Council of Teacher Education (NRCNCTE) is responsible for recognizing and authenticating teacher education institutions in
the northern part of the country.\textsuperscript{25} Of the 4,500 recognized programs that prepare teachers for certification in this region, approximately 200 are in the Greater Delhi Area. Of these 200 programs, 45 certify teachers at the elementary level (NRCNTE list). By comparison, Canada has 55 institutions that prepare elementary and secondary teachers for certification in Canada, 18 of which are in Ontario (Ontario College of Teachers, 2012). At the outset of this study, I generated a list of possible institutions by reviewing public documents on initial teacher education programs and speaking with teacher education researchers in both countries. Ultimately, 23 programs (16 in Canada and 7 in India) fit my criteria of offering tertiary-level elementary initial teacher education.

After receiving ethical approval for the study, I emailed the 23 institutions to inquire about their possible involvement as primary or secondary sites. If requested, I sent follow up documents via hard copy (Appendix A to D). Of the 23 institutions, one in Canada and one in India sent timely responses accepting the invitation to be primary sites. A cursory review of public program guides and conversations with senior officials from each site confirmed that both sites had an explicit focus on diversity education at the elementary level. The senior officials also gave me open access to the programs, faculty, and candidates for the ITE academic year.

Two other institutions expressed interest in being primary sites in India; however, their program timelines did not coincide with my study, and the available cohorts did not have a dedicated elementary focus. In Canada, one other ITE program agreed to be a primary site. However, on further investigation, its commitment to diversity education in ITE was not as defined as its counterpart. In the end, I chose Stanton University in Canada and Sahara University in India as primary sites for their potential to speak to diversity education at various levels of their elementary ITE programs.

The secondary sites came from the same list of possible institutions as the primary sites. As requested in Canada, I sent a follow up letter to the deans and principals of these institutions in the spring and summer months to invite their involvement as secondary sites. In India, due to cultural practices, I more often delivered these letters by hand. Ultimately, four institutions—two in Canada and two in India—responded favorably to the invitation and were available during my

\textsuperscript{25} The Northern Regional Committee’s jurisdiction consists of the following areas: Chandigarh, Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, and Rajasthan.
Phase Two timeline. The four secondary sites did not necessarily have programs focused on diversity education, but did expect some attention to diversity education either through program policy or course offerings.

An unanticipated development occurred during my recruitment of programs. In Phase 1, I was competing in Canada with a large-scale government study on teacher education. Several institutions were also running self-studies for accreditation renewals. The self-study process requires faculty to engage in activities above and beyond their teaching load. The deans and principals felt that another teacher education study would have to wait, and thus three of the possible sites declined access and two sites requested I touch base prior to the next academic year.26

In the end, I was able to recruit six programs that met my sample criteria. The primary sites—Stanton University in Canada, and Sahara University in India—were recruited in Phase One of my data collection. The four secondary sites—Forefathers University and the River Institute in India, and Baldwin University and Thomson University in Canada—were recruited in Phase Two. Table 3 gives a summary of the six sites and the structure of their programs.27 Each of the programs offers diversity education as part of its policies and program offerings. Table 4 gives a brief description of each of the secondary sites. In preparation for the findings chapters, this table briefly includes profiles of each site and its focus on diversity education.28

---

26 I have chosen to further protect the anonymity of participants by not specifying the years in which data collection took place.

27 I have also chosen not to identify which (if any) of the participating universities offer online and/or technological education degrees as it would compromise their anonymity.

28 In this study, I do not devote separate sections to each of the secondary cases and plan to do so in future work. In Chapter 7, I integrate findings from these cases with those from Glebe and Rani. The secondary cases provide valuable insights on the regional context and neighbouring ITE programs commitments to diversity education.
Table 3

*Structure of the Six Participating ITE Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sahara University, Rani College (primary)</td>
<td>River, District Institute of Education India (secondary)</td>
<td>Forefathers University (secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Teacher Education Programs Offered</strong></td>
<td>Elementary Secondary</td>
<td>Nursery Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Teacher Candidates Admitted per year</strong></td>
<td>350+</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Teacher Educators</strong></td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Involved in the Study (length of program)</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor of Elementary Education (4 years)</td>
<td>Diploma of Elementary Teacher Education (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Practicum Days in Schools or Teaching Settings</strong></td>
<td>95+</td>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic ITE Program Structure</strong></td>
<td>Cohorts by program year</td>
<td>Diploma enrolment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Program Profiles of the Six Participating ITE Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sahara University, Rani College (primary)</td>
<td>River, District Institute of Education India (secondary)</td>
<td>Forefathers University (secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson University, Glebe Cohort (primary)</td>
<td>Thomson University (secondary)</td>
<td>Baldwin University (secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forefathers University (secondary)</td>
<td>Thomson University (secondary)</td>
<td>Baldwin University (secondary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program Values for Diversity and Social Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social change</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Social change</td>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sensitivity</td>
<td>Social sensitivity</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Selection of Diversity Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender; Contemporary India; Observing Children; Practicum; Self-development</td>
<td>Sociological Perspective of Education; Population Education</td>
<td>Women and Indian Society; Education and the Emerging Indian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School &amp; Society; Teacher Education Seminar; Across Subject Areas</td>
<td>Inclusive Education for General Cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Social Studies for General Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Diversity Education Integration Strategies and Other Program Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several Courses Workshops Dedicated Cohorts Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Two Courses Workshops Course offerings in Multiple languages Dedicated Cohorts</td>
<td>Two Courses Course offerings in Multiple languages Dedicated Cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several Courses Workshops Extracurricular Dedicated Cohorts</td>
<td>One Course Workshops Dedicated Cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Course Extracurricular Activities Dedicated Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of Participants

I used criterion-based sampling to select the program administrators, faculty, and teacher candidates for my study. These participants are major stakeholders in teacher education classrooms and shape understandings of the day-to-day program interactions. This section describes how I structured the sample and recruited the various participant groups. It also provides a brief overview of the participants from the primary and secondary sites.

Structure of participant sample

My first criteria was to select one senior official from each of the primary sites and one of the deans and principals from each of the secondary sites. I also sought at least 1 teacher educator from each site who was in a leadership position in the elementary ITE program. Senior administrators and lead teacher educators offer insight into the institutional capacities for diversity education and the forces shaping elementary ITE programming at each site.

Teacher educators are the link between program policy and practice. They provide insight into the delivery and experience of diversity education in a program. I included at least 6 teacher educators from each of the primary sites. This number reflected more than half of the core faculty at both Rani College in India and the Glebe Cohort in Canada. At each of the secondary sites, I recruited 4 to 6 teacher educators, all of whom were full-time members of the core faculty. At both the primary and secondary sites, I sought at least 1 instructor who was teaching a course focused on diversity education. I identified diversity related courses from the program guides using key words from Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) typology of approaches to diversity education such as: diversity, (in)equity, equality, societal context of education, empowerment, inclusion, sensitivity, identity, society, communication, diverse learners, social identities (e.g., gender, class), respect, and acceptance.

At the primary sites, my aim was to select teacher educators who were subject specialists and foundations instructors with a range of expertise in the program. I also intended to select educators who had worked in the school system or were experienced with contemporary schooling. However, the Indian culture of teacher education does not require teacher educators to be classroom practitioners and I quickly learned that it is rare to find ITE instructors there who have actual classroom teaching experience. In Canada, it is more common to find faculty who
are experienced school teachers. Many ITE programs hire or second teachers from the school system to join the faculty for a period of time. Ultimately, I decided the criterion of classroom experience was a benefit but not essential.

I also sought at least 6 teacher candidates from each site. The candidates had to be registered in programs leading to elementary school teaching. They were selected based on their interest in the study and their mix of ages, genders, and backgrounds. Overall, the sample of teacher candidates is small, but provides a snapshot of candidate experiences of diversity education in ITE.

**Recruitment of participants**

The recruitment procedures tended to be the same at each site, with some variation for cultural norms or permissions. I recruited all participants via information letters (Appendix B to F). At the primary sites, I gave information sessions to the teacher candidates to explain the nature of my study and my presence in their ITE classrooms. The senior administrators provided phone numbers or access to electronic listserves to help me contact various groups. In India, the norm is to hand deliver letters rather than send them by email. At the primary sites, access to teacher candidates and teacher educators came through the program coordinators rather than through the senior administrators. At Rani College and the Canadian secondary sites, I was also permitted to post recruitment flyers on announcement boards and in student lounges. On receiving a response, I followed up to provide more information about the study, discuss any questions, and schedule interview times. All the participants signed consent forms.

At Rani, I first contacted the senior administrator of the program. She agreed to be a part of the study. I then contacted 11 of the 19 teacher educators on the list provided by the program coordinator. The 11 were either core instructors teaching several courses in the program or teaching components related to diversity education. Seven responded favorably to my invitation. I followed up with each of the 7 respondents in person, provided information letters, answered questions, and finalized involvement in the study. Of the seven, 1 teacher educator did not complete the interviews and so was withdrawn.

I hand delivered the information and consent letters to the Indian secondary sites (Appendix E and F). At Forefathers, 10 faculty were identified by the principal as possible teacher educator participants, four of whom agreed to be part of the study. Due to the timing of
my research, I could only contact teacher educators who were available on the day of my site visits. At the River Institute, I was able to deliver letters to all of the 8 core faculty identified by the principal, 6 of whom volunteered to participate.

The Rani program is a 4-year degree. I therefore adjusted the sample to include at least 2 candidates from each year of the program. The candidates were recruited through voluntary information sessions and completed background sheets (Appendix G). Out of the 20 candidates who expressed interest, I selected 8 participants. I later added 1 more participant because she represented the Hindi speaking population—a group that was underrepresented in the original sample. This brought the total number of Rani candidate participants to 9.

At Forefathers, the teacher educators participating in the research gave me the opportunity to announce my study in their B.Ed. and Master's courses. In total, I canvassed more than 70 candidates this way. I informed them of focus group times and responded to questions. Thirteen candidates from Forefathers attended the focus groups—8 in the first session, and 5 in the second.

I recruited the River candidates through a similar process. The teacher educators made announcements about my research and the focus group times in their courses. I was available to answer candidates' questions. Eight out of the 60 candidates I canvassed volunteered to attend the focus group sessions.

In Canada, I first contacted the Stanton senior administrator. She provided me with an overview of the eight elementary cohorts at the university and the names of the coordinators of each one. She also became a participant in the study. I then emailed the coordinators of the three cohorts that had diversity or social inclusion listed as part of their program focus. Out of the three cohorts, the Glebe coordinators expressed interest in the study and gave me access to the cohort's faculty and candidates. Next, I contacted the 10 teacher educators listed as core instructors in the cohort, 8 of whom volunteered to be part of the study.

The Stanton candidates were more difficult to recruit. Some said they had “so much on their plate” that they could not participate. In time, however, 7 of the 75 candidates in the cohort indicated their interest in the study. One candidate withdrew her participation because of time, leaving a total of 6 participants.
At the secondary sites in Canada, I was able to access the entire elementary teacher candidate and teacher educator pool through electronic listserves. However, for the most part, I had a poor response rate in both programs. At Baldwin, I had difficulty recruiting teacher educators. Despite the fact that the administration had sent my letter to the total teacher educator population, only 5 teacher educators out of a pool of approximately 70 responded favourably. At Thomson, my letter was also sent by the administration, but I received responses from only four out of the 60 faculty. At Baldwin, 5 teacher candidates responded to my electronic posting. At Thomson, 6 candidates responded. Each listserve reached approximately 600 candidates, half of whom were enrolled in elementary ITE programs.

In the end, more than 70 participants generously contributed their time to my research, half of whom—16 in India and 15 in Canada—were from the primary sites. Tables 5 and 6 provide an overview of the participants from Rani College in India. Tables 7 and 8 provide an overview of the participants from the Glebe Cohort in Canada.
Table 5
Program Director and Teacher Educator Participants from Rani College, India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Social Identity</th>
<th>Qualification (highest degree)</th>
<th>Class I–XII Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Prior Teacher Educator Expertise</th>
<th>Years with the Program</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indu</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Social Psychology)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes—School leader</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopa</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters (Arts)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayatri</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Mathematics)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—In-service trainer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeraj</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate (Philosophy of Education)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophy of Education and Foundations Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrinda (withdrawn)</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters (Education)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Literacy and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadhaka</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female Regional Minority</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Disability Studies)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social Foundations and Communication Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidya</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes—Teacher trainer in multiple contexts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmi</td>
<td>Teacher Educator and Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters (Education)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Psychology and Practicum Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All names in the study are pseudonyms.
Table 6
*Teacher Candidate Participants from Rani College, India*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>English or Hindi Medium Education Prior to B.El.Ed.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender Identification</th>
<th>Self-Identified as a Minority (Visible or Invisible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janvi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender, language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (scheduled caste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavleen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (reservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender, language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meenal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajani</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (gender)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
*Program Director and Teacher Educator Participants from the Glebe Cohort, Canada*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Social Identity</th>
<th>Qualification (highest degree)</th>
<th>Grade 1 to 12 Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Years with the Program</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Prior Teacher Educator Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Director of Elementary Initial Teacher Education</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Curriculum)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>Yes – School Leader, Teacher Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Male Minority</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate (Curriculum)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>School Leader, In-service Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female Minority</td>
<td>Masters (Education)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Board Leader, In-service Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate (Curriculum)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical and Health Education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Teacher Educator and Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Male Minority</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate (Curriculum)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Language Arts and Foundation Courses</td>
<td>School Leader, In-service Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Masters (Education)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>In-service Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Psychology)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Philosophy)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Social Foundations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Female Minority</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Math)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>In-service Educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Teacher Candidate Participants from the Glebe Cohort, Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender Identification</th>
<th>Self-Identified as a Minority (Visible or Invisible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (ethnicity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (ethnicity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (ethnicity, religious minority [within ITE program only])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Minority (dietary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisha</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minority (ethnicity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of participants from the primary sites

The data in the teacher educator tables provides basic background information on the participants, their qualifications, their number of years with the program, and their teaching experience in the school system. A strength of the teacher educator sample from the primary sites is that the participants include a mix of early and later career professionals. I defined later career professionals as having more than 3 years at a particular site. Teacher educators develop their expertise on how to “teach teachers” within an ITE context (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013). The more seasoned teacher educators provided insight into their program practices had shaped over time. They were also able to explain the history of diversity education in each site. The newer instructors also offer insight into the challenges they face in enacting diversity education alongside learning to become teacher educators.

The teacher candidate pools varied from site to site. The two tables on teacher candidates indicate basic profile information, prior schooling (India only), and the candidates’ ages. Overall the candidates at the primary sites represented a range of identities. The 9 teacher candidates from Sahara University in India were enrolled in a bilingual program; they had attended either English-medium or Hindi-medium schooling before entering the program. They also identified their religious affiliations as either Hindu or Sikh, which positioned them as belonging to the
dominant religious cultures in India. They all felt they experienced marginalization based on their gender. Two also stated that they had entered the program under reservation policies.

In Canada, only 1 of the 6 candidate participants from the Glebe Cohort was male. The candidates' ages ranged from early 20s to late 40s. Samantha was the only participant who did not identify as either a visible or invisible minority in Canadian society. Karen identified as a religious minority within the program because of the branch of Christianity that she practises. Preston identified as a vegetarian, which he saw as a personal experience of difference. The remaining candidates identified as minorities based on their ethnicity.

**Overview of participants from the secondary sites**

The participants from the secondary sites were quite different from those from the primary sites. I interviewed 20 teacher educators from the secondary sites. All 6 of the teacher educators from the River Institute in India held master's degrees in their subject specializations and 4 held two or three graduate degrees including a Masters of Education. One of the participants held a doctorate and also had school teaching experience. The teacher educators had been teaching in the program for 1 to 6 years.

The Forefathers teacher educators had doctorates in education or in their subject specializations. Four of the five held Bachelor of Education degrees and two had been Class I to Class XII classroom teachers. One participant had been teaching in the Forefathers program for more than 15 years. The remaining 4 had been with the program for less than 5 years, however they had senior leadership and teacher education experience from other contexts.

In Canada, the 4 teacher educators from Baldwin were full-time faculty at the university. They all held doctorates in education and 3 of the 4 had taught in K–12 classrooms. The Thomson participants included 2 school practitioners, 1 of whom was teaching in a diversity

---

29 Their religious affiliations became relevant in discussions of the socialization in India that inculcates a fear of Muslims.

30 The reservation system is an affirmative action policy that admits constitutionally protected populations such as scheduled caste, tribal, or a religious minorities into programs. Their entry requirements differ (e.g., lower fees, lower qualification marks) from the general population.

31 This number reflects teacher education in Canada at the elementary level, which tends to be female dominated. Crocker and Dibbon's (2008) research on Canadian ITE programs showed that three times as many females as males enrol in, and graduate from, initial teacher education programs.
education dedicated cohort. He was a vice-principal and had a master's degree. The 3 full-time faculty were diversity education course instructors and 1 was a foundations instructor. All 3 had doctorates in education and had been affiliated with the program from 4 to 10 years.

At the secondary sites in India, 23 teacher candidates participated in the study. Ten were from the River Institute. Six of the 10 were in their first year of the program and the remaining 4 were in their second year. The River sample was divided equally in terms of gender, with 5 men and 5 women. Two of the candidates identified as religious minorities. They were all between 19 and 22 years old. The Forefathers teacher candidates were older and had entered the program with undergraduate degrees. The Forefathers sample consisted of 13 candidates—5 men and 8 women. The average age of the B.Ed. candidates was 21. The M.Ed. candidates were in their late 20s or early 30s. Nine of the Forefathers candidates identified as religious minorities in India, a higher ratio than at the other ITE sites in my study.

The teacher candidate sample from the Canadian secondary sites was smaller and consisted of 11 participants. The 5 Thomson candidates ranged in age from 20 to 50. Three were embarking on teaching careers after a number of years in other professions. Four identified as visible ethnic minorities, and 1 was male. The 6 Baldwin candidates had recently completed their undergraduate degrees. They were between 20 and 25 years old. Three were studying in a diversity education dedicated ITE cohort at the elementary level.

The recruitment and selection processes were complex and required minor adjustments to accommodate the realities of conducting research at six distinct sites. The final number of primary site participants matched the envisioned sample, whereas the number of participants from the secondary sites was slightly smaller than anticipated. Although the participants are a small sample of the total teacher educator and candidate populations from each site, they provide powerful insights into the vision, pedagogy, and experiences of diversity education in their ITE programs.

**Data Collection**

My data collection spanned a period of 20 consecutive months. I divided the period into two phases of field work. In each phase, I had to adjust to various academic schedules, secure institutional approval at multiple sites, and ensure that the participants had experienced several
months of their program. In Phase One, the field work involved visiting the primary sites in each country. I spent 6 weeks in India and 7 weeks in Canada. In Phase Two, the field work involved visiting the secondary sites—two in each country. I spent a total of 6 days at each site.

This section describes the types of data I collected and the process I used. My data collection at the two primary sites included individual interviews, observations, and document analysis. My data collection at the secondary sites involved focus group interviews, individual interviews, and document analysis. Table 9 gives an overview of the data collection in Phase One and Table 10 gives an overview of Phase Two.

Table 9

*Data Collection: Phase One, Primary Sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE ONE</th>
<th>Interviews (Individual)</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One ITE program in each country—India and Canada</td>
<td>1 Administrator, 1 Program Coordinator, 6–8 Teacher Educators, 6–9 Teacher Candidates</td>
<td>3 observations of the teacher educators’ course and program components</td>
<td>Program Guides, Course Outlines, Candidate Assignments, Program Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Work Timeline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rani College, Sahara University, India</td>
<td>November, December and March of the same academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Work Timeline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Cohort, Stanton University, Canada</td>
<td>December to June of the same academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. An ITE academic year spans, for example, from September 2008 to May 2009 in Canada and from July 2008 to April 2009 in India.*
Table 10

Data Collection: Phase Two, Secondary Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE TWO</th>
<th>Interviews (Individual/Focus Group)</th>
<th>Site Visits</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Secondary Sites** | 4–6 Teacher Educators  
 | Two ITE programs in each country—India and Canada | Six days at each site in Canada and India. Tours of the program and campus. | Program Guides  
 | | 4–6 Teacher Candidates | | Public Information |
| **Field Work Timeline** | | | March and November of the same calendar year |
| River Institute & Forefathers University, India | | | |
| **Field Work Timeline** | | December to June of the same academic year | |
| Baldwin University & Thomson University, Canada | | | |

Several factors affected my timeline for data collection. The teacher candidates in both countries had school placements that limited the number of weeks I had available for in-class observations. In India, classes were cancelled while the candidates were preparing for exams. During both phases of the field work in India, the sites were closed for several days due to civil and academic protests. I also had to extend the number of weeks spent in both countries to coordinate my classroom observations with the instructors' teaching schedules. Program disruptions at the secondary sites also resulted in extra visits. In Canada, poor response rates stalled the momentum, and the interviews took place later in the academic year than originally hoped. I overcame the lags by working on other aspects of the research such as document collection and data analysis.

**Interviews**

Interviews are my largest data set and enable me to put stakeholders’ voices at the forefront of my study (Fontana & Frey, 2000; Hays & Singh, 2012; Lichtman, 2013). They help me to uncover the “meanings behind” and “alternative explanations of” what I saw (Glesne, 1999). Through a combination of semi-structured interviews and focus groups, I covered a range of topics on diversity education in ITE and also probed more deeply into participants’ beliefs and experiences.
At Sahara (Rani), the primary site in India, I conducted 32 individual interviews with 16 participants (see Appendix Q). At Stanton (Glebe), the primary site in Canada, I conducted 26 individual interviews with the 15 participants. My goal at the primary sites was to have pre- and post-observation interviews with the teacher educators to discuss their teaching practice in relation to their views about diversity education (Warren, 2001). In India, I was able to complete these interviews with relative ease because the classes were shorter than in Canada and the faculty had breaks in their schedules. In Canada, Joshua and Neal were unable to do post-observation interviews, but were able to substitute these with informal conversations, which I recorded in my field notes.

The majority of the teacher candidates from the primary sites participated in two 45–60 minute individual interviews. Initially, the plan was to hold two interviews with each candidate—one at the start of the data collection at the site and the other at the end—to examine any changes in their perception of the program. However, because the Stanton candidate interviews occurred toward the end of their program, I removed this point of comparison from the overall design. In the end, all of the Rani candidates and 2 of the Stanton candidates engaged in two individual interviews. The 4 remaining Stanton candidates each had a single interview that lasted roughly 70 minutes.

At the secondary sites, the interview methods shifted. Based on participant comfort and issues of access, I gave the secondary site participants the choice of an individual interview or focus group. The individual interviews lasted 30 minutes to 1 hour. The focus groups ran for about an hour. At the River Institute in India, 4 teacher educators participated in a focus group and 2 in an individual interview. At Forefathers, I held two focus groups and four individual interviews with the candidates. In Canada, almost all the teacher educators and candidates opted for individual interviews. Two of the candidates opted for a pair interview. The same interview guides were used for the interviews regardless of the method.

For the most part, I conducted the interviews during free periods in the candidates’ or educators’ schedules. In some cases, the participants opted to schedule interviews off-campus and on weekends. This was not a problem as I had indicated in my information letters that the interviews would be scheduled at the person’s convenience.
In India, the participants could choose to have the interview in Hindi or English. Although I have a functional knowledge of spoken Hindi, I wanted to ensure that the interviews were accurate and that the participants felt comfortable expressing themselves. I therefore asked a research assistant to accompany me to interviews that were primarily in Hindi. In the beginning, she would clarify key terms and statements in the interview. However, as the interviews progressed, I realized I was proficient enough to conduct the whole interview in Hindi and she took on the role of supporter instead. In all, the research assistant attended two teacher candidate interviews, four teacher candidate focus groups, and one teacher educator interview. A total of seven interviews from the India sites were in Hindi, three of which were used in the final reporting.

In all cases, the interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. The Hindi interviews were transcribed into English by the research assistant. The interview guides included questions on diversity in ITE, beliefs about diversity education, pedagogical approaches used or experienced, and challenges in implementing diversity education. However, the interviews also offered flexibility in terms of probing, and a general tone that encouraged organic conversations (Appendix G to N). Although the frequency of interviews across the sample varied slightly, I ensured that the participants were able to reflect on the same issues as intended in the initial study design (Seidman, 2013).

**Classroom Observations**

Observations are used to explore elements of an environment such as classroom settings and dynamics (Agrosino, 2005). According to Patton (2002), observations provide a unique perspective of a phenomenon. The researcher is able to experience an event directly rather than rely on others’ accounts. At a more meta level, observations act as catalyst for “ongoing and continual reflection on the setting, the participants, and the role of the researcher” (Hays & Singh 2012, p. 224).

As part of the observation process, I used an open-ended qualitative observation scheme (Appendix O) and took field notes by hand. I used the scheme to document classroom
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32 The research assistant had worked on research projects at Sahara University and was employed as a researcher for a local NGO at the time of my study. She signed a confidentiality agreement prior to participation and agreed to the non-disclosure of information. She was also not allowed to keep records of the materials.
interactions, teaching strategies, and lesson content. I later gathered these field notes into a computer file to create descriptive accounts. As I wrote up my observations, I inserted my own reflections on the interactions and content.

Classroom observations were my second largest data set. I completed a total of 18 observations with 5 teacher educators from Rani College, India. Five of the 6 Rani teacher educators generated complete data sets. A complete set included pre- and post-observation interviews, and three course observations. However, 1 participant was an exception because she was teaching two courses related to diversity education. I therefore observed her teaching six times instead of three and we discussed her pedagogy in both courses during our interviews.

In Canada, I completed 26 observations in the Glebe Cohort and was able to generate six complete data sets from the teacher educator sample. Both Neal and Joshua were only able to complete one lengthier interview and accommodate a single classroom observation. However, I chose to include their perspectives in the findings because they provide insight into the connection between teacher beliefs and practice.

Each observation lasted one class session. The sessions were 55–120 minutes in India and 90–180 minutes in Canada. I adopted the role of observer-as-participant. In this role the researcher is publicly present but minimally involved in the event (Newby, 2010). The candidates and educators were aware of my involvement in the class; however, I did not actively engage in the course activities. I arrived early and asked the instructor where I should sit. All of the instructors invited me to circulate during group activities. On some occasions, I was invited by the candidates to sit at their table so I could better observe the task at hand. In an effort to limit my impact, I remained a silent observer and had very few exchanges. Due to the number of weeks I spent at each site, I felt a shift in the level of acceptance I received. I became a fixture in the class rather than a foreigner in the community.

Documents

According to Merriam (1998), documents can ground case studies in “the context of the problem being investigated” and can “furnish descriptive information, verify emerging
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33 Vidya did not permit classroom observations. However her pedagogy and practice were triangulated through course assignments and teacher candidate accounts.
hypotheses, advance new categories and hypotheses, offer historical understanding, as well as track changes and developments” (pp. 108–9). In my study, I used documents such as meeting agendas (archival records), student work (physical artifacts), and government census reports (public records) to inform my questions on how diversity education is envisioned, enacted and experienced. State level documents such as national education reports and accords provided background on diversity issues and the broader teacher education context in each country.

I categorized and kept the physical documents in binders for each country. I stored the electronic documents in folders on my computer. At the primary sites, I collected course outlines, program guides, annual reports, and admissions applications. These materials gave me insight into the level of the participants’ commitment to diversity education (Banning, 2003). They also provided insight into discourses on diversity at each site and how diversity education was approached pedagogically. Artifacts like student activities and assignments addressed both the pedagogy used by the teacher educators and the candidates’ understandings of diversity and diversity education.

I also used self-generated documents in my research. I took a notebook to each site to record my field notes and observations. Over the course of my research, I compiled three notebooks that included my classroom observations, reflections on the interviews, records of informal conversations, and insights after site visits. I kept separate notebooks for India and Canada. I also kept data analysis notebooks in which to record emergent themes and mark ideas for further investigation. In some instances, I was unable to keep copies of materials returned to the candidates. To compensate, I digitally recorded verbatim excerpts from the texts I found relevant and also recorded my reflections at the time. I then transferred these reflections to my field notebooks and used both the notes and the digital recordings for data analysis.

I also took notes as I interviewed. The interviews were digitally recorded and then transcribed into computer files. The English interviews were transcribed verbatim. The Hindi interviews were translated and transcribed by a research assistant in India. In the English interviews that had some Hindi content, I translated the Hindi phrases into English and then had them verified by a native Hindi speaker. Appendix P: Overview of the Data provides information on which interviews were transcribed from Hindi to English.
Data Analysis

In qualitative case study research, data analysis is an iterative process that occurs as data are collected and continues until the final reporting (Bassey, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009). As I completed Phase One of the data collection at each site, I began to transcribe the interviews. This continued until several months after the closing of Phase Two. I transcribed several of the interviews in each group myself, and then commissioned help for the remainder. Transcribing the interviews allowed me to engage in transcribing as analysis. I began to see repetitions, patterns, and emerging themes, and recorded these in my data analysis notebooks. In reviewing the transcribed interviews, I also engaged in primary analysis by reading through the interviews and checking them against the audio recordings.

At the time of my fieldwork, I manually conducted a first analysis of each document, highlighting how it related either to the participants, the programs, or the conceptualization of diversity education (Esterberg, 2002). I then coded my interview data according to participant group and site using Microsoft Office Excel. These codes were incorporated into my lists of emerging themes. I also went back to my observation notes and coded these as well. The end product was a list of themes that were particular to each of the primary cases and across the secondary cases in each region.

At this point in the analysis, I began to see themes emerging on discourses of diversity, pedagogical practices, systemic barriers, and the range of experiences with diversity and diversity education in teacher education programs. I reviewed and refined the themes several times throughout the analysis. I found that each time I moved further into my inquiry, there were points where I felt overwhelmed by the amount of data I had gathered. At those points, I took a step back and synthesized the findings into reports that were largely descriptive and thematic.

As part of the writing process and in subsequent iterations of my case study reports, I engaged in a secondary analysis where I attempted to move from the concrete to the more abstract level of identifying the dimensions of and barriers to diversity education. It was at this time that two major shifts occurred. First, I chose to weave the findings from the secondary sites into my cross-case analysis rather than report them individually. Initially, I had woven the primary and secondary sites together into country cases. However, when I considered the volume of my data and the scope and intent of researching the secondary sites, I decided to restructure
my findings. Integrating the findings from the secondary sites into the cross-case analysis allowed me to examine discourses and dilemmas of diversity education across teacher education programs in both countries. Second, the shift allowed me to focus in on the primary cases, which ultimately contributed to a more developed understanding of diversity education in each region. I was able to offer a richer, more interconnected, and more complex view of the programs in which I had spent the most time.

I did comparative analysis at several points in the research. As I documented each site, I identified themes that were specific to cases in each region. After completing the primary case studies, I then returned to the data to draw out findings that related to diversity education at a cross-case level. At this point in the analysis, I focused on comparisons of the four themes presented in each of the primary cases: program aims; program content and structure; pedagogical strategies and challenges. I also revisited the data to gain deeper insights into what became a key theme for Chapter 7—images of the diversity educator. Ultimately, the comparative analysis occurred at two levels and stages. The first was within countries and across the sites within each country, and the second was across countries. In some cases, the comparisons focused on the findings from the primary sites—the richest data sets. In other cases, the comparison occurred across all six sites.

**Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations**

Guba and Lincoln (1994) define the validity of qualitative research by its “trustworthiness.” They base trustworthiness on the credibility, confirmability, and dependability of the research. In my study, I used several strategies to ensure internal validity and build trust in the findings. These strategies included: a) addressing my own subjectivity and bias, b) triangulating sources and data sets, c) member checking, d) providing rich and detailed descriptions, and e) engaging in long and repeated periods in the field.

The case studies are my portrayal of experiences and events at a particular time and place as seen through the perspectives of a select number of individuals. I present their world through my own interpretations and understandings, which have been shaped by my experiences as a researcher, classroom teacher, anti-discriminatory teacher educator, diasporic Indian, and program developer of initial teacher education programs. I recognize that my efforts are
circumvented by my own identity. According to Crossley and Watson (2003): “This [bias] may be based on personal prejudices, implicit values or preconceptions” (p. 36).

I carry into my study the sensibilities of a Western upbringing and academic training, which impact how I view the world. In addition, I was raised by a feminist mother. As a result, I carry with me the preconception that India condones the subservience of women and that this subservience crosses religious, cultural, and economic lines. This perception is continually reinforced in my research on girls’ education. In this study, I see the Rani candidates as women and teachers functioning in this society. As a child, I also believed that the West was a more promised land than India. The access to resources, the relative safety, the abundance for some in Canada made it superior to a country where resources are scarce and where abject poverty is pervasive. It was only through years of travel and work in India that I overcame this prejudice and appreciated the beauty and power of the country. I appreciate now that both countries are rich and have much to offer, thus a perspective I bring to this study and my analysis of the data.

My training as an educator and researcher is founded on Western theories of multicultural and anti-oppression education. I carried into my research a knowledge of how race, queer, and gender studies manifest in Canadian society. I had experienced the more traditional, additive forms of multicultural education as a child, and tried to implement a critical version of multiculturalism as an educator. Thus, I look for in the data various forms of diversity education. As part of my understandings of diversity education, I am interested in how and if oppression studies are included. I find them equally prominent in the Indian literature and most often focus on struggles of class, caste, religion, gender and ability. In my own visits and research in India, I learned how much the Indian education system relies on non-governmental organizations for exemplars of diversity education and approaches to pedagogy. Thus, I enter into the analysis aware that the relationship to alternative education can be a key part of diversity education.

Although I was well-versed in Canadian practices of education, I knew very little about Indian teacher education until I began my doctoral work. I tried to mitigate this gap by conducting frequent visits to India during my data collection and sourcing authorities who were either from India or had worked in India for some time. I also had the privilege of working with a research assistant who helped me navigate language and research codes during my field visits, two areas that would have otherwise been barriers. At the same time, coming from an Indian
family and having lived and worked in India in various capacities over the last 10 years, I was also familiar with many of the customs and norms that govern daily life. This knowledge played a critical part in my ability to permeate the insider–outsider limitations of comparative international research. It enabled me to build rapport with the participants as an outsider who was learning about the community—a perspective that the participants often found appealing.

To strengthen the validity of my study and build trust with the participants, I also engaged in member-checking. Member-checking involves sharing the raw data and emergent findings at various points in a qualitative study. In Canada, I emailed participants a copy of their interview transcript for review. In India, I gave hard copies to those who did not use email. I addressed interpretive validity—the degree to which the data accurately portrays the participants—by checking the findings with the participants. At the end of Phase Two, I also presented my findings to the faculty and candidates at Rani, many of whom had been participants in the study. Feedback on whether or not I had correctly captured their beliefs, as well as honouring requests for changes, were thus part of the data collection and analysis.

Triangulation refers to checking the consistency of data in systematic ways to strengthen both the validity and reliability of a study (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). In my study, I used three participant groups (administrators, educators, and candidates) and multiple data sources (interviews, observations, field visits, and documents) to triangulate the findings. I also used findings from one set of data to corroborate or challenge findings from another. For example, I triangulated interview statements with course outlines. At the primary sites, I was also able to corroborate the findings through two sets of interviews and observations at different points in time. In the analysis and reporting phases, I engaged in cross-case analysis to investigate the findings not only from the perspective of single cases but across groupings.

The ethical considerations of the study were guided by University of Toronto approval protocols and the requirements of the participating institutions. At all of the sites, I was required to share my interview guides with the deans or principals. I distributed consent forms and letters of information only after I had institutional approval. I made clear that participation was voluntary and that I respected the amount of time individuals were able to spend on interviews and observations. I removed identifying information in the writing as much as possible. It was at
times challenging to find a balance between providing enough description and holding back information that could lead to recognition of the participants or the sites.

I also maintained participant confidentiality as much as possible and this was my first priority. The program directors were aware of the cohort I was considering for data collection as I required their approval in advance. The participants did not ask who was involved in my study nor did I disclose this information. My presence in courses was an indicator to the teacher candidates that several faculty were participating in the study. This was unavoidable. These identifying elements were limited to each site and did not transfer across the sites. There are several cohorts and colleges involved in ITE at all the participating sites. In addition to pseudonyms for both participants and cohorts, I did not disclose the year of this study. By not knowing the exact date of the fieldwork, readers cannot be certain on who the coordinators, faculty, candidates were at the time of this study.34

At the institution level, I have used pseudonyms for the sites and provided a range or estimate of figures when possible. I acknowledge that while I have taken steps to protect identities other information about the region or the size of the university may make it easier to determine. In India, anonymity was difficult to achieve because of the limited number of elementary teacher education programs located in university settings. When asked which universities were participating, I disclosed the region I was working in but not the details. In the event that I chose to include information, I felt it was needed to provide context to the ITE programs and their approaches to diversity education.

Limitations of the Study

My study was also shaped by limitations that emerged as part of doing comparative international work. In the above section on sampling, I addressed some of the challenges I faced in recruiting participants and gaining access to the sites. For the most part, I was limited to individuals that expressed interest in the study rather than having a broad range of people to select from. Also, due to program schedules, I was only able to complete a limited number of classroom observations with some of the teacher educators. A longer time in each context with

34 In both programs, there is some change in staff and leadership every 1-2 years.
more observations at different points in the program would have provided a richer picture of diversity education across the courses and over time.

A constraint and advantage of my study is that each ITE case is distinct. First, teacher certification requirements within and across Canada and India are not consistent. Second, the study needs to negotiate variables in program duration (10-months or 4-years) and program content. Third, each site has a different focus on diversity education. For example, one ITE program had a practicum focused on diversity education, while another had a course devoted to inclusive education. The variety of cases and unique features of each allows for a range of perspectives on diversity education to be included in this study.

Summary

This study is a qualitative comparative international inquiry into diversity education in initial teacher education programs. The focus of the research is on the similarities and differences of diversity education in a selection of elementary teacher education programs in specific regions of Canada and India. I used case study methodology and collected data over a 2-year period. Phase One of the study involved two teacher education sites—one in Canada and one in India. Phase Two involved four secondary sites, two in each country. The data sources included field visits, course observations, interviews, document reviews, and my own research notes and reflections. The data analysis was a cyclical and layered process. At all stages of my research, I used strategies to support validity and reliability. I also took measures to model ethical practices and protect anonymity.

The goal of the study is to capture the descriptive experiences of initial elementary teacher education programs in two regions of the world. Ultimately, I hope to inform the dialogue on how diversity education is taken up in pre-service programs and how the curriculum and pedagogy of diversity education is moved from vision to practice. In the next chapter, I look at more deeply at the context of schooling and teacher education that guides the programs in the two regions of this study: Ontario, Canada, and Delhi, India.
CHAPTER 4
SETTING THE CONTEXT:
SCHOOLING AND INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN INDIA AND CANADA

Ontario and New Delhi are both densely populated regions and home to a wide range of communities. Although different in context, the social inequities in each region have prompted similar calls for greater social cohesion and positive forms of pluralism. In education, reforms champion social interdependence, the expansion of quality education, and greater attention to diversity education in schools and teacher education.

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the education system and movements for diversity education in ITE in each country. In the first part I focus on India and, in the second part, on Canada. In each part, I look at the school system, the structure of initial teacher education for elementary schooling, and the reforms that are shaping ITE curriculum in diversity education. The discussion sets the stage for presenting the results of the study in the next chapters and establishes diversity education as a clear expectation of ITE professional development in each country.

Schooling, Teacher Education, and Diversity Education in India

Pluralism in India is based on many social differences including its multi-faith, multi-lingual, and multi-cultural demographic (Joshee & Shira, 2009). Of the total population of 1.2 billion, an estimated 3.65 million students are enrolled in school (GOI, 2012a; GOI, 2011a). The diversity of the student population includes differences in region, language, socioeconomic status, religion, gender, caste, indigeneity, and ability (NUEPA, 2011; GOI, 2013; NCERT, 2005).

Social differences are core to issues of access, equity, and equality in education. It is estimated that anywhere from 3 million (GOI, 2013) to 8 million (UNESCO, 2010) children in India are not attending school. Out-of-school populations, which include child labourers and the 30% of Indians who identify as migrants, do not often enter or stay in the system (GOI, 2011b). Less than 1% of school-goers are children with special needs (GOI, 2009; GOI, 2010). Recent policies in education are encouraging these excluded children to enroll in or return to the
Within schools, some groups face challenges based on a variety of social differences. Language barriers within schools are problematic for those who speak anything other than English, Hindi or the language of schooling (Mishra, 2012). Religious diversity and related discrimination are also at play in India. In a roughly 80% Hindu majority country, the government recognized religious minorities include Muslim, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, and Parsis (Wali, 2010; GOI, 2009). Muslims are reported to be one of the least likely to enrol or be retained in the system— 25% of Muslim children will never attend school (Wali, 2010). Furthermore, although their population figures are inconclusive, India is home to other backwards classes (OBC), scheduled castes (i.e., Dalit), and scheduled tribes (i.e., Adivasi). Joshee and Shira (2009) estimate that the three groups comprise approximately 50% of national population. Several reports find that after enrolled there is a striking decrease of Muslim, Adivasi, and Dalit school participation over time. Intersections of various social identities compound the challenges faced by some individuals. According to Wali (2010) report on the status of inequities in the Delhi system, “the burden of deprivation falls mostly on members of low socioeconomic status” and “girl children” (p. 11). These are only a few of the key axis of social difference and inequality in education.

Education in India is a tiered system with poor quality schools serving the most economically marginalized, and better schools with more promising choices serving the middle classes and elites. The challenge is to provide a system that serves all sectors of the population. Historically education has acted as a gate keeper in Indian society due to the legacies of both the Hindu system of education and British colonial policies. “The vast majority of students making it through middle school to high school [are] from high-level castes and middle to upper class families living in urban areas” (Cheney, Ruzzi, & Muralidharan, 2005).

In terms of international rankings, the Indian education system places quite low. For example, on UNESCO's "Education for All" index, it ranked at 107 out of 127 countries. This index uses indicators of adult literacy, gender parity, other equality in education, universal primary education, and retainment (e.g., a student’s survival in school until Grade 5) to rate countries that signed the 2000 Dakar Accord. Signatories of this accord agreed to improve
programming and accountability for universal access to education (UNESCO, 2006). However, despite the low ranking, Indians' confidence in their overall education system is reported as good. A national survey indicated that 74% of rural households in India and 84% of urban households reported satisfaction with their schools (Sibal, 2009).

The three ITE programs in my study are operating within this wider context. In the following three subsections, I describe: 1) the school system in India—how it is structured and regulated, and how the curriculum is organized at the elementary level; 2) the preparation of pre-service teachers and how teacher education is structured; and 3) the policies and social movements in India that are promoting diversity education as a touchstone of quality in ITE.

**The School System in India**

In India, the central and state governments have joint governance over education. The central government sets guidelines for the pan-Indian education system, national exams, and the training of teachers. The 29 state governments monitor the distribution of educational funds, develop state-level curriculum, and develop and implement educational policy. In many cases, the state governments make decisions based on the suggestions of the central government. State funding for education is distributed to districts, cantonments, boards, or councils that have jurisdiction over the day-to-day operations of elementary and secondary schools.

In some states, local bodies in rural areas such as panchayati raj and village education committees are given power to control and monitor schooling in their areas (UNESCO, 2008). Most of the seven territories in India are linked directly to the central government. The prime minister appoints administrators to oversee education in these areas. However, the National Capital Territory of Delhi is one of two territories with the unique position of partial statehood and its own elected government that influences education.

National, state, and territory governments fully or partially fund 76% of schools in India (NUEPA, 2011). Funded schools may be secular or non-secular (Christian or Hindu). They receive partial funding in the form of land, facilities, and staff. Those designated as “government” schools are funded in all three areas by either the state or the territory. Some government schools known as Kendriya Vidyalayas are centrally controlled and follow a highly

---

Panchayati raj and village education committees are local elders who make decisions and oversee the community.
structured national curriculum. These schools serve the children of civil servants. Because civil servants can be posted to different locations in the country, the Kendriya Vidyalayas ensure that their children do not experience disruptions in their education. Other central schools are for talented children in rural areas and for special needs students. For the most part, government schools provide free and compulsory education. In the more marginalized schools in Delhi, the Delhi Directorate of Education also subsidizes students' textbooks, transportation, and uniforms (DDOE, 2012).

In Delhi, government elementary education is primarily the responsibility of the National Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD), the Delhi Cantonment, and the New Delhi Municipal Council as well as village education authorities in the peri-urban areas. A 2009 survey estimated that 80% of children in the country were in government schools (GOI, 2009). The figure for Delhi is lower with only 59.67% of students enrolled in government schools and 3.62% in government-aided schools (NUEPA, 2011). In 2014, this pattern remains the same (NUEPA, 2014). The total enrolment in government and government-aided elementary schools in Delhi is estimated at 1.6 million children (NUEPA, 2011).

Beyond government schools, other bodies such as non-governmental organizations, communities, interested individuals, and religious organizations also provide elementary education. Among these additional providers, independent and private schools are steadily gaining popularity in India. Independent and private schools are tuition-based, choose their own programming, and can be accredited by the government, international bodies or not at all. Private schools, for the most part, are not regulated by the government and can operate on their own. In 2010, nearly half of Delhi’s 5,044 schools were private institutions (Delhi Government, 2012).

Non-government providers serve both the elite communities and underserved communities like Muslims and the economically deprived (Cheney et al., 2005). They fill a gap in access to the public system in some areas. Although the focus of this study is on teachers trained for government schools, the parallel education systems in India cannot be ignored. Teacher educators in my study reported that ITE graduates find quicker employment outside the government system. In urban centres like Delhi, parents of all socioeconomic classes are increasingly choosing private schools (Bajaj & Yardley, 2011). Voucher programs and the desire for English-medium schooling are creating an exodus from government schools. This is
prompted by the poor quality of education and the desire for better life opportunities for some communities (Alexander, 2008; Nanda, 2008; NCERT, 2005). The Ministry of Human Resources and Development (2009) projected that 41% of India’s primary school population would be enrolled in private schools by 2014, a shocking statistic considering the number of new schools the government has built, the campaigns for involving all children in education, and the push for better qualified teachers.

The Delhi school system is similar to the school system in the rest of India and offers both elementary and secondary education. Table 11 shows that elementary education comprises 8 of the 12 years of compulsory education. In general, elementary education is divided into two divisions—primary (Class I–V) and upper primary (Class VI–VIII). Students are expected to attend school from age 6 to 14. However, because of the variation in attainment and retention, it is common to find young adults aged 12–17 in upper primary classes.
### Table 11

**The School System in India and Canada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Delhi, India</th>
<th>Ontario, Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Pre-Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elementary Education (full day and shift system)</td>
<td>Lower Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Compulsory schooling is shown in grey.*
The aim of elementary education in India is to provide literacy, numeracy, and citizenship skills. The majority of government schools in Delhi offer Hindi-medium education. Some offer English-medium instruction as well as other languages like Urdu and Punjabi (Delhi Directorate of Education [DDOE], 2012).³⁶ The mandated curriculum includes core programming in mathematics, language, environmental sciences, and physical activity/healthy living. Social sciences, science and technology, additional language studies, and work education (a combination of citizenship and vocational education) are part of upper primary schooling (UNESCO, 2008).

Secondary schooling, unlike its elementary counterpart, has yet to be universalized in India. Recent national education campaigns have shifted their focus from elementary to secondary schooling. They call for expanding the infrastructure of secondary schools, increasing access to secondary education, and improving the retention of students. Currently, the secondary system uses large-scale standardized exams to determine student progress and completion. The academic streams (Class IX to XII) are affiliated with one of three national curriculum and assessment boards: the Council for the Indian School Certificate Examinations (CISCE), the Central Board for Secondary Education (CBSE), and the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS).

Indian education is based on the National Curriculum Framework (2005), which advocates “joyful and stress free” child-centred learning, education for girls and minorities, multilingualism, peace education, and inclusive education (NCERT, 2005). The curriculum challenges traditional practices that treat the text as the sole authority (NCERT, 2005), hierarchic dominance of the teacher (Sriprakash, 2012), lecture-style teaching methods (NCTE, 2010), and views of students as knowledge receivers (Alexander, 2008). The official curriculum claims that child-centred methods raise awareness about “cultural, heritage, human, and moral values” as well as “responsible citizenship for national efforts,” and facilitate the all round development of children (DDOE, 2012, para. 2). The framework also calls for a return to indigenous philosophies of education and Indian values-based education (NCERT, 2005). Yet critics like Batra (2011) and NCTE (2010) maintain that these efforts are more rhetoric than reality:

³⁶ In Delhi, the majority of elementary school students choose Hindi (1.51 million) or English (1.1 million) medium education. A small number, approximately 1% of students, study in either Urdu, Sanskrit, Bengali or Malayalam medium schools (NUEPA, 2012).
In spite of constructivism being regarded the acceptable approach for both school education and teacher education institutions, efforts and achievements of learners are still being evaluated using behaviourist approaches and quantitative grading systems. (Pandey, 2011, p. 11)

The process of change in Delhi schools is slow. However, better training, better teaching materials, and paraprofessional support are becoming more readily available to government teachers. These reforms are also supported by public-private partnerships (Alok, 2012; Dreze & Sen, 2003). Scholars like Kumar (2006) argue that public-private partnerships are contentious because they absolve the government of its responsibility to provide quality education for all. However, other educators and activists see these partnerships as a way of improving conditions in education (Kumar & Sarangapani, 2005). In Delhi, for example, the Society for All Round Development provides services such as student resource centres in government schools, transition programs for students moving from NGO schools into government schools, and math and language support during school hours.

Overall, India is in a time of unprecedented system-wide and population-specific educational reform (GOI, 2013; Joshee & Shira, 2009). In Delhi, reforms are aimed at lowering the student/teacher ratio in elementary schools, increasing the number of government schools, and hiring thousands of teachers into the system (DDOE, 2012). Initial teacher education programs are seen as fundamental to ensuring that future teachers are initiated into the new curriculum and that they support the national goal to improve the quality of education particularly at the elementary level.

The Initial Teacher Education System in India

Initial teacher education in India is provided by post-secondary institutions, secondary institutions, non-governmental organizations, and state-funded vocational centers. More than 12,000 institutions offer pre-primary, primary, and secondary initial teacher education programs (UNESCO, 2008). This study focuses on three post-secondary institutes. Forefathers and Sahara are universities, and the River District Institute of Education is a state-sponsored training centre.

The structure and responsibilities of teacher education programs are determined by national and regional bodies. The National Council of Teacher Education sets the standards for teacher education from pre-primary to higher education. It issues guidelines for ITE programs
such as the minimum number of field experience days, faculty composition, professional foundations, and tuition fees. A second organization, the University Grants Commission, officially accredits teacher education programs at the university and college level. Other programs are monitored by the State Council of Education, Research, and Training, which can issue its own requirements for teacher education.

Each institution offers different pathways for teacher certification. At one time, there were 14 avenues for becoming an elementary teacher (Avalos, 1993), each serving different communities, as well as various state-controlled and district-controlled schools. In recent years, the government has tried to consolidate the number of avenues and types of certification.

Table 12 shows the different pathways in India for qualifying as an elementary or secondary teacher. Teachers who hold secondary qualifications can also teach in elementary schools. The four basic pathways are: diploma programs, undergraduate degrees, concurrent degrees, and consecutive degrees. In the diploma model, candidates receive a Diploma in Education after completing a 1- or 2-year program. The River Institute of Education, one of the secondary sites in my study, offers this type of programming. In the undergraduate degree models, candidates earn a Bachelor of Elementary Education (B.El.Ed.) by completing a 4-year program. The B.El.Ed. prepares them for teaching in the elementary grades (Class I-VI). Rani College at Sahara University, the primary India site in my study, is one of the few programs in the country that offers this degree. The concurrent degree program is for candidates taking a Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Education at the same time. Graduates from this program are certified for the secondary level. In the fourth model, the consecutive degree, candidates spend from 10 months to 1 year earning a B.Ed. They must have an undergraduate degree before entry into the program. Candidates qualifying for secondary schools can also take elective courses to teach at the upper elementary level. Graduate models, in which candidates complete a master’s degree or doctorate, are geared toward educational research or leadership; however, those with graduate degrees can write exams to teach in the public school system. Both Sahara University and Forefathers University offer consecutive and graduate models.

37 “Variations in nomenclature for elementary teacher education programmes can be found across states. For instance, it is called the Diploma or just Elementary Teacher Education (DETE/ETE) in Delhi, the Basic Training Course (BTC) in Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand, the Diploma in Education (D.Ed.) in Gujarat, Punjab, Haryana and Andra Pradesh, and the Diploma in Teacher Education (DTE) in Tamil Nadu or the Teacher Training Certificate in Kerala etc.” (Pandey, 2010, p. 161).
### Table 12

**Initial Teacher Education Programs in India**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Certification Levels</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Entry Qualification</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-category training for Special Education</td>
<td>Elementary/ Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary Diploma or Certificate/ Secondary Matriculation/ Sr. Secondary</td>
<td>DIET, IASE, CTE, SCERT, RIE, and Non-Governmental Organizations&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Elementary Education</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Matriculation</td>
<td>DIET, Faculties of Education, and Colleges of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Visual Arts Education</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Matriculation</td>
<td>DIET, IASE, CTE, SCERT, Arts and Crafts Teacher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Performing Arts Education</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Matriculation</td>
<td>DIET, IASE, CTE, SCERT, Arts and Crafts Teacher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Elementary Education</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Matriculation</td>
<td>IASE, Teacher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Bachelor of Education/ Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Matriculation</td>
<td>Regional Institutes of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>Middle/ Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>CTEs, IASEs, Faculties of Education at the university-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Special Education or Physical Education)</td>
<td>Middle/ Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>Special Education units in CTEs, Secondary Teacher Training Institutes, Faculties of Education and Colleges of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education M.Ed.)</td>
<td>Elementary/ Secondary/ Lecturer/Tea cher Educator at Training Institutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education or other undergraduate degree</td>
<td>CTE, IASE, Faculties or Departments of Education in universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>38</sup> Across India, there are 31 Institutes of Advanced Studies in Education (IASE) and 104 Colleges of Teacher Education (CTEs) (NCTE, 2010). Of these, five are Regional Institutes of Education and Training (RIET) which are run by the National Council of Education, Research and Training. More than 520 District Institutes of Education and Training (DIETs) operate in India. They have been established as partners with the State Councils and focus on initial, in-service, and educational innovation at the local level. Beyond the regulated programs and purview of this study is ITE offered by non-governmental organizations and community groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Certification Levels</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Entry Qualification</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master in Special Education (M Ed Spec Ed)</td>
<td>Elementary/Secondary/Teacher Educator at Training Institutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.Ed. (Spec Ed) B.Sc. in Child Development</td>
<td>Special Education units in Colleges of Education, Secondary Teacher Training Institutes, Faculties or Departments of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Block-level Institutes of Education Training (BIETs) have been proposed to provide in-service courses and special programming for marginalized sectors (GOI, 2012b). This table is adapted from Avalos (1993) review of South Asian teacher education programs.

The ITE curriculum in India consists of coursework and field placements. Courses include foundations in the sociopolitical context of schooling, child development, subject specializations, and pedagogy. They also include opportunities for broad-based expertise in areas like non-formal and special education. For the most part, the pedagogy is teacher directed. Instructors rely on lectures, core texts, and class discussions. The pedagogy also conforms to the pressures of an exam-based system—almost all teacher education courses are assessed by a final exam (Bansal, 2007; Batra, 2011). Many programs use reflection assignments, labs, drama, visual art activities, and field visits. Institutions supporting the current curriculum reforms also offer inquiry-based learning, community outreach, and inclusive education practices (Durga, 2008; GOI, 2012b; Rajput & Walia, 2001; Singh, A., 2013). Pandey (2010) argues that much of India’s ITE curriculum is transplanted from the West as it focuses on Dewey instead of Gandhi, Krishnamurti, or Tagore and on “blind imitation and practice of the western model of teaching” (p. 170).

Field experiences involve structured classroom observations, community visits, and practice teaching. The majority of candidates qualify in one division (elementary or secondary). Programs must have 6–10 weeks of practice teaching with additional days for field visits. School placements are structured in blocks of several weeks and are determined by the individual programs.

Admission to ITE programs in India is based on academic merit and entrance exams. Some programs, such as the B.El.Ed., also base admission on interviews. Candidates from specific groups such as Scheduled Classes and Tribes may be admitted with slightly lower marks in order to promote higher education among these groups. Although B.Ed. and B.El.Ed. courses
are quite popular, the prospect of gainful employment for new graduates in government schools is dismal, while the employment rate in private schools is much higher. The new graduate is faced with eligibility tests, bureaucratic red tape and slow hiring processes.

The undersupply of qualified and trained teachers for both elementary and secondary schools has been a constant issue in India and is well-documented in annual educational reviews. In 2012, it was projected that India would need 1.2 million teachers over the next 5 years (GOI, 2012b; NCTE, 2010). The shortage is most evident in government schools. In Delhi alone, nearly 12,000 government school positions were vacant in 2012 (Nangia, 2013). Contributing to the shortage are recent reforms that call for more rigid qualifying exams and smaller class sizes. The government is also notorious for its slow hiring processes (NCTE, 2011). To address the shortage, a large number of schools, especially in remote areas and in impoverished communities, employ para (community trained) or contract teachers with little or no formal training (Kingdon, 2007; Ramachandran, 2009).

**Diversity Education in Initial Teacher Education in India**

Recent trends in curriculum renewal as well as campaigns for school staffs to reflect the diversity of the wider population impact all forms of teacher education in the country. Educational researcher Sudeshna Lahiri describes the current situation as a shift from “the quantity of schools to improvement in the quality of teachers” (2011, p. 56). The quality of teachers is linked to what transpires in teacher education programs at both the pre-service and in-service levels (NCERT, 2005).

Several government and non-profit reports critique the state of teacher education in the country (e.g., Alexander, 2008; Kingdon, 2007; Pandey, 2011; NCERT, 2003; NCTE, 2010). The Justice Verma Commission, for example, argues that “current dominant teacher education programmes offer ritualistic exposure to fragmented knowledge which is neither linked to the larger aims of education and disciplinary knowledge, nor to the ground realities of classroom practice” (GOI, 2012, p. 13). The 2005 framework, which is partly based on a National Focus Group report on ITE, also commented that “existing teacher education programmes neither accommodate the emerging ideas in context and pedagogy nor address the issue of linkages between school and society” (NCERT, 2005, p. 107). However, all three documents identify the
potential for change in ITE, imagining a future with more responsive, inclusive, and innovative programs.

The most recent national curriculum framework (2005) positions ITE programs as preparing teachers to take on particular roles in the classroom. Teachers are portrayed as empathetic social agents who are self-aware, aware of others, and advocate for the needs of diverse learners. Teachers should be prepared to “see their own responsibility towards society, and work to build a better world” (NCERT, 2005, p. 108). They should also work to “build a citizenry committed to democratic practices, values, sensitivity towards gender justice, problems faced by the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, needs of the disabled, and capacities to participate in economic and political processes” (NCERT, 2005, p. 126).

The 2005 framework also proposes a departure from lecture methods to socially responsive pedagogy. Teacher education programs are expected to initiate candidates into seeing diversity as an important part of Indian society. According to the NCERT:

Teacher education programmes need to provide the space for engagement with issues and concerns of contemporary Indian society, its pluralistic nature, and issues of identity, gender, equity, livelihood and poverty. This can help teachers in contextualising education and evolving a deeper understanding of the purpose of education and its relationship with society. (2005, p. 109)

In 2009, the National Council of Teacher Education published a new framework for teacher education subtitled "Towards Preparing a Professional and Humane Teacher." This framework is a response to the disengagement of some children (e.g., Muslim, Adavasi, Dalits, low socioeconomic status) resulting from the inadequate preparation of teachers. It positions diversity and diversity education as a moral and professional responsibility: “Multi-cultural education and teaching for diversity are the needs of contemporary times” (p. 19).

Delhi has also recommended reforms to teacher education programs in its jurisdiction. In 2009, the State Council of Educational Research and Training of Delhi initiated curriculum revisions to its 2-year diploma program (NCTE, n.d.). Several elements of the Delhi report align with the NCTE pan-India framework. Both recommend changes to foundations courses (Child development, Pedagogy, and contemporary India), subject courses (e.g., social studies), and practicum placements. In both frameworks, teachers are expected to see education as embedded in a social context, be aware of the fundamentals of human rights, and have knowledge of
inclusive pedagogy. They should demonstrate a proactive perspective and a sense of agency, as well as flexibility, critical-thinking skills, reflexivity, and adaptability.

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RtE) also identifies teacher education as a lynch pin in quality education. The act requires schools to have appropriately trained teachers in every elementary classroom. It also requires that teachers be “socially sensitive” and create safe classrooms free from discrimination (GOI, 2012b). The requirement for smaller class sizes in government schools has also increased the demand for teachers. As Rajan, Dewan and Jain (2013) point out:

The large influx of teachers necessitated under RtE represents the biggest opportunity to bring fresh life into schools for decades to come. The challenge is to enhance the role of teachers in shaping the social transformation India is witnessing, as well as have a long lasting impact on the quality of education, also making it significantly more equitable. (p. 1)

Based on the RtE Act, the government has instituted the Central Teacher Eligibility Test (CTET) for those wanting to teach in elementary government schools. In reviewing sample tests from 2011–13, I noted that candidates are tested on their knowledge of gender-sensitivity, linguistic differences, and learning differences. For example, one question under Child Development and Pedagogy asked if inclusive education is: “a) the indoctrination of facts, b) the inclusion of marginalized teachers, c) celebrating diversity in the classroom, or d) stricter admissions processes” (CTET, 2012). Assessing prospective teachers' understandings of inclusion and the pluralist nature of India reinforces that diversity and diversity education are viewed by the government as essential to teacher education programming. As Pandey (2011) comments:

Teachers in the existing socio-cultural context of the country need to be logical and reflective because of increasing racial, ethical, cultural and linguistic diversities in the schools and in society which demand broad minded citizens. Also because a number of empirical evidence suggests that teachers' own beliefs play a major role in how they respond to the diversity in their classroom situations. (p. 9)

Teacher education in India is operating in a changing sociopolitical context. Its responsibilities are being defined not only by governing bodies, but also by social practices that
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39 The correct answer is c) celebrating diversity in the classroom.
prevent groups like girls and children with special needs from accessing public education. Social inclusion is on many agendas and the hope for change in education is tangible. The call for renewal has also spurred new discussions in teacher education circles. Many cite the increased attention to teacher education and the ensuing momentum as both unprecedented and invigorating (GOI, 2012b; Rajan et al., 2013). Teacher educators are engaging in dialogue, innovation, and partnerships in ITE through conferences, inquiries into program quality, new curricula, and a new journal on teacher education. Collectively these efforts are preparing practitioners for the newest mandates of the system, many of which are deeply connected to issues of diversity education.

Schooling, Teacher Education, and Diversity Education in Canada

As in India, pluralism in Canada is based on many social differences such as its multi-faith, multi-lingual and multi-cultural population. In 2010, of the 35 million total population an estimated 5.3 million students were enrolled in school with only 260,000 in private schools (Statistics Canada, 2013). Many social identities contribute to the diversity of the student population. In Ontario, these include differences in ethnicity, citizenship status, language, locality, sexual orientation, religion, gender, ability, and mental health (OME, 2009b).

For example, increases in the number of immigrant families, seasonal workers, visa students and refugee claimants, as well as significant internal migration, are changing urban and rural school demographics (Statistics Canada, 2008). In 2011, 27% of Ontario students were born outside of Canada. Of the total number of Ontarians, 14% spoke a language other than English or French as a mother tongue in their households (OECD, 2011; Statistics Canada, 2013). In 2011, 13.8% of Ontario children lived in low-income households and one in seven children in Ontario live in poverty (Campaign 2000, 2013). The ratio is disturbingly higher in Aboriginal communities and recorded at 1 in 4 children (Statistics Canada, 2013). This community is also the largest growing demographic in the country with a 20% increase in their total population since 2006 (Harvey & Houle, 2006; Statistics Canada, 2013). These are just a few of the many social differences and targets of educational support in Ontario.

Aboriginal communities in Canada include over 550 First Nations, Inuit, and Métis communities.
Overall, nationally and provincially the Ontario education system fares well in international rankings. For example, in 2009, Canada ranked in the top 8 of 73 countries rated on the PISA index (Programmes for International Student Assessments). PISA is an international evaluation of educational systems based on the competencies of 15-year-olds in reading, mathematics, and science. Canada continues to maintain its high status (OECD, 2005; OECD, 2013). Canadian parents, teachers, administrators, and students also report a high level of satisfaction with the education system (Government of Alberta, 2011; Hart, 2012).

The School System in Ontario

Education in Canada is provincially regulated by ministries of education. The ministries set curriculum requirements and assessment tools, establish policies on teachers’ working conditions, and decide on resources earmarked for education. The education system differs from province to province in terms of structure and content. Local school boards in each province are provided with funding and are responsible for distributing the funds to schools, maintaining and operating schools, and ensuring the provincial curriculum is delivered appropriately.

Both Catholic and public school boards serve the Ontario system. These two boards of education are further subdivided into English and French boards. All four boards are federally and provincially funded. Independent or private schools with tuition-based programs are governed by accreditation bodies such as the Independent Schools Association. In 2010, of the two million students enrolled in Ontario educational programs, less than 1% were enrolled in home schooling or private education programs (Statistics Canada, 2013).

Elementary schools provide education for children aged 4–12 (see Table 11, p. 122). Primary education consists of three divisions: primary (Grades 1–3), junior (Grades 4–6) and intermediate (Grades 7–8). Secondary or high school education is for students in Grades 9–12. Although many provinces offer an additional year of pre-primary school, Ontario is the only province that offers an optional 2 years of Kindergarten. As a result, students can enter the public education system as early as age 4. In Canada, children are required to attend school from age 6–16. In Ontario and New Brunswick, students must attend until age 18 or until they graduate with a secondary diploma.
At the elementary level, the curriculum includes core programming in language arts, mathematics, social sciences, science and technology, health and physical education, the arts, and French or English as second language (OME, 2005; OME, 2006). Schools may offer additional programming based on their student populations; for example, for Aboriginal students, students with exceptionalities, or students with special needs. Ontario Ministry of Education initiatives at the elementary level focus on student-centred learning, technology, and numeracy and literacy education. The aim is to “teach for meaning” rather than to focus on drills or rote memorization. The pedagogy strives to improve student performance and enhance character development.

The secondary system includes a range of compulsory and elective courses. The difficulty of the academic content varies according to students' career and higher education aspirations. The Ontario Secondary School Diploma (OSSD) requires compulsory credits in a range of subject areas and credits in elective courses. Students must also pass provincial literacy tests and complete 40 hours of community involvement to receive their OSSD. Unlike Delhi, Ontario does not require students to take subject-based regional or national exams for their secondary school diplomas.

Different from Delhi, Ontario teachers are in oversupply. The infrastructure for public schools is also largely established. However, similar to Delhi, the school system faces questions over which students it serves and does not serve. For example, one recent religious debate has centred on whether or not the Catholic board upholds the values of diversity outlined in national charters and provincial policies towards the LGBQT community (Callaghan, 2012). Another focused on Muslim prayer accommodations in secular Toronto schools. These and other social diversity issues are becoming part of conversations in society and teacher professional development programs.

The Initial Teacher Education System in Ontario

Teacher education in Canada is governed at the provincial/territorial level, with each jurisdiction having unique programs and professional certification processes. Programs in
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41 Courses are designated as Academic, Applied, Essential, or Open (general courses to meet diploma in secondary school requirements). In Grades 11 and 12 students complete courses that lead to either employment or post-secondary education.
Ontario are overseen by the Ontario College of Teachers. Early childhood and technical education is offered by higher education institutions at the college and university levels. Teacher education in elementary and secondary schooling is offered at the university level. The three Canadian cases in this study—Stanton, Thomson, and Baldwin—are universities and were selected from the 13 faculties of education in Ontario that offer ITE programs.

Table 13 shows that Ontario offers three pathways for qualifying in elementary or secondary teaching: consecutive programs, concurrent programs, and graduate programs. In the consecutive model, the B.Ed. is a second degree. Candidates must have successfully completed an undergraduate degree before entering the program. At the time of this study, depending on the university, the degree took 8 months to 1 year to complete. The consecutive model is the most common route in Ontario (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008). In the concurrent program, candidates spend 4–6 years earning a B.Ed. degree at the same time as an undergraduate degree (e.g., a B.Sc.). In the graduate model, candidates complete a Master’s degree (e.g., Arts, Education, or Child Study) at the same time as qualifying for professional certification. Individuals with backgrounds in technology are exempt from the traditional B.Ed. route and can teach in secondary schools after earning a Diploma in Technological Education. The structure of teacher education in the rest of Canada is similar to Ontario, although the length of the B.Ed. is 2 years rather than one. Quebec and the territories offer teacher education as a 3- or 4-year sole Bachelor of Education degree at the undergraduate level.

Table 13

Initial Teacher Education Programs in Ontario, Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Entry Qualification</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Early-childhood (pre-primary)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Early Childhood Leadership</td>
<td>Early-childhood (pre-primary)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary College or Collaborative program with a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Consecutive</td>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>8 months to 1 year</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree, required number of courses in teachable</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Entry Qualification</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education Concurrent (Undergraduate Degree and B.Ed.)</td>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Teaching</td>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education plus Master of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Child Studies</td>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B.Ed. (Spec Ed) B.Sc. in Child Dev.</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admission to Ontario ITE programs is based on an applicant's academic merit, statement of interest, and teaching-relevant experience profile. Some institutions also use interviews. To diversify a largely female, white, middle-class teaching force, some institutions encourage and recruit minority students, internationally trained teachers, and/or students who identify as having a disability. Entrance into programs is competitive: in 2013 Ontario received 25,000 applications for 7,500 seats (Ontario Universities and Application Centre, 2013). The oversupply of trained professionals has led to a decline in the number of applicants over the past 5 years (Alphonso, Morrow & Bradshaw, 2013; OCT, 2012). Teacher candidates are typically enrolled full time; however, some part-time models are offered, as well as distance education programs that serve remote and marginalized communities (e.g., University of Ottawa’s Aboriginal Teacher Education Program).

Course work and field experience are the two main components of ITE programs in Ontario. Candidates take courses in curriculum and instruction, school law, classroom management, educational psychology, the sociology of education, subject specializations, and professionalism. “All programs include course content about who is to be taught (learners), what is to be taught (subject matter and curriculum), how to teach (principles and practice of teaching), where the teaching takes place (context), and why teaching is important (foundations of teaching)” (Gambhir et al., 2010, p. 15).
Field experience involves structured observations and practice teaching. The majority of candidates learn to teach in more than one division (i.e., Primary/Junior, Junior/Intermediate, or Intermediate/Senior). Each province/territory regulates the number of practicum days, which ranges from 3 weeks to more than 20 weeks (Crock & Dibbon, 2008). The structure of placements is determined by the individual programs and can take several forms: 1) block placements where candidates spend several months in a classroom after their course work, 2) several 2- to 4-week placements over the course of the academic year or, 3) full-year placements where candidates divide their time between classrooms and ITE courses on a weekly basis. The field experience is a guided apprenticeship in which candidates are paired with mentor teachers.

Teacher education pedagogy in Canada is largely based on constructivist and social approaches to learning and teaching (Beck & Kosnik, 2006; Bullock, 2012). Many programs group candidates into communities of learning or smaller cohorts. A significant aspect of pedagogy involves reflective inquiry where candidates recall and examine their own experiences of schooling alongside their journey as novice teachers (Brandenburg, 2008; Collin & Karsenti, 2011; Korthagen et al., 2001). Teacher educators use case studies, discussions, group activities, and presentations to engage students in the curriculum (Lindo, 2010). In some programs, candidates engage in experiential learning, community partnerships, and inquiry-based activities (James, 2010; Solomon et al., 2007). A growing trend in ITE is the use of on-line courses, social media, and digital technology in the classroom (Kosnik, Menna, & Bullock, 2012).

The oversupply of teachers in Ontario has called into question the design, content, and duration of ITE programs. Politicians, employers, and parents are also lobbying for improved teaching skills in technology, special education, diversity, equity, and physical health. The surplus of teachers has also shifted the outcomes for ITE graduates. Ontario-trained teachers are seeking employment in other jurisdictions and internationally (Macdonald, 2011; Van Nuland, 2011). This trend is changing the scope of ITE from preparing teachers for the local context to a more global context.
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42 Extending the length of teacher education has gained popular and political support in Ontario. The Bachelor of Education is slated to move to a 2-year degree as of September 2015 (OCT, 2013).
**Diversity Education in Teacher Education in Ontario**

Current reforms in Ontario imply that teachers have knowledge of diversity education and that teacher education programs provide diversity-related content. For example, in 2012 the Safe Schools Act implemented a mandatory bullying prevention week and legislated that teachers respond to and prevent bullying. As a result, novice teachers must learn how to address bullying in schools. The act also includes directives to ensure that schools are “more equitable and inclusive for all people, including LGBTTIQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, two-spirited, intersex, queer and questioning) people” (OME, 2009b). Building teachers' abilities to address family diversity and multiple identities is thus highly relevant to teacher education. Yet, as Turnbull and Hilton (2010) point out, drawing on the work of Taylor and Peter (2009) and Schneider and Dimito (2008): “It is clear that teachers feel unprepared to address these issues with students” (para. 10). They join other scholars who are calling for increased attention to LGBQT issues in teacher education programs (Kitchen & Bellini, 2012; Sykes, 2011).

The Ontario practice of integrating special education students into mainstream classrooms is also inspiring reforms in ITE. A nationwide survey of ITE participants by Crocker and Dibbon (2008) found that 81% of principals and faculty deemed “teaching children with disabilities or other special needs” as important ITE content. In stark contrast, the survey found that only 7% of graduates were well prepared in this area. Special education or inclusive education courses are not a required component of ITE programs. This being said, my research on Ontario faculties of education revealed that some faculties address it as part of ITE foundations and others through extracurricular workshops.

Recent provincial and board policies also indicate that knowledge of diversity is expected of novice teachers. In 2009, the Ministry of Education issued *Ontario’s Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy* requiring greater accountability from teachers and schools for inclusive education. A coalition of educators, community groups, politicians, and researchers also generated a provincial strategy for creating positive learning environments. Their report included requirements for all boards to institute policies on equity and inclusion by 2012. Both current teachers and new hires have to comply with these policies, thus creating new responsibilities for ITE programs. “Achieving equity is a shared responsibility; establishing an equitable and
inclusive education system requires commitment from all education partners” (OME, 2009a, p. 12).

The 2011 census data show that 40% of Aboriginal students did not complete high school (Statistics Canada, 2013). This figure is even higher—over 60%—on reserves. In response to this long-standing reality, the Ministry of Education initiated the Ontario Aboriginal Education Strategy. The strategy provides funding for transition programs, capacity building, and Aboriginal K–12 curriculum development (OME, 2009a). Over the years, the strategy has not only impacted the school curriculum, but also increased content, resources, and awareness of Aboriginal issues in teacher education programs. For example, the Deepening Knowledge Project provides teachers with resources, background on Aboriginal knowledge and pedagogy, and stories by teacher candidates who have addressed Aboriginal issues in the classroom (see www.oise.utoronto.ca/deepeningknowledge for more information).

The Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE) has also ratified several accords that make a commitment to indigenous education (2009) and internationalization (2013). In 2005, the ACDE focused on the role of ITE programs in preparing teachers to understand the transformative power of education, their role as social and political leaders, and their responsibility to respond to community needs. The accord includes a concrete commitment to addressing diversity and diversity education: “An effective initial teacher education program promotes diversity, inclusion, understanding, acceptance, and social responsibility in continuing dialogue with local, national, and global communities” (ACDE, 2005).

Beyond government and faculty of education reforms, the push for diversity education in teacher education comes from outside agencies. In 2012, the London and Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership (LMLIP) and the Peterborough Partnership Council on Immigrant Integration (PPCII) issued a plea to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to institute mandatory equity and diversity education in ITE. Although the Ministry does not regulate teacher education, the message was clear; diversity education is needed. The letter states that all teachers will face diversity from their first day in the classroom, not just those who choose to take AQ [additional qualification] courses. While in-service courses do provide supplementary knowledge and skills for teachers, this timing is not effective. The
optimal period for developing a foundation for diversity-focused and inclusive classroom practice is during pre-service teacher training. (p. 2)43

The letter also listed four requisites of Ontario ITE programs:

1. completion by all pre-service teachers of a mandatory equity, inclusion, and diversity course;
2. integration of equity, inclusion, and diversity content in all course work;
3. concentration on diversity as an asset rather than a deficit; and
4. opportunities for critical reflection on equity, inclusion and diversity issues (LMLIP & PPCII, 2012, p. 3)

Both the London and Peterborough groups are newcomer immigrant agencies. Teacher and school support for newcomers and their families is a long standing campaign in Ontario (Coelho, 2004; Janzen, Ochocka, Sundar & Kilbride, 2001; People for Education, 2013). Based on the above recommendations and others, ITE should focus on increasing teacher awareness of diversity, fostering values of pluralism, and creating critical and reflective practitioners. Faculties of Education have responded by creating in-service and pre-service workshops to help teachers understand newcomers' needs and the basics of English language development. However, research indicates that although teacher candidates are empathetic to the plight of English language learners, they lack the competency to serve these learners in their classrooms (Faez, 2012; Webster & Valeo, 2011).

At present the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT) does not require diversity education in the core content of pre-service programs. In 2006, the OCT held community consultations on the professional and accreditation regulations of ITE programs. The Ontario Teachers' Federation, the Ontario Parents School Board Association, the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations, and the Learning Disabilities Association of Ontario all recommended that ITE include diversity education as a core course:

These organizations, along with other groups such as the English as a Second Language and English Literacy Development Resource Group of Ontario, the Canadian Coalition for Immigrant Children and Youth and individual school boards also insisted that there should be a focus on the diversity of the student

43 Additional qualification courses are optional in-service courses that Ontario teachers can take to upgrade their professional qualifications. Course titles include Inclusive Classrooms, English as a Second Language Part 1, and Special Education Part 1.
population and that teachers should be taught to address different learning styles and be sensitive to cultural differences. (OCT, 2006, p. 26)

The OCT has incorporated some of the community recommendations. For example, it has issued a directive to Faculties of Education that newly accredited ITE programs meet the requirements of the College’s “Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession” and “Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession.” As part of the ethical standards, teachers must “model respect for spiritual and cultural values, social justice, confidentiality, freedom, democracy and the environment” (OCT, 2012).

In 2015, faculties of education will also be required to institute longer B.Ed. programs. Draft recommendations by the Ministry of Education specify that content on mental health issues, equity, diversity, and special education be integrated into programs for new teachers (OCT, n.d.). As Crocker and Dibbon (2008) point out, several faculties list diversity and equity policies as part of their program visions and a handful already offer mandatory inclusive education or special education courses in their programs.

The momentum for diversity education in Ontario ITE is coming from the community, government, and faculties of education. Unfortunately, while teachers are expected to respond to diversity in their classrooms, there is a lack of clarity on how they are to do this. The most recent developments in Ontario indicate that ITE is responding to the call and for diversity education in an evolving context.

**Conclusion**

The landscapes of New Delhi and Ontario are most certainly different, yet the intention to find better ways to serve pluralism in education is evident in both contexts. Local and regional governing bodies in both countries have created a range of policies that promote social cohesion and the recognition of students’ needs. In Ontario, the novice educator is expected to be aware of the diversity of the student demographic, the barriers facing particular groups, the needs of diverse learners, and the importance of including this diversity as content in the classroom. In Delhi, the novice educator is aware of the diversity of society, the inequities that hinder or privilege access to education, and the need for human rights education.
In both contexts, government policies position diversity education in ITE as preparing teachers to be agents of change. Fulfilling this role relies on their ability to take the envisioned diversity mandates into schools and classrooms and thereby increase the capacity for quality education. However, it also relies on schools being ready to accept the challenge of becoming partners in change. This adds another layer of complexity to diversity education in ITE. Further, there is a high preference of private schools in India as opposed to Canada. Many of these schools are unregulated or exempt from diversity policies (e.g., adherence to the RtE Act). The high and increasing rate of private schools in the country adds another factor that affect diversity education in ITE.

Initial teacher education in both countries is working to respond to educational policies. Ontario and Delhi each have a handful of programs that include diversity education as part of their core curriculum. The focus of teacher education programs in both countries tends to be on keeping up with the demographic imperative driving educational reforms. Undisputed is a teacher's responsibility to serve all learners. But the more complex issue is how to integrate diversity education in ITE programs and how best to put it into practice. Suggested program and policy responses have been multifaceted—core courses, focused teaching placements, longer teacher education programs. Ultimately, the six universities in this study are operating in countries where diversity education is an expected part of the ITE landscape.
CHAPTER 5

PUSHING BOUNDARIES:

DIVERSITY EDUCATION AT SAHARA UNIVERSITY’S RANI COLLEGE, INDIA

Massive and diverse, India is home to a wide range of social identities. In response to this diversity, government initiatives have expanded school infrastructure to accommodate the mushrooming child population, established legal sanctions for retaining students who enter the system, and issued top-down directives for improving the quality of education (GOI, 2009; UNESCO, 2011). Yet nearly 70 years after independence, as Joshee (2003) and Kumar (2006) point out, India is still struggling to live up to its founding values of equality and universal access to education. Despite a history of policy commitments to education and the belief that education can reduce inequities in society and lead to economic prosperity (Alok, 2012; GOI, 1950; Guha, 2007), the education system is crumbling in some sectors and flourishing in others. According to Alexander (2008) and to Nanda (2008), this division creates unequal possibilities for future generations of children.

Two of the sources of the ailing system are attributed to the teachers (GOI, 2009) and the traditional models of teacher training (NCTE, 2010; Panda, 2009). Teachers, for example, are blamed for pushing children out of school because of discriminatory practices and taking up teaching positions with poor or no training (Govinda & Bandyopadhyay, 2011; NCERT, 2003; Ramachandran, 2009). Yet they are also seen as the solution. Policy documents argue that teachers are the heart of social change and have the potential to impart sensitive, culturally responsive, and knowledgeable practices (GOI, 2013; NCTE, 2010).

Increasingly, the focus of reform in India is on teacher preparation, particularly for government schools and at the elementary level. One of the most notable reforms is the call for greater attention to diversity education in ITE programs (Sleeter et al., 2012). However, I found

---

44 The Rights to Education Act (2009) and other amendments to the constitution legally require the government to meet certain norms and standards. For example, neighbourhood schools must create an environment that is free of fear and inequitable treatment (GOI, 2013).

45 In Chapters 1 and 4, I explain that issues of access, equity and equality in Indian education impact several children including those who identify as migrants, girls, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, Muslim, child labourers and children with special needs (Govinda & Bandyopadhyay, 2011; NCERT, 2005).
little research that documents what diversity education in this context means, or how it is enacted and experienced in ITE programs at the college and university level. In response to the limited research in this area, this chapter presents a case study of diversity education in the Bachelor of Elementary Education program (B.El.Ed.) at Sahara University’s Rani College.

The Rani program is a 4-year integrated professional degree at Sahara University and is one of the few in a university setting that prepares candidates for careers at the Class 1 to Class VIII level. It aims to prepare teachers that are “sensitive to cultural and socioeconomic diversity and treat children equally” (Rani Newsletter, 2005). Drawing on interviews with the director, faculty, and candidates at the program, as well as on classroom observations, visits to a partner elementary school, and a review of program artifacts, the case study highlights the processes and challenges of raising diversity consciousness in India.46

During the course of my research, it became clear that the Rani program is a unique ITE model for elementary educators in the Indian context. Different from other models, it has an explicit commitment to serving the most marginalized schools and is regarded as a pioneer in the field of elementary teacher education at the university level.

The chapter begins with a description of the Rani program and the beliefs about diversity education underpinning its aims. It then presents findings on the program's approach to incorporating diversity education in the curriculum and how this approach is experienced by teacher educators and candidates. The third section describes the various pedagogical strategies used at Rani and the links between these strategies and participants’ experiences. The fourth section looks at the tensions and challenges affecting diversity education in the program. The final section provides a summary of the findings at Rani College.

**Diversity Education in the Rani Program: Context and Objectives**

Sahara University and its Faculty of Education are located in Delhi. As part of its ITE programs, the Faculty of Education offers a B.El.Ed. at Rani College, one of the eight women’s colleges at the university providing the program. In this first section, I look at three aspects of the Rani program—its evolution, its composition, and its aims.

46 Diversity consciousness is the understanding, awareness, ability and skills in areas of diversity. It is often coupled with a fundamental change in attitudes and the desire for continual learning (Bucher, 2010).
**Program Evolution**

How the B.El.Ed. came to be located at Sahara University and Rani College has shaped the program's approach to diversity education. At the outset, the B.El.Ed. was designed to change India’s approaches to teacher preparation and elementary school education (Sahara University, 2001). Historically teacher education at the elementary level was located in Institutes of Education, in state-sponsored centres for graduates of upper elementary and secondary schooling, and in senior secondary programs offering vocational training. However, questions arose about the quality of teacher knowledge and the appropriateness of the training provided in these programs (GOI, 1992; GOI, 1998; NCERT, 2006). In the 1980s, a group of educators and politicians revitalized the idea of a university-based ITE model for Class I to Class VIII teachers. They believed that locating the program in higher education institutions could build strong subject-matter knowledge, foster critical thinking skills, challenge current school practices, and restore quality education for the masses (Sahara University, 2001).

A feasibility study for the program reported an impending crisis in education. Not only was the population booming, but government school conditions were deteriorating. The study projected that the elementary student population in Delhi alone would increase over the next decade from 1.7 million to 2.6 million and that this increase would lead to a significant shortage of trained professionals. According to documents at Sahara University (2001), the teacher education system was producing only 15% of the certified elementary teachers needed. Researchers also argued that the curriculum, pedagogy, and structure of government schools were failing to serve students’ needs. In particular, the highly regimented marks-based system created a competitive, autocratic environment centred on a culture of textbook learning (Kumar, 2006; Majumdar & Mooij, 2013).

Locating the B.El.Ed. at Sahara University challenged the design of ITE programs in India in several important ways. First, the new program lengthened teacher education to 4 years. Second, it primarily partnered with government schools serving low socioeconomic neighbourhoods. It also included a wide range of partnerships from affluent schools to non-

---

47 A textbook culture refers to education practices where students are expected to memorize the content of textbooks and reproduce this same knowledge. The books are relied upon as authorities of knowledge and teachers use drills (the content at times verbatim) to measure student understandings. Until recently, textbooks were not seen as promoting critical thinking or problem-solving skills, rather they were tools of rote memorization (NCTE, 2005).
formal or alternate schools serving marginalized communities. Third, it changed the pedagogy of teacher education by offering bilingual programming in Hindi and English, and introducing new courses to promote reflexivity, experiential learning, social sensitivity, and community engagement. At Sahara, the B.El.Ed. was located in the undergraduate colleges instead of in the Faculty of Education, thereby reaching a younger demographic. “The ‘college model’ [allows] for a concrete linkage with the wider community. Despite a fierce debate on this issue, the B.El.Ed. has helped on reaching the unreached” (Sahara University, 2001, p. 10). The unreached in this case included some of the most marginalized sectors of Delhi. As Indu, a senior administrator in the B.El.Ed. program for more than a decade, pointed out, this change determined the vision of diversity education in the program:

The vision was and it still is to sustain the teacher to look at the government school system, to continue with that. Our government school system reality has changed over the years. It’s become more and more marginalized actually so in that sense we know we are looking at the question of diversity in our context very very squarely.48

According to Indu, the decision to locate the B.El.Ed. program in Rani College was based on two main ideas. First, the college was well regarded and, by affiliating the B.El.Ed. with the college, it was hoped to increase the professional status of the program and its appeal to academically inclined and regionally diverse applicants. Second, the B.El.Ed. program and Rani College had similar visions. Rani has an ethos of empowering women through critical education. Its mission statement explicitly lists values of inclusivity in education (Rani College Mission Statement, n.d.). The B.El.Ed. also aims to create teachers who are confident, assertive, and inquiry focused (Sahara University, 2001, pp. 3-5).

**Program Composition and Study Participants**

Rani College is a strong academic institution and consistently ranks in the top five in the country for its scholarship in liberal arts education (National Survey, 2013). Its ITE program has an intake of 20–30 new teacher candidates per year, with a maximum enrolment of 120 candidates across the 4 years. B.El.Ed. students make up 6% of the college’s student population (Rani College, 2010). The program’s attrition rate is also quite small with only one or two

---

48 The dates (without year) for all participant interviews and data collection are provided in Appendix P.
candidates failing or leaving the program annually. Once admitted, the candidates travel through the program as a cohort across the 4-year period.

An on-site program coordinator oversees the program for a 2-year period. This position rotates through the core faculty. The program is delivered by eight faculty who act as subject specialists, practicum supervisors, and major research paper supervisors. In addition to the eight permanent faculty, four to five contract instructors also teach components and supervise placements in the program.

The 6 teacher educators in this study represent a range of novice and seasoned faculty in the Rani program (see Table 8, p. 102). Neeraj was new to the program and teaches several courses in Year 3 and Year 4. He oversaw practicum placement, major research papers, and teaches the Basic Concepts in Education and School Management courses. Gayatri was in her first year as a full-time teacher educator and was teaching math education courses across all 4 years of the program. Lopa had recently completed her Master’s and was teaching the first-year Social Studies courses. This was her first semester in the B.El.Ed. program. Lakshmi is an expert in child psychology and Sadhaka is an expert in disability studies. They had been with the program for nearly a decade, were teaching several courses, and had taught a range of sociology and psychology of education courses in the program. Vidya had been with the program for 8 years and identified as a community activist for women rather than as an academic. She was teaching Gender Education at Rani.

According to program documents, Rani College is proud of the heterogeneity of its candidate population and that the candidates represent a “diverse strata of society” (Rani College, 2012, p. 1). The teacher educators in my study attributed this diversity to the admission process in which candidates are assessed via an interview and written test. This is different from other programs that consider only a candidate’s performance on secondary school exams. The program’s mandate is also to admit students from schools both in Hindi and in English, which widens the student population beyond those graduating from elite English-medium schools and is more representative of the socioeconomic demographic of India.

The 9 teacher candidates in this study represent a cross-section of the teacher candidates at Rani College. According to Janvi, “it is like the whole of India is sitting together and learning in the same classroom” (Teacher Candidate). Anu, Janvi, Neha, Aarti, Ela, Kavleen, and Rajani
are participants who graduated from private or elite English-medium government schools. Meenal and Priya are Hindi-medium schooled participants who also came from elite government schools. Only Neha and Kavleen identified as minorities who entered the program via the reservation or special quota categories of admission.49

The candidates identified as either Hindu or Sikh, both of which are dominant religions in India. In terms of their socioeconomic status only Meenal and Neha said that they came from less privileged backgrounds than their peers. Overall, the candidates represent urban, rural and regional backgrounds. Eight of the 9 candidates in this study come from the Greater Delhi Area, however 2 have spent the majority of their lives in other parts of India.

Although the 9 candidates chose Rani College because of its reputation, none expressed interest in the program’s focus on government schools or bilingualism. For Ela, it was the Rani “tag” that made the program appealing to her. For others, it was the prospect of job security and quality of life as a teacher. Meenal and Rajani were hired by private schools before completing their final semester. Other recent graduates that I met had been recruited by non-government organizations as researchers. Indu, from her viewpoint as program director, explained that the B.El.Ed. graduate is seen as a coveted hire with a unique skill set:

I think B.El.Ed. graduates are very much sought after. Many public schools are actually in their advertisements seeking teachers who have done a B.El.Ed. program as their training so they are putting that down in black and white…We would rather have them go into government schools but the private schools are grabbing them [up]. But whenever they have gone into government schools, I hear very positive reports because they seem to be more committed, they are looking at new things, they are looking at children and they are learning and taking responsibility for their learning.

Aims of Diversity Education in the Rani Program

The findings of the study in terms of program documents and comments by teacher educators and candidates reveal that diversity education in the Rani program has three main aims: to fulfill a social and moral responsibility to pluralism, to empower teachers and learners.

49 A handful of students are accepted each year into the program based on reserved seats as affirmative action policies for Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribes and Children with Special Needs. The reservation system is a constitutionally sanctioned practice that ensures access to employment, education, and government services for particular groups.
and to raise awareness of hierarchies and barriers both in the education system and in Indian society more generally. The aims also point to the types of commitments and knowledge a diversity educator should have. Additionally, they lay the foundation for Rani’s approach to curriculum content and pedagogy in diversity education.

Valuing pluralism

The Rani program guide defines quality education as a fundamental human right. Consequently, supporting this right is deemed a duty of Indian citizens and educators. Statements in official program materials and from the participants stress the civic nature of diversity education, positioning it as a social and moral responsibility for social cohesion in Indian society. The Vice-Chancellor’s inauguration letter, for example, invokes the Indian Constitution and sees the program as aligned with values of respect, justice and positive views of difference.

The future development of the program must then remain anchored to the constitutional values of respect for the right of all India’s citizens to be and remain human, and mindful of the duty of the most exacting solicitude for the values of secularism, justice, and pluralism. (Sahara University, 2001, p. 1) [italics in the original]

Rajani, a teacher candidate, also explained that diversity is a pervasive concept in the Indian context alongside “unity, pluralism, and multiculturalism” and that civic responsibilities are tied to what many see as the lived reality of diversity. In this reality, diversity education takes on the moral agenda of fostering open-mindedness and tolerance toward others. Indu commented on how the social context in India is tied to the moral and social responsibility of ITE:

The diversity question has been so, it’s like, a lived reality for us. It comes from one's own experience of living in India. There is no other way but to create an open mindedness, to create a sense of tolerance, and that is what it [the B.El.Ed.] is about.

Vidya, a teacher educator, described diversity as “vibrant.” Her colleague Gayatri described it as being “encouraged.” Several of the teacher educators described diversity as something to be “celebrated.” Anu described it as adding “richness” to society, implying that differences are welcome in India. Others viewed it in terms of “sameness” and “equality” among people. Several stressed that education needs to focus on how to bring people together rather than looking at differences, thereby promoting diversity education for unity and social cohesion.
In this perspective, difference is seen as a social norm rather than as an exception. The idea that social differences are lived, active, and present in the Indian context aligns closely with what Joshee and Shira (2009) claim—diversity is “a defining feature of Indian identity and Indian democracy” (p. 425). The participants also indicated that equal treatment is a key feature of social cohesion.

The teacher educators and candidates also expressed an alternate view of diversity, often at the same time as supporting the need for diversity education. One teacher educator and 2 candidates defined diversity as a conflict-based construct where difference must be “tolerated” or “adjusted to” or where it is “a barrier to be broken.” For these participants, a lived reality that includes prejudice, discrimination, and intolerance prompts them to see diversity education more in relation to co-existing with difference rather than agreeing with the beliefs of others. Their discourse implies that a key feature of social cohesion is attention to conflicts and inequities in Indian society.

Underlying both lived and conflict-based views is the moral agenda of respecting others and valuing histories of peaceful co-existence. In the following passage, Indu maintains that the focus on diversity education responds to the fragmentation of Indian society:

The challenge that contemporary India faces is precisely this. There is a fragmentation happening along questions of religion, caste, manifesting in very gross and violent ways, so we were very aware of the fact that instead of focusing on individual differences, we really need to focus more on the plurality and the plural fabric of our society and to enable people to see the ease of which we have been living over generations and how we need to preserve this kind of thing.

Lopa, the Contemporary India teacher educator, agreed with Indu and described the Rani agenda as “bringing students together in the classroom” and in society. When diversity is represented as positive pluralism, teacher education has the moral and social responsibility to prepare educators that understand and promote the values of harmony, unity, and mutual respect. For some, positive also includes attention to issues of equity and conflict in society.

**Empowering teachers and learners**

Several of the Rani program documents identify teachers as empowered individuals who promote social change. The director of the National Council of Teacher Education stated, for
example, that “the B.El.Ed. curriculum is grounded in the belief that teachers prepared ‘differently’ can trigger a chain of desirable changes in the system” (Sahara University, 2001, p. 3). These changes require teachers to have agency and political voice. The aim of the program is to “help students develop from a position of dependence to autonomy” (Sahara University, p. 10). “[The candidates] learn to challenge hierarchies and obstacles that resist change. They learn to be confident, assertive and competent teachers” (Sahara University, 2001, p. 11).

In his introduction to the program, a highly reputed Indian scholar sees the B.El.Ed. as a “conscious attempt” to prepare educators who “critically question, use alternative knowledge, sensitize communities to the needs of deprived learners, and empower their learners through education” (Sahara University, p. 6). In the Rani program, empowerment translates as having the strength to use one’s voice to change education, to question practices, to recognize one’s agency in society, and to pass these skills on to students.

Central to the program’s philosophy is the desire to work with the government school system which includes students from the most marginalized and underserved communities. Making education accessible and meaningful for these students requires teachers to have knowledge of the communities from which these students come—a value that is reinforced in the Rani program. Other values listed in the program guide include dispelling myths about marginalized groups, building candidates’ self-confidence, and developing their commitment to agency. Sadhaka, a veteran teacher educator, believes that these values culminate in action: “the goal of the program is to make a difference. Particularly, we could categorically look at it as ‘wanting’ to make a difference. But yes, I think the program is about creating teachers of a different calibre who can go out to make the change that is required.”

The program values also include attention to the schism in India between those who speak Hindi and those who speak English. A large proportion of government schools only offer education in Hindi; if they offer English instruction, it is often of poor quality. The teacher educators claimed that, on graduating, the ITE candidates tend to repeat this divide. Hindi-speaking graduates typically go into government schools and English-speaking graduates into the private system. This is a practice that contributes to issues of unequal system access because some government schools are unable to offer quality English education. The divide also perpetuates the elitism of English in India, and diminishes the value of Hindi. In response, the
Rani program offers a bilingual ITE program. According to Indu, the program director, diversity education is about creating spaces for Hindi and English speakers to learn together:

That's why the B.El.Ed. was envisioned and instituted as a program and I think it’s been able to create spaces for empowerment. Because people coming from the vernacular are able to engage with important issues in education sitting side by side with a person speaking English, so they are an intimate part of that group.

The bilingual nature of the program is also premised on the belief that “the construction of knowledge is a free process beyond linguistic barriers” (Rani College, 2010). Empowerment is therefore tied to beliefs in fostering confidence in people's ability to participate and to overcome social barriers.

**Raising awareness of hierarchies and barriers in education**

The Rani program aims to increase candidates' understanding of “the hierarchies and barriers in Indian society” (Sahara, 2001). This creates a view of diversity education as social reform that depends on awareness of how power, privilege, and marginalization work in society. The aim is to help candidates see differences as socially constructed at individual, intergroup, and intragroup levels. According to the participants and the planned curriculum documents, the most recognized forms of discrimination in India are based on religion, socioeconomic status, caste, gender, region, and language. These socially constructed categories frame ITE conversations on barriers, hierarchies, and how education maintains or challenges the position of different groups.

Teacher educators Sadhaka and Neeraj also emphasized the importance of diversity education in helping teachers understand how intragroup discrimination operates in education. They find it helps candidates to move away from monolithic views of identity. Priya, a teacher candidate, commented on how she learned about the intersection of gender and class differences through her practicum. She noticed that in addition to boys having more privileges, the elite girls had more “worldly exposure” than girls from poorer families:

The boys get more opportunities than girls. If we look at class differences, like elite class girls have better exposure. The poor class family feel that girls should be in homes, should not go out. This kind of difference we can see easily when we go to schools for observations.
Vidya, the *Gender and Schooling* teacher educator, explained that a fundamental aspect of diversity education is challenging perceptions of dominance, particularly the dominance of urban and northwestern areas in India over rural, southern and some northeastern areas:

I think we are a very vibrant society so there is the urban-rural diversity to begin with, which is very marked in a way. You know, the very traditional to the very modern to the ultra-modern sensibilities and lifestyles that you have and, beyond that, you have the regional diversities [and] the state diversities. I am very involved right now in the northeast of India. The northeast of India is like a different country or seven different countries. We don’t know about it. We think we are the mainstream out here, because we are the centre, we are Delhi…We [think] the Hindi belt is the heartland of India.\(^{50}\)

Perceived group superiority is not only based on regional differences, but also on differences of gender, religion, socioeconomic status, and ability. Neha, a teacher candidate, commented on how perceptions of dominance lead to exclusion in education: “If a person is of a lower class, lower caste, if he belongs to the Muslim religion and has a different language, his views are neglected.”

Several of the participants talked about socially accepted fears that lead to marginalization, especially Hindu fears of Muslims. Kavleen, a third-year teacher candidate, mentioned the “alienation of Muslims by certain sections” and the prevailing stereotypes of Muslims. She described being frustrated by the unequal treatment of certain groups in the current education system. She had witnessed this fear both in the ITE program and in her practicums. For Kavleen, diversity education is about challenging practices of deficit-thinking, dominance, and exclusion.

Neeraj, a teacher educator, argued that although caste is politically silenced in Indian society, it remains in the Indian mindset.\(^{51}\) He believes that, even in the classroom, teachers subconsciously use caste to isolate low-status students from learning:

---

50 Northeast India consists, in part, of seven clustered states that are known for having diverse populations: Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, and Tripura.

51 The caste system in India is a hierarchy that segregates individuals by birth, family occupation, and religion. Caste, often identifiable by job or surname, can also limit employment options and educational opportunities. Practices of individual, institutional and systemic discrimination essentially pigeonhole individuals at birth. People can spend a lifetime challenging the prejudice and bias surrounding their “caste” identity.
Caste is one of the more potent dangers and challenges to diversity which also poses a big challenge to the teacher in the class. Although religious discrimination is also a potent challenge, in the case of the Indian subcontinent, caste is a major factor because whosoever and whatsoever religion you belong to or even if you convert...you carry over the hangover of the caste along with it. That is one of the things I believe. And within that caste system we see the sense of exclusion of children from the pedagogy. That is so subtle and sophisticated that most of the time even the teacher does not realize that he or she is excluding someone.

Caste-based pedagogical exclusion can occur when a teacher never asks students of a certain caste direct questions, gives them older textbooks, seats them in the back of the class, or asks them to do chores during class time (Govinda & Bandyopadhyay, 2011; Kumar, 2007). Neeraj believes that traditional caste divisions have become today's socioeconomic class divisions: “It is the fallout of modernity.” In his view, socioeconomic class is the new, yet permitted, hierarchy of oppression in society. It is socially accepted to discriminate or assume power based on financial status.

The belief that the caste hierarchy no longer operates because it has been officially abolished also impacts understandings of diversity and diversity education. Vidya, a teacher educator, explained how she unmasks this belief in her course:

>In] coming to the problematic sense of diversity where there are diverse classes, diverse castes and different gender discriminations, there are religions which one looks upon as superior to the other. I think we have so many lines of difference, which have become lines of borders, discrimination and oppression that cut across [identities]. It’s a huge jumble. Everybody is on some part of the grid but the grid is extremely complex and multilayered. We haven’t even found proper ways to conceptualize it, far less ways to really deal with it and to even accept...to even accept that it exists.

For instance, asking my students …fourth year of B.El.Ed…. Do we still have caste in India? Do we still have problems across caste? Two years ago I remember asking this and they said, “no m’am we don’t have caste in the urban areas,” which is such nonsense. After working with it [the concept of caste] over 3–4 months, they said “of course we have caste” and they all had examples to give, and we had SC students in classes— the Scheduled Caste—Dalit students in class, who had earlier been invisible and silent…who then started sharing [the] discrimination they feel within the college.
As teacher educators, Neeraj and Vidya both see diversity education as a way to stimulate discussions of social oppression and inequity. Their argument is that part of diversity education in teacher education is making the subconscious conscious. The purpose is to decode the social construction of identity and understand how it creates identity markers. By making their beliefs about particular social identities explicit, the candidates can enter into conversations that identify individual, institutional, and systemic barriers.

In summary, the Rani program clearly understands diversity education as a way of promoting empowerment, inquiring into questions of dominance and oppression, and supporting the moral responsibility of national and social cohesion. The collective voices of the study participants also establish diversity as complex and multilayered. Diversity education means studying both the forms and context of difference. This being said, Vidya also commented that the aims of the Rani program in diversity education are ambitious and its outcomes difficult to measure:

How much do we [teacher educators] actually help them understand and grapple with the diversity issues, with basic poverty issues, and children from a different community? I think at least as important as gender in this country if not more important is that we have kids from poverty. I mean it is the girls from poverty households that face the worst. They are the dropouts. They are the ones who face insult from teachers. They can’t open their school bags at home. What kind of learning can they do? Are we able to really empower these teacher trainees to handle those issues?

Vidya raises the question of what is really achievable in ITE. Rani aims to both empower marginalized learners in government schools as well as its own candidates. The program expectations also indicate candidates will learn to address many forms of social inequity. However, Vidya posits that the program cannot underestimate the depth and breadth of skills required to do so.

**Curriculum Content and Structure at Rani: Integrated and Gender-Focused**

Rani’s approach to diversity education is central to the content and structure of its ITE curriculum. As the program director commented:

The program does orient itself very deliberately and very consciously towards the questions of diversity that face us, whether it’s language, whether it’s caste,
whether it’s gender, religion, community, all of that. So the program itself and the courses within that, many consciously look at those elements of diversity, which are part of our contemporary and past reality.

The deliberate and conscious attention to diversity is echoed in findings from curriculum documents. The program also has a focus on gender that is not officially prescribed in the ITE curriculum, yet was described by the participants as evident and pervasive. In this section, I present findings on how diversity education is integrated in the Rani curriculum and how this integration is perceived by teacher educators and candidates.

The B.El.Ed.’s *Programme of Study Guide* (2001) details the program’s vision, structure, course syllabi, readings and assessment practices. The guide was written to promote consistency of program delivery across the colleges at Sahara University. Rani defines itself in the guide as an integrated ITE program where integration refers both to the combining of different aspects of the program (communication skills, subject knowledge, human development studies, pedagogical knowledge) and to the ways in which diversity education is addressed. The content or spaces for diversity education are embedded within foundations courses across the 4 years and taken up from a multidisciplinary perspective. Table 14 gives an overview of the ITE curriculum. It shows the trajectory of the program as described in the guide and my interpretation of the location of diversity-focused programming over the 4 years.
Table 14

**Progression and Location of Diversity Education in the Rani Bachelor of Elementary Education Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Cognition and Learning</td>
<td>*Basic Concepts in Education</td>
<td>Curriculum Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary India</td>
<td>Language Acquisition</td>
<td>*School Planning and Management</td>
<td>*Gender and Schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Language</td>
<td>*Human Relations and</td>
<td>*Logico Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Pedagogy in one of the following: Language,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Pedagogy of Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Math, Natural Science or Social Science (Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Mathematics</td>
<td>*Language Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>Liberal Course Option II</td>
<td>Subjects of the Elementary Curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Liberal Course Option 1: Subject areas include: English, Hindi, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, History, Political Science, Geography, Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Core Social Sciences</td>
<td>Liberal Course Option II: Subject areas include: English, Hindi, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, History, Political Science, Geography, Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Core Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Basic Concepts in Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*School Planning and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Logico Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy of Environmental Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Course Option II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject areas include: English, Hindi, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, History, Political Science, Geography, Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Core Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Observing Children</td>
<td>School Internship (Block Teaching Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Participatory Work</td>
<td>Self-development Workshops</td>
<td>*Classroom Management</td>
<td>Major Research Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia—Performed activities on children’s literature, storytelling, drama, music, and learning resource centres, seminar presentations of school experiences. Visits to private and government schools.</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>*Material Development and Evaluation</td>
<td>*Colloquia—e.g., Create a Resource Centre for their Partner School and Present it to the Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia—e.g., Storytelling and Children’s Literature</td>
<td>Colloquia—e.g., Practice teaching in schools formal and non-formal schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Curricular Learning</td>
<td>Academic Enrichment—Forums, Discussions and Seminars within and outside the Rani College B.El.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bold font identifies components that have diversity-focused courses or practicum components. The * refers to the ones I had a chance to observe or review component-related assignments.
The course work at Rani includes both theory and practicum components. The theory component is divided into four categories: core courses, pedagogy courses, liberal courses, and foundation courses. In the first year, the core courses provide concept knowledge in mathematics, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. In later years, the liberal courses focus on subject disciplines like Hindi, math, political science, and economics. Candidates choose a teaching specialization such as math or English and build advanced knowledge and pedagogical skills in this area. They complete pedagogy courses in their third and fourth years of the program. These courses develop candidates’ skills in teaching elementary students and are connected to the key curriculum areas in Indian schools.

The foundation courses are taken each year. Based on the course descriptions, these are the courses most connected to issues of diversity and diversity education. They offer candidates an in-depth study of the process of child development and learning; how education of children is influenced by the social, political, economic and cultural contexts in which they grow; techniques and process of school organization and management; educational theory; and issues and concepts specific to elementary education. (Sahara University, 2001, p. 24)

For example, the first year course Contemporary India covers major issues such as childhood in urban and rural contexts, human rights, and social conflict in education. The same and additional issues are revisited in the fourth year in courses like Basic Concepts in Education and Gender and Schooling through conceptual lenses of equality, conflict, stereotypes, and socialization. The practicum components are activities and tutorials designed to offer candidates opportunities to work with and learn from children inside and outside of the school context. They focus on building candidates’ capacities for teaching in government schools and on building self-concept and self-confidence. Some components are designed to help candidates explore their identities and build professional skills while others offer space for connecting theory to practice. Candidates also have opportunities to gain experience with the performing and fine arts, crafts, and physical education.

The practicums also include field placements tied to foundations courses, thereby supporting the interdisciplinary and integrated nature of the program. In the School Contact Program, candidates go into schools and conduct activities with elementary children from different communities. In the Observing Children practicum, they learn about childhood
experiences in different contexts; for example, how the experiences and daily routines of a slum child differ from those of a child from a middle class family. In the Self-development Workshops, candidates learn how to express themselves, build confidence, and explore biases through professional and personal skill development modules. The School Internship takes place in the fourth year and is a major component of the program. Candidates immerse themselves in a local school and teach 4 days a week for the majority of the academic year.

Candidates also complete a Major Research Project on an area of educational interest. Some opt for diversity-focused projects like “how to promote girls' education in the primary classroom” while others opt for subject-based projects such as “teaching English through stories.” The classes are divided into whole class courses and small group tutorials so that candidates have a chance to ask questions in different environments. Every year, colloquia are arranged on special activities like storytelling or creating a school resource centre. As part of their fourth-year practicum, several candidates are placed in a single school. As a team, they create a resource centre of activities, materials, and displays that support child-centred pedagogies.

From the course outlines, the Rani program also appears to achieve integration of diversity education by using a spiral curriculum (Bruner, 1960/2003). Concepts of diversity education presented in the early years of the program are revisited each year as the candidates build their expertise in the profession (see Appendix Q). Key aspects of diversity are taught across courses in a given year and also across the 4 years. For example, difference (e.g., the reservation system, social hierarchies) is addressed in the first year course Contemporary India as well as in the third-year course Basic Concepts of Education. The repeated focus on a concept helps candidates to move to more complex understandings of a topic like its philosophical underpinnings, social implications, and connections to schooling.

The Rani program’s attention to developing teachers' skills as inquirers is fostered in several places such as the Year 1 Social Studies course, the Year 2 Observing Children practicum, and the Year 4 Major Research Project. The purpose of inquiry is to raise candidates' sociocultural and critical consciousness\(^{52}\) and enable them to apply this learning to their student

---

\(^{52}\) Sociocultural consciousness is the degree to which an individual is aware of their identity, location, power and privileges and how this impacts the lens from which they see issues (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Critical
teaching. For example, *School Planning and Management* aims to create critical consciousness on the role candidates can play “to change the situation.” It is expected that candidates will act as models of change for the partner schools and demonstrate “unconventional pedagogies” in the classroom (Sahara, 2001). As another example, *Gender and Schooling* uses a feminist framework to explore gender inequities and encourages candidates to develop strategies both for the classroom and their own lives.

Several theory and practicum courses at Rani focus on fostering candidates’ attitudes toward diversity. Through courses and activities, candidates work on qualities that are important not only to the Rani vision of teachers, but also to diversity educators in general—for example, self-awareness, social sensitivity, communication skills, and open-mindedness (Grant & Gibson, 2011). These qualities are explored theoretically in courses like *Human Relations and Communication*, and then put into practice through *Self-development Workshops* and assignments. Teacher candidates Aarti and Janvi reported that the *Self-development Workshops* taught them to foster self-concept and confidence: “In first year it was on confidence, in the second emotions, and in the third expressions [how to express emotions]. In the self-development workshops, we talked about our own fears and how we would overcome them” (Aarti, Teacher Candidate). The ability to recognize fears, articulate them, and overcome them are all part of anti-bias education in diversity education (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Janvi claimed that theatre courses are about getting to know who you are, and are therefore also essential knowledge builders for diversity education. In recalling her theatre course she said: “Theatre is for self-development and how you can work with children in innovative and creative ways. It is also about learning how to understand yourself, getting into your soul.”

Practicum experiences and field visits require that candidates build connections to marginalized communities in various ways. In the first year, as mentioned previously, candidates visit a slum in Delhi and meet with families to learn about daily life and access to education. In their third year, they visit non-governmental organizations to observe after-school and non-formal education curriculum for children.

consciousness stems from Freire’s work on oppression in society, the awareness of how power, privilege and marginalization function in the world, and the impact this has on an individual's sense of agency and ability to take action (Freire, 1986).
At Rani, the interrelatedness of the curriculum represents a form of integration. It is manifested in the link between theoretical course content, inquiry projects, and other courses or practicums in a given year. The various components work together to provide a complex understanding of a particular issue. Program coordinator Lakshmi explained that psychology and sociology courses are carefully planned for “theory and practice linkages. It's just the whole aspect of how one establishes a skill, a practice. So Observing Children is thoroughly based on what they learned in Child Development about play, moral development, and social class.” In the practicum course, the candidates research childhood in various contexts (slums, middle class areas, affluent neighbourhoods), encouraging them to rethink their assumptions about childhood experiences.

Lopa commented on how her Contemporary India (CI) and Core Social Science (CSS) courses work in tandem to help candidates explore the impact of socialization, thereby furthering their understanding of the interrelated approach to the curriculum:

Basically CI helps you understand your society the way it is now and how it has become to be the way it is now. There [are] different topics in it; there is one entire unit on economics, one entire unit on society, one entire unit on the socialization of children and how they grow up. So the point of view is not to take anything for granted. In the CI, everything has a reason for becoming the way it has become and to also question why things are done in a particular manner, so you have to know the history for that and you have to know the contemporary aspects of it. So this is what we are trying to do. And CSS is more particular in how you do this, how to collect the data, [and] all of that. Then again more particular about the different kinds of qualities… they are very interlinked, both CI and CSS.

The Rani program furthers its interdisciplinary approach to curriculum and diversity education by emphasizing critical inquiry across courses. The candidates build awareness of issues in Indian education and the experiences of children from marginalized communities in their history, sociology, child development, subject discipline, and pedagogy courses. The program also weaves education theory together with ITE practice. The foundations courses enable novice teachers to recognize the impact of sociocultural contexts on learning. For instance, the curriculum of the Nature of Language course focuses on the importance of seeing students as a source of knowledge, particularly knowledge of multilingual identities. Vidya also reported seeing candidates as a source of knowledge in her Gender and Schooling course.
The Rani curriculum also addresses key concepts of diversity education across disciplines. The Social Studies course, for example, concentrates on the relationships and interactions between groups. Human Relations, Observing Children, and Basic Concepts in Education focus on the same concept, but from different vantage points—communication, psychology and philosophy. As Neeraj explained, each course has its own approach: “Talking about the idea of diversity in those papers [Human Relations and Communications and Social Sciences] and then talking about it in the Basic Concepts of Education is quite a different thing. In Human Relations and Communication, it’s more in a psychological way, whereas in Basic Concepts of Education it is more [in a] socio-philosophical way” (Neeraj, Teacher Educator). In his courses, diversity is addressed through the lenses of identity formation, Indian social groupings, and world philosophies of education. Ultimately, diversity education in the Rani program is delivered in a multilayered, interconnected approach across the majority of courses in the curriculum.

One of the key components of the Rani curriculum is a focus on gender. Anu, a teacher candidate in the early part of her first year, pinpointed gender as the “axis” of the program, followed by class and caste:

Caste, class, gender—these are the things that are emphasized throughout the courses. Like gender is what you can say is the axis of the B.El.Ed. program because all the things are related to gender in such a way. If the girl child’s education is not going on, how can we expect that next generation will progress?

Rajani, a candidate in her final year, saw gender as a topic that was touched upon in all her courses. She said it was hidden in the early years because it was not the primary focus of courses until Gender and Schooling. Nonetheless, she described it is a pervasive thread from Year 1 to Year 4: “Gender is hidden in all the pedagogical papers. We have gender in CI, CSS, and HRC [Contemporary India, Core Social Sciences, Human Relations and Communications]. Gender is in the B.El.Ed. but for the first time here [in Gender and Schooling] we study gender so explicitly as a proper subject.”

Rani’s focus on gender issues can be attributed to several factors. First, Rani is a female college and focuses on the empowerment of women. Second, the program is operating in a policy context where women’s education in teacher education is emphasized (National Policy of Education, 1986/1992). The National Council of Teacher Education, for example, mandates
Gender Education as required ITE curriculum content. Third, the program director at Rani identifies feminist pedagogy as a core value of the program. In her view, feminist pedagogy is a vehicle for understanding “questions of diversity” from a range of communities. Fourth, the program focus also aligns with beliefs (e.g., cited by candidate Meenal and instructor Vidya) that gender and socioeconomic status are a key intersection of inequity in society.

According to the teacher educators, discussion of gender differences occurs even in courses that are not explicitly diversity focused. As Gayatri, the math teacher educator, said: “I will be doing with fourth years [a course] which is called Pedagogy of Mathematics. There is a whole section devoted to gender issues.” Addressing gender issues therefore goes beyond the Gender and Schooling course. In reviewing my observation notes, I found that while caste, class, and religion dominated many of the course discussions, gender was also addressed. From the accounts of the study participants and my own observations, gender differences have a primacy in the program that is not evident in the course curricula.

In summary, the Rani curriculum builds on diversity education over the 4 years of the program. As teacher educator Lopa noted: “After you have the concepts and theory in place, you learn to embody them.” Diversity education is integrated into the core components of the program rather than taught as a distinct course. By interrelating theory and practice within subject disciplines, the program presents a dynamic, scaffolded, and multidisciplinary view of diversity education.

Curriculum integration and interdisciplinarity across courses are often associated with approaches to diversity education in K–12 schools (Beane, 1997; Gay, 2004; Jardine, Lagrange & Everest, 2004; Niyozov & Pluim, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). However the dynamics of integration and interdisciplinarity are relatively unexplored, particularly in the context of ITE curriculum in India and Canada. Similarly, the successes and challenges of particular pedagogical choices are only recently surfacing (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2009). These challenges are further discussed in Chapter 7 where I take up a cross-case analysis of the programs in my study.
Diversity Education Pedagogy in the Rani Program

In this section, I examine the pedagogical practices used by teacher educators at Rani to implement diversity education in the ITE classroom. Two aspects of practice are considered here: the connection to goals of diversity education (e.g., challenging stereotypes) and the activities used to achieve these goals (e.g., discussions, group work). The findings in this section combine educators’ accounts of their practice, candidates’ reported experiences of the pedagogy, and my own classroom observations of the program.

Goals of diversity education pedagogy

Based on the program vision, Rani graduates are expected to value plurality, consciousness of social difference, and agency in the face of inequities (Rani, 2012; Sahara University, 2001). As this section shows, the teacher educators in my study try to raise awareness, disrupt commonplace understandings, and challenge candidates to think and act for social inclusion. The rationale for their practices is derived from the program goals, their beliefs about teaching, and the ways teacher candidates respond.

Even though the admissions process tries to draw candidates who exhibit openness to diversity, the teacher educators in my study reported that the candidates hold prejudices. Vidya, the Gender and Education instructor, gave religion as an example:

Almost all [candidates] have a huge bias about/against Muslims when they come in. Muslim girls are very bad. Muslim women are very bad and they are dirty. [The men] have four wives. When you look at these together you find that the [candidates’] socialization patterns are exactly the same.

According to the teacher educators, there are few forces in the education system in India that challenge students' understandings of the world and how these understandings impact schooling. As part of the pedagogy at Rani, teacher educators attempt to broaden the minds of candidates by exposing them to new ways of thinking and to the beliefs of different communities. The aim is to help candidates ground their beliefs in their own experiences of the world rather than in socializations or perceptions based on the experiences of others.

Some teacher educators also see the Rani candidates’ level of maturity as relevant to pedagogy. Many of the candidates are transitioning from their late teens to their early twenties and are at a critical phase in their lives. Some began to consider marriage while in the program.
In arranged marriages, this involves introductions to prospective partners and families. Teacher educators who teach courses such as *Human Relations and Communication* and *Gender and Schooling* see the questioning of life choices and socializations as having powerful personal relevance for the candidates. Neeraj, on the other hand, saw age and maturity as less of a factor: “A B.Ed. student might be as ignorant or as innocent as a B.El.Ed. [student].” His aim as a teacher educator is to help candidates recognize their limitations and analyze their beliefs.

The candidates’ accounts of their ITE experiences correspond with the pedagogical aims of the teacher educators. The candidates readily admitted that they entered the program with biases and that these biases were challenged through their experiences in the program. Ela, a second-year candidate, admitted that her thinking had changed since entering the program. Through the program content and pedagogy, she was beginning to understand that people are socialized into particular beliefs. Rajani, a fourth-year candidate, also believed that her understandings of government school children were problematic at the start of the program. Like Ela, she viewed these students as being less intelligent and capable: “I certainly had a doubt and a framework [belief] that they can’t do it. That is why they go to the government schools. I had this notion that government schools are less than every other public school.”

Aarti, a third-year candidate, recounted an assignment in the second year of the program in which they were asked to go to a book market to get readings. This market was located in a Muslim-dominated neighbourhood of Delhi. She said that some candidates went to the market in a group because they were afraid of the Muslim community:

In my class, there are some girls who say that they fear going to a Muslim-dominated area. When the teacher told us to go into a particular market where Muslims are to get books, some of the girls said that they will go only [if they are] in a group. I don’t know why it is like this, because of media perhaps? They show that Muslims are doing terror attacks.

Kavleen, a third-year candidate, corroborated Rani’s focus on challenging norms in society. In the following comment, she explains that she had mixed emotions about the Bombay hotel bombings in 2011 and had never learned how to express her feelings of injustice, but was finally able to do so in her ITE class:

This was in second year, after 26/11. There was a war-like situation and people were endlessly blaming Pakistanis. I was feeling very disturbed. At the end of day
they [Pakistanis] are also humans. In the dirty politics, it is the people that suffer. My English teacher discussed this and I broke down and she asked why I am crying. So I put across my views and she said they are beautiful views and that I just had never expressed them. She told me that they were also having the same discussion in the staff room so I should not feel isolated. She said, you have the power of your words and your thoughts, so express them and you may come across more people who think the same and you may be able to do something. Earlier I used to feel so helpless.

As part of this sense of empowerment and agency, all the candidates felt that the program gave them the skills to challenge old ways of learning and envision new methods of teaching. According to Meenal, the Rani program teaches candidates to feel confident about taking action in the classroom and preparing their own students to make change. She explained how her philosophy of education is different from what she observed in Municipal Corporation of Delhi schools where corporal punishment is the norm, children are asked to clean the room, and where those who challenge the teacher are punished.\(^{53}\)

I feel what is being taught to us is very different. I do not say we can change the whole world but then we can take a few steps towards it. We are 14 students [teacher candidates] in our class. When each of us becomes a teacher, we will have a class of at least 30 students and these are the students we can influence positively. They [the students] can then challenge the system and be change agents.

These examples indicate that the teacher educators' pedagogical aims are also reflected in the candidates' experiences, particularly in the challenging of socializations, developing new philosophies of education, and building a sense of agency.

Part of the teacher educators’ understanding of pedagogy was connected to the time needed for learning and reflection. As a teacher educator in the program for 8 years, Sadhaka believed that her aim of getting candidates to be self-reflexive and engage deeply with the content is tied to the program design: “No doubt it’s a beautiful ladder and you go step by step. That’s something beautiful about the program.” Similarly, the candidates recognized that their learning did not happen overnight or in a single moment. For example, when I asked Janvi about the particular pedagogies that built her sense of agency, she explained that it was a gradual and

---

\(^{53}\) Candidates themselves did not share stories of corporal punishment in their own schooling experiences but did talk about an exam-based system where textbooks were the main source of knowledge.
continual process: “It's not about one instance or two. Every day we are doing something new, learning something new. I feel that yes, I am doing something different and I can do something different.” Priya also shared that her understanding of teaching and her role as a teacher developed over time: “The experience comes through a period of time and this is very important. The time span is very important that the B.El.Ed. provides. It cannot be done in a hurry.”

**Pedagogical Strategies for Diversity Education**

The findings reveal that teacher educators at Rani use various strategies to put their goals of diversity education into practice. These strategies include building social and emotional sensitivity, exploring assumptions and biases, developing critical thinking skills, and contextualizing learning.

**Building Social and Emotional Sensitivity**

Indu, the program director, identified both social and emotional sensitivities as being cultivated in the program:

I think the premise of which we really perceived [the B.El.Ed.] is that we try to get students who have some of these open-minded critical kind of abilities, to be able to become more sensitive. But we have built into the 4-year program a whole lot of practical and theoretical engagement activities which get them towards that.

With respect to emotional sensitivity, the candidates are asked to explore their beliefs in relation to empathy, trust, and compassion toward others. According to Lopa, one of the teacher educators: “We are trying to make them into more sensitive human beings, more intelligent human beings who know what they are doing and why they are doing it.”

With respect to social sensitivity, the teacher educators use strategies such as collaborative activities, discussions, and identity exploration to build candidates' interpersonal communication skills and awareness of others. Sadhaka, Lopa and Lakshmi described exposing the candidates to collaborative learning and team-teaching methods in their courses and practicum placements. In *Human Relations and Communication*, the candidates are divided into groups of four to review a book. They then present the main themes from the book to their peers. In the third-year internship, the candidates design and co-teach various lessons to elementary students in their future practicum schools. In the *Observing Children* component, the candidates
create theatre presentations to present their findings on the various forces shaping children's lives outside the classroom. In my observations, I saw some of the planning sessions for the presentations. The candidates worked in teams to analyze the data from their interviews with children and determine what their peers should know about the different backgrounds they discovered. As a culminating task, they planned and performed a dramatic representation of their understandings for the whole class. The collaboration lasted several weeks and required a significant amount of team work.

According to Aarti, a teacher candidate, group work connects classmates and promotes unity. The unity among candidates is something she saw develop and strengthen over time. As a learning community, they learned to help each other with course readings and assignments. Both the unity and mutual support are key areas of social understanding and foster a sense of interdependence. Sadhaka and Lakshmi, both teacher educators in the program for nearly a decade, believe that group activities allow candidates to synthesize their learning by understanding their peers’ viewpoints and by practising techniques of listening and negotiation. Lakshmi also explained that, in some cases, she purposefully groups candidates so they are exposed to other ways of life:

It is very interesting because some of them have observed games like computer games and games like Power Rangers as opposed to another student who has observed primarily more make believe play like ghar gar, teacher teacher. So then I would pair them together so that there is a variety in the data which they have collected…They are living in separate parts of the city. Some of them have more opportunity to observe outdoor play. Some of them have more opportunities to observe indoor play. So in that I would purposefully make groups.

While reading the candidates' reports on their visits with children, Lakshmi gleaned information on the children's socioeconomic status and background based on their access to technology and the surrounding environment. She then uses a cross-dyad approach to assigning groups.

Emphasizing strategies for developing communication skills, both verbal and non-verbal, was a priority for several of the teacher educators. For example, in several of the courses, teacher educators encouraged the candidates to share their perceptions of an issue—for example, who holds the power in education, what is the role of women in rural India—either in whole class or paired discussions. Meenal, a fourth-year candidate, explained how this impacted her learning:
“In first year, I was very quiet but then I am now very active. The course demands that we speak.\textsuperscript{54} Such is the class environment, many views are expressed and it's interactive.” In the whole class discussions, candidates converse with each other as well as with the instructor. In the Contemporary India course, Lopa directed the class discussion to help promote participation. She controlled the conversation flow; candidates primarily engaged with her. She waited until all of the students had contributed their thoughts to a topic before moving on to the next issue. Anu, a Year 1 candidate recalled: “When we came in the beginning, everyone was speaking their own points and then ma’am taught us how to discuss. Then we started to speak one by one.” Anu noted that the courses are set up so that everyone participates in discussions and that there are “no back benchers.” In many ways, communication is also about learning how to take risks. It begins in small ways like class participation and using one's voice.

Part of interpersonal skill training includes activities related to listening, negotiation, body language, and self-expression. The Self-development Workshops encourage candidates to role play with peers, debrief through problem-solving activities, and journal about particular emotions. According to several teacher educators, the ability to empathize is paramount to effective teaching. Neha, a teacher candidate in her second year, gave an example of how candidates practice compassion and listening through role play. In the following scenario, Neha was asked to console a friend whose father had passed away.

When I was given a chance to console my friend, I was with Sunita and she was my friend and it was her father who passed away. I really couldn’t speak anything. Ma’am showed us that there are different ways to console somebody and [you must] try to listen to what the person was telling us. First accept that there is a problem with the person and tell him or her, ke ya [that yes] I really know that you might be going through many problems. You might be feeling too bad, but I know that the good times will come. Then she taught us ke [that] it is not just the verbal thing that is going to work. You can even touch her, hug her.

In another activity, one candidate took another around the college blindfolded. The activity was meant to teach candidates how to let go of fears and inhibitions.

When asked which pedagogies had an impact on them, the candidates talked about self-reflection activities such as journaling after a field visit, writing poems about factors that shape

\textsuperscript{54} The candidates commonly referred to the B.El.Ed. program as a “course” like in a course of study. They are referring generally to all their classes rather than to a particular class.
their identity, class discussions on their beliefs about particular groups, or values that are important to them. All of these activities relate to building social and emotional sensitivity. Kavleen explained how the activities used in the Self-Development Workshops encourage candidates to explore their values.

We play different games, then we had a specific topic to stress upon… [for example the] topic would be empathy and then there were many things faith, trust, friendship, relationships. There were many topics in each of the classes and we had to discuss each of them. So I mean the training makes us feel, think over if we value our relationships. What are the values that we value?

My own observations of courses, teacher educators’ intentions, and teacher candidates’ experiences reinforced emotional sensitivities as core to programming. Further, the small class sizes of 20–30 candidates make it possible for teacher educators to communicate directly with each candidate in a session or activity. Consequently, class size is a key attribute of the program and enables many of their diversity education-focused activities.

**Exploring Assumptions and Biases**

A key aspect of the Rani program involves building sociocultural awareness. Candidates are asked not only to explore their prejudices and biases from a personal viewpoint, but also to understand how educational beliefs and practices are socially constructed. Neeraj used teacher-directed discussion to encourage candidates to share their perceptions. He first uncovered candidates’ beliefs and then, in subsequent classes, connected these beliefs to how education is culturally laden and socializes people into belief systems. In one of my classroom observations, Neeraj and the Year 3 candidates discussed constructions of identity and social difference in education. Neeraj linked meanings of North and South Indian to the candidates’ sense of right, wrong and comfort. He began the discussion by asking the candidates what it means to be South Indian. They were able to name the states and territories of the region, but not the various cultures. Neeraj pushed the candidates to consider their assumptions in relation to their own identity:

Neeraj: We don’t know how to construct it so in order to understand it we just largely group “it” as South India. If that is the case, then we become North India.

Candidate: (in a factual tone) Well yes, we are divided geographically.
Neeraj: Do you believe South Indians are constructed by us in the same way as North Indian? Are you ready to be perceived as a Bihari?... (qualifying his statement) … Not to be pejorative but just as an example because Biharis are deeply marginalized and seen as the disadvantaged, politically corrupt and poorest regions in North India.

Candidate: Just like we don’t know about [South Indians]—the festivals, the language—they must not know about us as well.

Neeraj: (looking at the candidate) Although constructs are subjective they become objective assumptions. The idea that what is perceived as truth or real is determined by beliefs and perhaps not fact.

Candidate: Inside, I had this feeling of discomfort when you suggested that I may be Bihari.

Neeraj: Yes, very good, because we have assumptions of what a Bihari is.

Candidate: It felt wrong.

Neeraj: What I am saying is that there is a subjective feel but it becomes objective reality over time.

Teacher educators like Neeraj, Sadhaka, Lakshmi, and Lopa also helped the candidates to explore biases by sharing experiences from their own lives. This strategy consistently elicited responses from the candidates on how they learned their own beliefs. The teacher educators drew on examples from their age, religion, language, or regional backgrounds. In the example below, Sadhaka had just finished sharing her own story of learning only the negative construct of South Indian in her early years of teaching in Delhi and how this made her feel emotionally isolated. She then turned the discussion over to the students. Having used her life as an example of how to deconstruct her awareness of power and privilege, she then asked the candidates to examine inconsistencies in their own lives and look for patterns of exclusion.

Candidate 1: My sister’s best friend is Muslim and others ask if she is “ok” as in safe with her. I was so surprised.

Sadhaka: This is a challenge that we have to look at. We have to examine our own stereotypes.
After Sadhaka made the above statement more students begin to share their own perceptions and stories. The participation increased as candidates contributed examples from their own lives to the discussion.

Candidate 2: There was a Muslim student in our school. The teachers would not intervene when others taunted her. I and another person were the only ones who stood up for her. They taunted her until the day she left school. The teachers did not do anything. The teachers just ignored her.

Sadhaka: Well, we can’t perpetuate this.

Candidate 3: Teachers also have assumptions about students. For example, I was a student at Spencer School. A teacher saw my name on the board. The teacher asked me – How do you pray in a mosque? I did not say I am Hindu or anything to the teacher. I just went home and said – why did you give me this name?

In addition to their own stories, the teacher educators used readings and field visits to trigger discussion. The candidates read the materials before class and were then prompted to share their thoughts and beliefs on a group or issue. Neha, a teacher candidate, described these catalysts as “moral dilemmas.” The readings prompted candidates to consider others’ points of view and question their own values about religion or entitlement. For example, Sadhaka asked the candidates to recall a prior class discussion on what vegetarianism means. She noted connections to some candidates’ beliefs about cleanliness, humaneness, compassion, and religious identity. She then directed them to venture into their perceptions of non-vegetarians. Some of the candidates felt that non-vegetarians are acceptable, while others felt they were morally and religiously compromised. Also present was the idea that biases can be applied to the larger population while exempting their peers. The teacher educator then explored with the candidates the biases she heard, questioning why they claimed it was acceptable for their peers but not for others. The non-vegetarians in the room also shared how they felt about learning that they were seen as inferior by their vegetarian peers. The class ended with statements from the vegetarian candidates about their new awareness of the negative impact of their biases on their non-vegetarian peers.

From the perspective of the teacher educators, exploring beliefs is a way of building sociocultural awareness. Anu, like the other candidates, recognized the importance of this strategy: “We are taught so that we break our stereotypes.” And as Janvi added: “[I have] grown
as a person. I have been able to shatter some stereotypes. This is there with all people [in society]. This course has changed my thinking.” We can see from Janvi that changing one’s thinking is a key part of the program. My observations and these examples reinforce that Rani sees challenging candidates’ assumptions as core to raising their awareness. In the next section, I look at the pedagogical strategies teacher educators at Rani use to promote critical thinking.

**Developing Critical Thinking Skills**

From accounts of their practice, all of the educators believe that part of their responsibility is to help candidates develop their critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills are also a central part of nearly all forms of diversity education (Sleeter & Grant, 2009) and a key trait of diversity educators and their ability to embody diversity consciousness (Bierema, 2010; Bucher, 2010). Neeraj sees critical thinking as tied to candidates’ abilities to form their own understandings of social issues: “I am not here to give them my perspective. I am here to help them construct their own perspective.” And as Rajani, a teacher candidate, said: “The pedagogy was different because it actually focused on saying a) read about the same concept from varied perspectives. That is something. And then b) building your own perspective.”

According to Indu, the purpose of critical thinking is to teach candidates to look at content beyond the packaged information they are given. They must learn to interrogate text, curriculum, society, and their role as teachers through an inquiry lens (Sahara, 2001). Anu, a teacher candidate, echoed her comments by saying how the program challenged them to experience teaching and learning in a new way: “Till now we have studied in different ways. We had books, which we had to cover. Now there is a teacher, topics, and syllabus and no books. The course is trying to break our habit of spoon feeding…We are not habitual [familiar] to this and it is challenging given the constraints.” In Rani’s view, the Indian education system does not teach candidates how to build their own perspectives or deviate from the text.

Sadhaka, a teacher educator, sees critical thinking as the foundation of social action. Being able to reflect on their experiences—for example, on their visits to slum neighbourhoods—helps candidates to foster critical perspectives on the conditions of education. Without the ability to question society, candidates are unable to create social change.
Like Sadhaka, Vidya also believes that critical thinking on social issues like arranged marriages leads to social action and personal action. Critical thinking, she argued, promotes questioning and thus encourages candidates to “challenge [their] powerlessness.” The pedagogy itself is a form of social action that prompts multiple perspectives on the world and fosters the skills needed to make decisions that lead to change.

Rajani, a teacher candidate, confirmed this approach by saying that critical thinking is more about a mindset than a set of materials:

If I have six or seven faculty members, all of them follow different pedagogical strategies and skills. It is not that one kind of book is being followed. We have readings, we have textbooks but at times we are given no readings and we are given no textbooks...so it is [that] I just come with the mind. Come with a thinking mind and that in itself is more important.

The teacher educators at Rani use several strategies to foster critical thinking on diversity and inclusion—encouraging candidates to build their own perspectives, encouraging them to probe and question, and triggering dissonance as a way of generating new understandings. The following sections provide examples from classroom observations and from interviews with candidates and educators.

Building perspective

Building perspective involves learning how to contribute to conversations about social issues and developing awareness of different points of view. At Rani, the teacher educators encourage candidates to take ownership of their learning by influencing the daily curriculum. For example, in Lopa’s Contemporary India course, the candidates raised questions about the Supreme Court decision in 2009 to decriminalize same-sex behaviour in India. Although it was not part of the readings, the candidates brought a pressing issue of social inclusion into the course. In this activity, candidates voiced their opinions, listened to different perspectives, and had a say in the curriculum.

Lopa also used a round table method to bring out the range of perspectives on Indian affirmative action policies. She moved around the room ensuring that all of the candidates voiced their perspectives on the topic and then noted their responses on the board. Anu, a teacher
The teacher educators also encourage candidates to build perspective by seeing their peers as sources of knowledge. For example, Vidya recalled a lesson where she had observed the candidates’ note-taking practices on gender in schools. The candidates were taking notes when she spoke but not when others spoke. She paused the conversation and asked the candidates to adopt a new strategy. Vidya explained to the candidates: “It is not that I am talking and you take down the notes. It is that WE are generating [together].”

Gayatri, a teacher educator, used a reading to help candidates to see an alternate perspective on math education. In one lesson, the candidates examined a Brazilian study on street vendors’ abilities to do math. She closed the lesson by asking the candidates to observe their next market transaction for how the vendors engage in complex mental math. Several candidates shared that it was the first time they saw vendors as possessing formal math knowledge. She then encouraged the candidates to apply this awareness to how they see their own students.

Neeraj, a teacher educator, also used readings as a catalyst for perspective building on issues of diversity. He had the candidates follow an education issue in different newspapers and then analyze how the articles show similarities, differences, and biases in messaging. His colleague Sadhaka gave the candidates readings on adolescence from the perspective of a Muslim child and a Hindu child. In one way, she was encouraging them to see adolescence from various viewpoints. In another way, the ensuing class discussions focused on encouraging candidates to articulate any new understandings about their own experiences.

**Probing and questioning**

As teacher educators, Lopa, Neeraj, Lakshmi, Vidya, and Sadhaka believe that candidates must view diversity issues through a critical lens. This lens sets the foundation for candidates to foster educational change. The ability to probe and question is also an important part of various profiles of the diversity educator (Bierema, 2010; Bucher, 2012; Freire, 1970/1986; Gay, 2002; Kumashiro, 2000). Janvi, who was in her first year, explained: “We are taught to question and it is not necessary that you agree with what is written in the books. We can question anything, even what our teacher is saying.” Neha also commented that in Year 2 “that is what we have learned in the course, to question the answers given to us. Our teachers want us to ask questions.”
Lakshmi described her approach as asking candidates strategic questions: “It is an open discussion, yet with a consciousness to constantly throw little challenges to their thinking.” I had the opportunity to observe one of Lakshmi’s classes in which candidates presented plays on the experiences of children from different socioeconomic backgrounds. After one of the plays, she asked the presenters to consider the evidence they used and push their understanding of patriarchy. “Overtly you may not see it, but I am not sure that it has broken the chattels. You need to consider her role again.”

Later in the discussion she asked the candidates to ask the presenters questions. In reflecting with her after the class, she noted that critical skills take time to develop. She was somewhat unsatisfied with the candidates’ brief responses to her questions and believed they could go deeper in their thinking. For example, according to Lakshmi, in the presentations, many candidates played “the part” from their own backgrounds. In other words, at a subconscious level, the candidates reconstructed their own experiences in the play. Thus, they limited their opportunity to learn by not trying to experience the position of others. In her next class, she planned to probe the candidates’ rationales and encourage them to adopt a more critical perspective on their choices and thinking.

At times, encouraging candidates to explore the roots of their thinking can be uncomfortable. For example, Neeraj probed a candidate’s assumptions of her “self” and “others.” During an internship, he witnessed an elementary student asking the teacher candidate if she was Hindu or Muslim because her name was a hybrid of both religions. Though she is a practising Hindu, she responded by saying: “I am neither. I am a human being.” In the following scenario, shared by both candidates and Neeraj, he maintained that probing is not about student comfort but about student learning. Neeraj explained:

I [Neeraj] asked: What was stopping you from saying that I’m a Hindu?

She said: Then the child would have constructed an opinion of me which would have been very prejudiced because he was a Muslim.

I said: Why do you believe that whatever opinion he would have constructed of you would be prejudiced to you? It could have been the other way around also, and he might have ended up appreciating the Hindu identity.
She said: No.

But then I said: That you can construct out [that you are Hindu] because you were sporting a bindi. Sporting a bindi is like—it’s a mark of Hindu identity and that’s how the child can construct that [fact]. So you lied and said that you are not a Hindu and not a Muslim. You are a human being.

Neeraj went on to explain that, by the end of the discussion, the candidate had considered other responses to her experience. He believes that teacher educators must probe issues even if it causes discomfort: “It’s not that we need to avoid all those issues which are uncomfortable to the students. We need to address them. We need to talk about them, and their perception needs to be shared with the class [and it] needs to be analyzed.”

**Dissonance**

The teacher educators also draw on dissonance as part of teaching critical thinking about diversity issues. Sadhaka and Lopa called it the “unlearning” of content. Neeraj called it the “de-learning” or the devil’s advocate method. He promotes oppositional discussions by making the case for a position that the students then have to then try and refute.

For example, when I had to talk about the caste system in the class—you would have observed that also—the students generally don’t want to open up in that sense. They also know what it means to be politically correct. So they won’t say that they believe in the caste system. So I will tell them, look, now I am going to argue for…in favour of…the caste system. You all know that the education system is against and purports that its purpose is to do away with the caste system. But, I am now going to talk about the merits of the caste system and I leave the job of talking about its demerits….Then they go to the library and they take out the material and then they vehemently oppose the caste system in my class and I deliberately take a devil’s advocate standpoint.

For Rajani, a teacher candidate, this pedagogical approach leads to confusion, but also to new ideas: “He gives the concept. He breaks the concept first—we de-learn the concept—and then we build a [new] concept on it. He leaves us at times in a state of confusion and we also build our own understanding of it which I think is the best way to do it.”

Neeraj and Lakshmi strongly believe that with dissonance comes a change in thinking towards others. It is this change that leads candidates to challenge their biases about particular
groups and their understandings of social inequities. Consequently, fostering dissonance is a cornerstone of their diversity education pedagogy. According to Neeraj, “they need to be agitated and restless. This restlessness, I believe, makes them work.”

Lakshmi also uses dissonance to push candidates out of their comfort zones. One of her strategies is to ‘hot seat’ and cause cognitive conflict. A candidate makes a comment or statement. Lakshmi challenges the candidate. She probes the candidate from other people’s perspectives (adopting roles of dominant and marginal voices) until the candidate experiences dissonance. She described it as “cornering them. Cornering them…til they become uncomfortable and they say, ‘ok, it is not maybe the way we thought.’” In this way, the candidates learn to articulate their stance, see others' viewpoints on their position, interrogate their own assumptions, and acknowledge that there is more than one way to see the world. When I asked Lakshmi why and how she uses this strategy, she said that she lays the groundwork in the first-year Psychology course by introducing them to the concept. She then has them experience dissonance and encourages them to learn from the confusion:

The idea is that I am not explaining it to you, but I will give you a question that will make you think about it for yourself. I will take them to the level where I want them to go…[a level] where they become confused and where it causes a dissonance in their heads. And they say: “Okay now, I have started to feel dizzy so hold on”…but then [I say]: “you hold on to what you just said”…I mean it doesn’t happen [exactly] this way in the class but it comes to a point where they say, “Okay m’am, but wait…you know, I mean I am confused and I am thoroughly confused.” I say now my role is over so then I step back for awhile…I say, “you think about it and then we will again come back and we will see where it leads to.” They then come back with more questions.

Lakshmi also sees dissonance as challenging affective beliefs. She describes her role as a teacher educator as “arousing their emotions” as well as their “academic/intellectual thinking.” She believes that when pedagogy converges intellect with emotions, candidates are positioned to challenge their beliefs. Her job as an educator is to get them to this point, however, she recognizes that only the candidates can truly change their thinking: “For something like diversity you have to be into it…not only intellectually but emotionally to be able to challenge your own belief system.”
These findings show that diversity education pedagogy at Rani focuses on social, emotional, and critical consciousness. By modelling strategies of questioning, the teacher educators try to help candidates probe their thinking on social issues and see different perspectives. In itself, critical thinking as diversity education at Rani suggests a form of social action. By exposing candidates to new ways of learning, teacher educators encourage them to reflect not only on their own lives, but also on their future practice in the classroom.

**Contextualizing candidates’ learning**

The Rani program offers candidates learning experiences in a range of contexts. Contextualized learning aims to make diversity education both practical and meaningful to novice teachers. The context can be the candidates’ experiences, a specific environment, or teaching in particular communities. Consequently context is taken up as lived experience, classroom experience, and community experience.

In several courses, candidates were asked to make connections to their lived experiences. For instance, in a class about negotiation skills in *Self-Development*, Neha reported that her teacher educator began the lesson by asking the candidates to generate scenarios that were relevant to their daily lives. In *Human Relations and Communications*, Sadhaka grounded her discussions on prejudice in the candidates’ life experiences. Vidya asked candidates to use their own families as case studies for the intersections of gender, power and privilege:

> You know it’s amazing how much you can do if it’s linked to experience. How much theory you can actually bring into class if it is linked to their interest and experiences.

The teacher educators drew on existing experiences but also offered new opportunities for learning. For example, Lakshmi teaches her initial classes in Shud Hindi (academic Hindi). Shud is a form of Hindi that very few hear on a daily basis. Through this strategy, she wants candidates to appreciate how hard it is for their Hindi-medium schooled peers to learn in English-medium classes and what it is like for their future students whose home language is not the medium of instruction. “I begin,” she says, “by talking in Hindi. I use very tough terse terms so that people [schooled] in English become uncomfortable. That is the point….this is what happens to us when the instruction is all in English.”
Sadhaka has the candidates in her course interact with guest speakers from different communities. In an extracurricular workshop, she invited representatives from an NGO on disability education to help them learn about special needs. After attending the session, Ela, a teacher candidate, explained how the simulated experiences used in the workshop allowed her to consider accessibility in her own college.

She thought we should know about different disabilities. So last year we had a proper unit and then there was a talk arranged by a different organization like REACH. How do disabled people feel? That is how we get sensitized and experience [it]. Like this time, for the class, we were asked to move on one leg, to know how it feels [and to know] how the college is built. Some girls were moving in a wheelchair, so it is important to know how that feels.

Community experiences provide another context for learning about diversity issues. Sadhaka asked candidates to attend a Children’s Fair. The fair was run by organizations for underprivileged children in the southern part of Delhi. As part of their assignment, the candidates conducted interviews with children on access to schooling.

In the School Contact Programme the candidates conducted a slum visit. For many of the candidates, this was their first exposure to severe poverty in a school and home. As Neha observed:

Then we went for a slum visit. We had to interview a child. The child was studying in a NGO and we had to interview his mother. She told us how they came to Delhi, [and about] the facilities provided by the government. That was the time of the elections and she told us all these parties come here, make promises and do not fulfill any.

Our teacher told us that there was a family where our seniors went to interview. The lady asked them: “Do you want water?” They said “yes” and then they waited for 10 minutes. The lady had no utensils in her house and had to go to a neighbour’s and borrow glasses. This reflects the background the children come from. We heard about poverty but then we see this and we are forced to think.

Contextualized learning as an approach to diversity education is part of the planned program content and also a pedagogical strategy. Similar to the strategies for sensitivity-building and critical thinking, contextualizing learning aims to challenge candidates’ beliefs and open them to new ways of seeing the world.
The Rani approach to diversity education is dynamic and multifaceted. The various pedagogical practices engage candidates’ social, emotional, and intellectual development. They try to build candidates’ capacities and interest in their role as diversity educators. Some teacher educators argued that discomfort can lead candidates to dig deeper, question their beliefs and expand their comfort zones. Inherent in the pedagogies is also an intensity that can be difficult for candidates to manage. The pedagogy challenges them on personal and professional levels. The teacher educators expressed strong commitments to their pedagogies as fostering candidates' sensibilities, critical thinking skills, and meaningful learning. A program that offers something different from mainstay teacher education is not without tensions and challenges.

Challenges and Tensions of Diversity Education in the Rani Program

In this final section, I highlight the tensions and challenges surrounding the implementation of diversity education in the Rani program. Some of the challenges relate to dynamics within the program. Some relate to observed practices such as teachable moments that are not acted upon. Others relate to systematic issues such as the reduction in faculty opportunities for cross-program partnerships, the changing needs of students, and the political and professional status of the program in the broader teacher education context. The various factors establish the context in which the pedagogies are operating. They also lay the foundation for the cross-case analysis in Chapter 7, which explores how tensions impact the integration of diversity education in ITE.

The pedagogical tensions refer to issues that teacher educators face in their teaching. For example, building social sensibilities relies on group activities. However, group activities become challenging if students are unwilling to engage or participate. Sadhaka gave the example of “social loafing” where only a few students in the group complete an activity and others use their work. Another issue is students choosing their partners versus the teachers choosing their partners for them. This is something that the younger cohorts (Years 1 and 2) cited as a challenge because of the cliques that had formed along lines of socioeconomic identity, language, perceived studiousness, and popular interests. When the students were asked to choose their own groups, it was always the same candidates working together and these cliques were part of the program culture.
Sadhaka explained that the phenomenon of cliques changes over time in the program. The students are in cohort communities that spend full days together for a minimum of 5 days a week. As a teacher educator, Sadhaka needs to be aware of the social dynamics that develop within each cohort: “I really believe in it when I give a group work. I think it's important for me and as teacher educators [that] we need to be sensitive to the diversity that is in the classroom.” By Year 3, however, the students are more open to working with anyone in the classroom: “This time I gave them a choice. I said, ‘Do you want to make your group?’ [They said] ‘No m'am’. I think [the] self-development workshops have also helped them break those kinds of differences.”

Another pedagogical challenge relates to the idea of lost opportunities. In my course observations, I noticed that teacher educators do not always take up candidates’ comments in discussions. One scenario in particular repeated itself at Rani. A candidate is asked about her views on a particular dynamic in society. After the candidate responds, the teacher educator moves on to another topic instead of probing further. Lopa attributed this pattern to time constraints and having to move through the daily materials. She felt that some issues are better taken up privately or in a small group rather than as a whole class. Both Neeraj and Sadhaka also mentioned that the deeper work is “up to the candidates.” Ultimately, although educators can introduce concepts, the candidates must take ownership of their learning. From previous statements made by Janvi, Anu and Rajani, we can see that student ownership of learning is something teacher candidates see as both daunting and desirable.

Teacher educators and candidates at Rani negotiate the program’s mandates with their own abilities as educators. These challenges impact nearly all the practices of diversity education in the program, including the aim of empowering teacher candidates as agents of change. Neeraj advocated building this capacity in small steps and providing more support for candidates. He contended diversity education in ITE is an ambitious and difficult endeavour for both teacher educators and candidates alike.

Teacher candidates at Rani see becoming a change agent as both invigorating and unsettling. Some expressed a deep appreciation for the journey while others were less enthusiastic. Lakshmi claimed that there are those who resist and disengage. It is a pedagogical tension that requires resilience on the part of the teacher educator:
The course becomes a part of you. To deal with that is a real challenge. They might be physically there in the class, but beyond a point they refuse to go with you and then to really drag somebody along is very difficult and that for me is becoming hard.

Vidya believes that successfully engaging in the program view of teachers requires support and mentoring, particularly during practicum times. She believes candidates need space to debrief the issues of gender, discrimination, and access that arise in their practicums. This space involves discussing the struggle of putting diversity education into practice. She decided to offer time each class to take up the candidates' questions. Lakshmi noted the importance of pre-internship training:

So it really depends on the students, and on the batches as well, as to how they take it [agency] up. And also for how we initially prepare them for internship....Last year we also had a workshop on sexuality, on communication, on negotiation and peace building. They were...in that sense they were prepared. This batch I feel we haven’t prepared them.  

Other challenges relate to issues of accessibility. For example, Hindi resource materials are scarce and the teacher educators have a hard time sourcing the content. This impacts their ability to teach bilingually in the program. Lakshmi tried to balance the readings in her courses but also recognized the challenges:

The third factor is a balance between the Hindi and the English readings. This is something which I never ever achieved but I do try to choose Hindi readings…so I make a selection, even if it is not contemporary. There must be at least two or three readings in the syllabus.

The lack of Hindi resources also affects teacher candidates. Hindi-speaking students struggle at times with the volume of English readings and rely on their peers for translations. At the time of this study, Sahara University had received a grant to translate several of the core readings from English into Hindi.

Similarly, the teacher educators struggle to find Indian resources for their courses. Many believe that the diversity and social inclusion content needs to be rooted in Indian theories of

---

55 Batch is a colloquial term for a cohort. Candidates in their final year, for example, referred to as the fourth year batch. For the most part, candidates are cohorted/in a batch for their entire program.
education (e.g., as presented by Tagore, Krishnamurti, Gandhi) rather than the more pervasive Western models. Vidya explained that “too much of what we do is Western theory superimposed without looking at realities here at all.” She attempts to mitigate the challenge to her teaching of feminist perspectives by including newspaper articles and Indian women’s narratives as course content. She draws on candidates’ experiences to bring in local “reality.” Lakshmi also claimed that the program relies on “foreign authors, primarily American and European.” Her priority is to seek out Indian and Hindi journals for the college: “It is becoming more readily available, but there is still a dearth….and there is only one copy as opposed to three or four copies of other English journals. We are trying to achieve this but it has not been achieved.”

Both Vidya and Laskshmi highlighted the challenges of the applicability and accessibility of resources for teacher educators. This constraint requires some of the teacher educators to be creative in how they integrate Indian authors in the curriculum. Lopa, Gayatri, and Sadhaka all had lessons in which the candidates were expected to work from a required text. Unfortunately, very few had the copies on hand or had read the materials. The candidates complained that very few copies of the readings were available and that photocopying was expensive. Access to resources is critical if the pedagogy relies on texts to provide alternative views for discussion. One solution is to return to a more traditional lecture-based and teacher-centred approach. However, this approach limits time and space for diversity education practices like dissonance pedagogy or probing. If only some of the candidates have the readings, then it also means that very few are able to get through the materials of the course on a daily basis. In my course observations, the lack of candidate preparedness tended to frustrate the teacher educators. A significant portion of the class had to be spent reviewing the content or even reading an article verbatim to the students. When I inquired about this practice in post-observation interviews, the teacher educators said they felt it was important for candidates to have the content as the exams were approaching. In this case, the external exam culture impacts their pedagogical choices.

The teacher educators also mentioned organizational tensions and challenges. Although they see their work as valuable to the Indian education system, they also feel they are increasingly operating in isolation. Organizational challenges also exist in the Rani program. Lakshmi, who was in her last term as coordinator, explained that although the official aspects of the program are overseen by the Faculty of Education, the program is “lived” at the college level. The educators have a limited connection with educators at other institutions at the university that
offer the B.El.Ed. Over time, the room for cross-program development has eroded. There used to be opportunities to hold joint planning meetings on courses where faculty from the colleges would come together to create and innovate. As Lakshmi explained:

We used to meet at least once a year, twice a year. Especially the ones who were teaching the same papers. That has decreased unfortunately maybe because we are still getting into a lot of administrative things. That used to be very interesting and that used to give us a lot of feedback about how one could take one thing up forward. So if you are taking about that kind of external support I wish we could just be more proactive and have that kind of support.

The faculty at Rani also felt they had a tremendous workload with the many school placements, courses, assignments, and supervision responsibilities. Although they see each component as important to the program, their work is demanding and consuming. Lakshmi, in her position as program coordinator, promoted team teaching and course content sharing to help the faculty make cross-curricular connections in the program. She tries to bring the faculty together in teams. She explained that over the years these initiatives have resulted in faculty learning about the content across courses, improving opportunities to make links, and re-imagining assignments. The teacher educators are also able to draw on each other for support.

The challenges at Rani also involve recognizing that the needs of the students are changing. Graduates can wait up to 3 years before getting a position in the government system. Very few actually enter the government system in the end. Sadhaka explained that this challenge is not about the program's ability to deliver diversity education, but about “whom” the program is truly serving:

Most of them in the program are not being geared towards government schools. It [employment in government school] is not a simple procedure. They have to write an entrance exam, go for an interview, the whole process takes up to 3 years, sometimes it’s 1 or 2 years, depends on whether that year there is going to be an entrance exam, or not. So the first challenge is that they are all going out and they are going to be in private schools.

The same question of “whom it serves” arises when considering the location of the program in women-only colleges. At the time of the study, discussions on offering the B.El.Ed. in co-ed schools at Sahara University were underway. However, there was some debate on whether the feminist orientation of the program would be engaging to a co-ed audience. Meenal,
a candidate, believed the program would be an awakening for male peers: “Like in the B.El.Ed. course there is so much on gender issues and I feel boys should also be sensitized towards these issues. I think they need it more than the girls. This course should be in co-ed colleges.” Many of the teacher candidates and teacher educators agreed that it should be expanded to co-ed colleges.

Indu sees the principles of the program benefitting anyone who enters, whether or not they go into teaching:

This course does give the opportunity for young people to engage with themselves even if they don’t become school teachers. I don’t think it’s a bad idea to extend it to both sexes. Questions of critical thinking, questions of being open-minded, questions of you looking at education as something more than just a transmission of knowledge, I think those questions are important to focus on as a society. I would be very happy that this extends to a whole lot of young men as well because in this country we have many young men coming into the teaching profession.

However, offering the B.El.Ed. in co-ed colleges is also meeting with resistance. According to Indu, this resistance originated with the program’s inception and continues today. Part of the problem is that the program is seen as an outlier both within the Faculty of Education and in the country as a whole:

We don’t have too many advocates for doing the B.El.Ed. All this effort that we made is some of us who really believed to proliferate this model because the resistance that was there in the initial years at Sahara University continues to be there. That is the largest struggle actually….It’s not only about teacher education. I think the B.El.Ed. offers a space for thinking radically about education per se. And that is what is being resisted and will continue to be resisted because it is swimming against the current.

The radical elements are in the program content and in its vision of creating agents of change that have “an impact on how society moves forward.” The B.El.Ed. strives to establish its political and professional legitimacy in a context where B.Ed. programs are popularized as shorter, more lucrative, and established (see Chapter 4 for a description of the pathways in ITE). Even getting the degree recognized on national pay scales as equivalent to the B.Ed. is a source of contention. Indu argued that this struggle is symbolic of a larger systemic issue. Many people are happy with the location of elementary teacher education outside the university. The social reality of the teacher education landscape means that the B.El.Ed. operates in relative isolation.
I would argue that, since the time of this study, the context is changing. The B.El.Ed.’s unique focus on government schools and its orientation to diversity education has given it authority on teacher preparation for the most deprived sectors. It is seen as a pioneer of alternate models of teacher education at the university level and acts as a mentor in program design for higher education and state institutions (NCTE, 2010). B.El.Ed. faculty are also gaining recognition for their expertise in elementary education. B.El.Ed. faculty have been involved in government initiatives such as revising the District Institute of Education and Training 2-year teacher training programs. The program has also cropped up in several universities, private and state institutions, in the north and south of India.

**Conclusion**

Examining the Rani College program allows for a deeper understanding of how diversity education is conceptualized in policy and practice. A common theme in the findings is that the program is pushing boundaries. The B.El.Ed. is transformative because of its approach to ITE, focus on diversity education, location in higher education, and emphasis on serving the most marginalized schools and populations. The program also asks its candidates and teacher educators to reimagine diversity education pedagogies and embody the values of the diversity educator. Building a new cadre of teachers who promote educational and social change is a complex and challenging task.

Rani’s approach to diversity education is morally and socially driven. It is founded on valuing pluralism, empowering teacher candidates and learners, and raising awareness about hierarchies and barriers. Diversity education is integrated into the curriculum in a way that promotes learning as scaffolded, multidisciplinary, and interconnected. The combination of national policies on girls’ education, Rani’s focus on emancipatory education, and the program's location in a women’s college result in a distinct gender focus in the B.El.Ed. In addition to this, many social issues are addressed across the curriculum such as caste discrimination and Hindi-dominance. The Rani program is able to highlight the needs of many communities in its content and delivery such as Muslim experiences in education.

Teacher educator pedagogies at Rani are inspired by the program’s mandate and structure, as well as by the needs of the candidates. The teacher educators see the candidates as somewhat naive about the realities of the world and as embarking on a journey. This belief
results in pedagogical practices that focus on candidates’ sensibilities, transformation and growth. The teacher educators also promote the importance of understanding others and the interdependency of society. Diversity education requires candidates to unravel what they have already learned and make decisions on how to move forward. As part of pushing themselves, they are encouraged to take ownership of their learning. The teacher educators are also asked to invest a great deal in their practice.

Social agency is a key tenet of the Rani program. It is fostered in the program by teaching candidates how to practice openness in their learning and go beyond their comfort zones. Therefore, social agency begins in small ways like class participation and then progresses to challenging gender divides and other forms of discrimination in their internships. However, ITE is only the beginning of their journey. Their ability to become agents of change is relegated to their careers. The reality of this challenge is a complex and often uneasy responsibility, an issue explored more concretely in Chapter 7.

Diversity education at Rani is also seen as both an emotional and intellectual journey. For some candidates, the journey is about negotiating dissonance. For others, it involves learning how to practice empathy, compassion, and new awareness of others. Underpinning many of the teacher educators’ practices is the belief that diversity educators take risks and accept challenges as new learning. The policy, curriculum, and pedagogical practices at Rani promote the educators’ role as opening minds for action. The teacher educators ask candidates not to accept the world as given or the conditions of society as unchangeable. Ultimately, Rani strives to graduate elementary teachers who will push their personal understandings and professional abilities, and thereby push the boundaries of what is possible in the Indian education system.
CHAPTER 6
A PROGRAM IN TRANSITION:
DIVERSITY EDUCATION AT STANTON UNIVERSITY’S GLEBE COHORT, CANADA

Canada prides itself on being a pluralist nation—a composite of many social identities in a vast geographical land. Across the country, a diverse range of indigenous, heritage, and immigrant communities informs the policies shaping provincial education (Joshee, 2004). The Ontario public education system is officially open to all Canadians; however, there are also instances and practices that continue to exclude particular youth populations (Battiste, 2009; Callaghan, 2012; Dei, 2008; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013). As an indicator of systemic exclusion in some localities, research shows that some minority (e.g., Aboriginal, Hispanic) youth are more likely to have low graduation rates, high dropout rates, higher rates of suspension, and inadequate support in schools (TDSB, 2010; People for Education, 2013). In response Ontario curriculum reforms and legislation call for teachers to value this diversity and include a range of social identities in their practice (OME, 2009b).

Ontario and pan-Canadian policies require educators to address social exclusion and create safe learning environments (OME, 2008; OCT, 2010; Hussain, Christou, Reid, and Freeman, 2013). In elementary education, the Ontario Curriculum includes priorities on communication skills, critical thinking, and anti-discriminatory education (OME, 2006). The Ontario Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession stipulates that classroom educators “model respect for spiritual and cultural values, social justice, freedom, and democracy” (OCT, 2010). The Professional Standards requires that teachers “treat students equitably and are sensitive to factors that influence individual student learning” (OCT, 2010). In terms of teacher education, the Association of Canadian Deans of Education asserts that “an effective initial teacher education program promotes diversity, inclusion, understanding, acceptance, and social responsibility in continuing dialogue with local, national, and global communities” (ACDE, 2005). Although the policies establish socially inclusive education as a priority, they do not

56 The teaching profession in Ontario is framed by three documents: The Ethical Standards focuses on the framework of care, trust, respect and integrity. The Standards of Practice describes the knowledge, skills and values of the professional. The Professional Learning Framework outlines standards of practice for teacher development (OCT, 2010).
provide guidelines on how to prepare teachers for their professional and social responsibility as inclusive educators.

In Canada, research on individual ITE programs and courses oriented toward social inclusion is limited. The research that does exist provides insight on curriculum and pedagogy that is multicultural, urban, internationalized, peace-based, and community-specific (see Conle et al., 2000; Cook, 2014; Schick & St. Denis, 2003; Solomon & Sekayi, 2007). However, many of the studies focus on ethnocultural difference rather than on the broader notion of diversity recognized today.

This chapter presents a case study of diversity education at the Glebe Cohort (hereafter called Glebe), one of several cohorts in the Stanton University’s Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) program. The B.Ed. is a consecutive, 10-month postgraduate degree for candidates preparing to teach at the elementary level. The findings in this case study are based on interviews with faculty, candidates, and an administrator at the program, as well as on classroom observations, program documents, and course artifacts. They reveal that many of the teacher educators at Glebe are committed to diversity education and use a range of strategies to raise awareness, build community, and promote critical thinking. However, the findings also document a program in transition as faculty and administrators reconcile understandings of the role of diversity education and the most effective way to integrate it in their practice.

The first section of this chapter gives an overview of the Glebe Cohort and the B.Ed. program. It also outlines the assumptions underlying diversity education in the program and its stated and perceived purpose. The second identifies the content and approach to diversity education in the Glebe curriculum. The third section looks at the pedagogical practices used by the teacher educators at Glebe and the ways in which these practices are experienced by candidates. The final section addresses tensions and challenges in the program arising from different views of pedagogy, varying conceptions of diversity education, and the realities of
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57 The B.Ed. program at Stanton is based on a cohort model. The goal of this model is to develop a community that helps candidates solidify their learning and build a support network. The cohorts are defined either by their educational focus (e.g., Aboriginal education), location in the city, or school partnership. The candidates are assigned to cohorts based on their preferences, which they indicate after admission into the program. At Stanton, candidates take most of their courses in cohort.
teaching and learning in this particular ITE context. Ultimately, these tensions are part of Glebe’s endeavour to increase the profile of diversity education in its program.

**Diversity Education in the Glebe Cohort: Context and Objectives**

Stanton University is one of the largest universities in Canada. It offers both graduate and undergraduate programs in a range of disciplines. Stanton's Faculty of Education is known for its innovation and leadership in education. Up to the 1950s, elementary teacher education in Ontario was offered through normal schools and short qualification programs taken after secondary school (Kitchen & Petrarca, 2013). However, the Ministry of Education then mandated that elementary teacher education be offered in the university setting and that candidates require an undergraduate degree before enrolment in programs. In 1974, the Ontario government formalized the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) at the elementary level (Stanton University, 1996). The Faculty offers ITE through professional learning communities, one of which is the Glebe cohort. In this section, I look at three aspects of this cohort—its composition, its participants, and its aims.

**Program Composition and Study Participants**

Stanton offers different ITE pathways for qualifying in one of three divisions defined for teacher certification purposes in Ontario: the primary/junior division (Kindergarten to Grade 6), the junior/intermediate division (Grades 4 to 10) and the intermediate/senior division (Grades 7 to 12). Of the various pathways, the consecutive B.Ed. program is the oldest model in Stanton's faculty of education. At the time of this study, the program had a total enrolment of 800 candidates, half of whom were preparing to teach in either the primary/junior or junior/intermediate divisions.

Stanton defines itself as deeply committed to “equity, diversity and social justice.” At the Faculty level, this commitment influences leadership, candidate recruitment, staffing, research, and resources. At the ITE level, the focus on diversity is addressed both as a theme across the program and in depth in particular courses. Faculty of Education's mission statement emphasizes:
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58 Normal schools are colleges that are established specifically for public teacher education. The term is still used in many countries such as China and Italy.
equity and access and the improvement of the educational experiences of people of all age levels and backgrounds. While the themes and issues of equity and social justice are explicitly focused on within course work (e.g., School and Society, Teacher Education Seminar), there is an expectation that all courses embrace and infuse these principles through discussion and application. (Stanton University, 2011, p. 14)

Policies and practices fostering diversity and anti-discrimination education have been part of the Stanton ITE program since the early 1970s. As policies for multiculturalism, immigration, community action, and human rights took shape in Canada, so did the Faculty’s focus on diversity and pluralism. Over time the priority has shifted from multiculturalism, interculturalism, class equity, and gender equity (Stanton University, 1996) to diversity and social justice (Stanton University, 2005). The Faculty of Education’s focus on diversity made it a promising location to investigate how an institutional mandate translates into program practice at the elementary teacher education level.

In this study, I examined an elementary cohort focused on social justice, community learning, and action research. Miriam, the director of Elementary Teacher Education at Stanton, explained that Glebe was in a time of transition. Although community and action research have been long standing principles of the cohort, the coordinators had recently added social justice and equity in order to align more explicitly with institutional priorities and build on their own interests and expertise.

At the time of my study, Vanessa had been a coordinator of several cohorts at the Faculty of Education and had only recently become the coordinator of Glebe. Her experience as a classroom teacher and administrator informed her commitment to the new strand. She explained that the attention to equity represents good teaching, character education, and student success as Glebe’s foundation: “[Social justice and equity education] need to be interwoven into all the decisions we make. And it’s not a discipline or a subject. It’s more of a belief, a core of who we are.” When asked how she engages the faculty in this vision, she said they were “already on board”:

They all know that we have a social justice theme. Carrie and I talked, and she does math. And she does a spin on social justice teaching math. And I think at the beginning of the year when we had our first meeting, I said, “These are our themes.” So they knew.
The Glebe teacher educators include permanent and contract faculty, as well as seconded instructors. The permanent and contract faculty teach in the B.Ed. and other Stanton programs. The seconded instructors join the faculty as part of an educational leave from the local school board. All three types of instructors are responsible for teaching components and supervising practicums. The cohort has two coordinators, Vanessa and Hilary, and 10 teacher educators. I interviewed eight of the teacher educators for my study. They represent a mix of new and experienced, as well as tenure track, contract, and seconded instructors.

The new teacher educators, Joshua, Paula and John, had been with the program for less than a year. Joshua taught *Science Education* in Glebe and *School and Society* courses in other cohorts. He had worked for several years as a teacher and administrator in inner-city schools. Paula is a field practitioner who had recently joined the Faculty of Education, but has experience as a teacher educator. She was seconded to the program for her expertise in equity, diversity, and social studies. John had been a teacher educator for 2 years and a classroom teacher for 5 years. He taught *Physical and Health Education* in Glebe and in other cohorts in the B.Ed. program.

The remaining 4 teacher educators had been connected with Glebe for a longer period. Neal and Lynn had both been teacher educators in the program for 10 years. Neal taught *Arts Education* courses, bringing several decades of expertise as a visual arts teacher. Lynn has expertise in psychology and education. Carrie and Steven each had 15 years of experience in the program. Carrie had been a classroom teacher for 10 years. She had worked extensively on math education with elementary schools. Steven, a social foundations instructor, is a veteran of the Bachelor of Education program. Steven and Carrie also brought knowledge to this study on the history of diversity education at Stanton.

The 6 teacher candidates who volunteered for the study varied in ethnicity, religion, and age, and came from a mix of urban, suburban, and rural communities. They were 6 of the 75 candidates enrolled in the cohort at the time. Allie and Preston were taking the program as a second career. Preston had recently returned to Canada with his wife and child. He comes from a European heritage and had worked in the corporate world, taught overseas for a number of years in South Asia, and then returned home with his multicultural family. Allie was in her late 20s.
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59 Seconded faculty are teachers and administrators recruited, with the approval of school boards, to teach in the ITE program for short periods of time (e.g., 2 or 5 years). They return to their board at the end of their time in ITE.
and had owned her own business. Allie applied to the program believing that, after years in other occupations, teaching was her true calling. She described herself as having a Middle Eastern heritage.

Sara, Samantha, Karen, and Nisha were in their early twenties and came to Stanton shortly after completing their undergraduate degrees. All four said their passion for teaching had developed in childhood. Sara described herself as South Asian and Muslim. She wanted to “do something meaningful” in her life, a sentiment shared by her peers. Samantha grew up in rural Ontario and described herself as “the White, Catholic girl who moved to the city, [and] experienced culture shock.” Karen described herself as Asian and a devoted Christian. She wanted to be a teacher to increase the diversity of the teaching force and fulfill her love of music education. Nisha is Indian and had experienced bullying as a child. She hoped to give her future students a safer experience at school.

All the candidates chose Stanton over other programs because of its urban location and reputation. Samantha was the only candidate planning to return to her rural community after graduation. The others were hoping for employment in the school districts near Stanton. Interestingly, none of the candidates said they chose Stanton for its focus on diversity, equity, or social justice.

Stanton graduates contribute significantly to the number of new elementary teachers qualified for certification in Ontario. However, the program also offers candidates the opportunity to teach overseas for one of their practicum placements. Nisha was among the 8% of candidates who took an overseas internship that year. She did so because of the dwindling job prospects for newly trained teachers in Ontario. Miriam, the program director, commented on the international relevance of the B.Ed. at Stanton:

The program fosters skill sets that translate around the world. It aims to help candidates work in any context and see diversity issues in whatever community they are in….Every community they go to would have [the] marginalized, power and privilege, and dominance at play.

In her view, a program graduate has the potential to use ITE diversity education teachings in any context.
Aims of Diversity Education in the Glebe Cohort

In response to consultations and research on effective teacher education, the ITE program at Stanton developed seven priorities as part of its vision, one of which was diversity and social justice. In 2005, the Faculty of Education also added diversity and social justice to its aims, thereby merging its vision with the ITE program. Together these aims reflect two guiding principles: “1) who we are and what we do will reflect the diversity of the communities we serve, and 2) everyone in our community and the communities we serve will be treated equitably” (Stanton University, 2005).

The principles also speak to the beliefs underlying the ITE program’s approach to diversity education. Stanton defines diversity as complex and multilayered—a definition informed by the Ontario Human Rights Code (Stanton University, 2005). The Code defines diversity in its broadest sense as a concept encompassing a range of social identities such as family composition, gender, ancestry, and citizenship status. Stanton also acknowledges that social identity markers are “constantly in flux.” Equity is defined as “similar or differential treatment” with the aim of bringing about “equality in results” (Stanton University, 2005). Social justice is defined as a commitment to “the just treatment of individuals and communities, attention to overt and covert discriminatory practices, helping individuals or groups overcome barriers of oppression, and raising one’s voice on equity issues” (Stanton University, 2005).

Social justice, equity, and diversity guide hiring, admissions, and content in ITE. The program aims to admit candidates that represent the “ethnic, cultural, and social diversity” of urban and Ontario schools (Stanton University, 2009). Applicants need to show how their life experiences and ambitions connect to the principles in Stanton’s policy. Student Services offers support in areas such as cross-cultural training for internationally trained teachers, and accommodations for students with special needs. Social justice is also promoted “in all areas of the curriculum and pedagogy” (Stanton University, 2005). Teacher educators Vanessa, Paula, and Joshua see diversity education as essential to preparing “good teachers.” Miriam, the program director, also stated: “I think it’s sort of like bedrock in a way….It’s something more intimately connected with what education’s for and about.”

The findings reported in this section draw on the voices of teacher educators and candidates to illuminate the aims of diversity education in Glebe. The findings reveal a
multifaceted view of diversity education guided by three main purposes: 1) recognizing and valuing diversity in education, 2) raising awareness of equity and social justice education, and 3) empowering novice teachers to meet the needs of learners.

**Recognizing and valuing diversity in education**

The candidates and educators in Glebe believe that diversity goes beyond the traditional reference to race or culture. Steven, the *School and Society* instructor, argued that although “traditional” differences are popularized, they should not be the only ones considered: “I think that only a tiny proportion of human differences go along gender, race, ethnicity, linguistic, whatever lines, but the way people talk, these differences are given so much prominence.” Sara, a teacher candidate, sees ethnicity as the default definition of diversity in education, but maintains there is more to difference than culture:

> It’s funny because when you hear the word diversity, you have been conditioned to relate it to multiculturalism, ethnicity, but there is also diversity in learning styles, diversity in personalities, so especially as a teacher it is important to think about all the classes of diversity, not just culture.

Miriam, the program director, reinforced Sara’s comment by saying, “some people use [diversity] as a code word for race.” She defines diversity as a “multiplicity” of individual differences and perspectives. Samantha, a teacher candidate, also shared this view. She explained that diversity involves social differences based on large categories that then filter down to individuals and that “diversity, itself, is just everybody has something that’s different. And it’s not just color; it’s not just religion. It’s a little bit of everything.”

The idea that difference is both an individual and collective construction came up often in the interviews. Nisha, a teacher candidate, said that the instructors at Glebe emphasize “seeing everyone as different,” thereby reinforcing the concept of difference as individuality rather than solely a group trait. Sara also agrees that the teacher educators “really push” the idea that knowing the many forms of difference is a teacher’s responsibility. Vanessa, the Glebe coordinator, identified the purpose of diversity education as understanding how group social identities manifest in the individual and, how this understanding leads to differentiating instruction:
Diversity education is probably about inclusivity and acknowledging and recognizing that you have diversity in your classroom. Even though maybe all the kids look alike, surface features, hair color, but their identities are still very different. It all boils down to who you are in your identity….So understanding that [individual identity] and understanding that you need to differentiate your instruction even in what looks like a homogeneous classroom. You need to differentiate the instruction because there’s going to be diverse learners of all sorts in your classroom.

Less explicit in the interviews were comments on intragroup differences. Recognizing intragroup diversity has two purposes: to appreciate individual representations of social categories, and to remove group stereotypes (McGee-Banks, 2001). Vanessa alluded to the first purpose when she stated that teachers need to recognize diversity “even in what looks like a homogenous classroom.” Steven, a teacher educator, believes it is the teacher’s responsibility to see and support the uniqueness of each student:

Like you have two kids from the same family, two brothers or two sisters, one of whom is intensely interested in their traditions and the other doesn’t want to have anything to do with that. And that’s a great example I think of both how you can let people develop themselves and also how you get incredible diversity within a group.

In relation to the second purpose, almost all of the participants mentioned the importance of not stereotyping people based on group identity markers. For example, Sara explained how being a woman is not the same for everyone, nor is being Muslim. Steven, a teacher educator, argued that teaching about groups without attending to intragroup differences only reinforces stereotypes:

I think my biggest criticism of diversity education is that it ends up categorizing people. It ends up having the opposite effect of what we want. And it ends up stereotyping people and giving the impression that everybody of a given gender, race, ethnicity is the same and the differences are between these groups, whereas I think, by far, the most important differences are within these groups.

Paula, a teacher educator, maintained that diversity changes from region to region in Canada: “If you said equity right now, or if you said inclusiveness right now, or if you said diversity right now, and you went to different places in the province, you’re going to get a different answer.” Her colleague Joshua brought a Canadian and American distinction to the
concept, something he felt should be part of the discussion in teacher education: “As far as diversity, it would be any group of people other than the norm or the typical. Here in Canada, that would be white male, Christian, able-bodied, and young who would be considered the norm in power.” Another teacher educator, John, argued that diversity education in ITE should prepare candidates to see social inclusion as being not just for the marginalized or those “outside the box,” but for all learners—those “inside the box” as well. And according to teacher candidate Preston: “It is not something that is so easy to define, it’s a kind of reflection of reality and can change over time.”

Part of the complexity of diversity education is many views of diversity, some focusing on increasing awareness, celebratory aspects and/or the negative treatment of diversity in society. Teacher educators John, Steven, and Vanessa all talked about how Canada is a diverse, multicultural, and historically pluralistic nation. They believe diversity is the norm in urban contexts and a positive attribute in the country. However, the teacher candidates also spoke of diversity as a barrier and a limitation. For instance, Karen discussed diversity in relation to her own identity: “I think just for myself, as a Christian, we are trying to be more equitable and trying to include everyone else's faith and beliefs, I think I should hide mine because it might offend them.” In their courses, some teacher educators work to promote diversity by demonstrating its function as enriching society. At the same time or independently, others see their attention to diversity supporting other ITE agendas, particularly teaching about inequities and social justice. Some comments also suggest that the broad view of diversity outlined in program policies may be more selective when connected to individual’s beliefs.

**Raising awareness of equity and social justice education**

Several of the Glebe teacher educators believe that one of the main purposes of diversity education in ITE is to challenge hegemonies of race, gender, and class. As Miriam, the program director, explained:

You would see that I was talking about inclusive education or equity education, whatever we want to call it. In fact, I don’t even want to use inclusive education. [It's more] like anti-hegemonic, anti-oppressive education or something like that.

Later in the interview Miriam added that anti-hegemonic education should take an empowering tone. According to Steven, a tone of blame is often associated with anti-racist or other
approaches defined by what they fight against. Miriam expressed what many diversity educators agree is a challenge in raising awareness of social justice issues. An anti-oppression curriculum that focuses on examples of dominance or oppression can lead to resistance by ITE candidates due to feelings of guilt and victimization, and the belief that the curriculum is meant for others and not for them (Solomon & Daniel, 2009; Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). At the same time, teacher candidate Nisha saw a possible alignment between diversity education in ITE and anti-oppression education:

It could be integrated with anti-racism education, by looking at race and also looking at secondary matters, like gender, sexual orientation, disability….I think anti- or inter-racial education would be another way of describing diversity education or looking at social justice issues.

According to Vanessa, the program coordinator, teaching social justice issues requires understanding the systemic nature of oppression and how this perpetuates marginalization. She posited that education can challenge accepted beliefs and break cycles of oppression:

The ultimate purpose is so that we have a better world to live in. And what better way to start than in school? A better way to start is at the home, but you have a vicious cycle sometimes where the home can be a place where assumptions and beliefs are promoted. Unfortunately, [this is the case] sometimes and not all the time and then that cycle continues. But education is the facet where we can stop that cycle and that we can be aware of groups that are marginalized and understand why and that sometimes this is so systemic that it's invisible. And that's the main reason is so that we have a just world.

Paula, Joshua, and the coordinators feel that teaching diversity education as social justice awareness needs to include interrogations of power. Joshua defined this as “disrupting perspectives of dominance.” Miriam, the program director, defined it as “teaching everybody about how power works in schools or in society. What are our real histories here in Canada? [History] has just sort of been swept under the carpet and [we need to ask] why are we doing this?” Joshua considers the topic of dominance through an anti-racist and culturally responsive approach. Like Miriam, he believes marginalization needs to be understood in historical terms:

I think we need to look at our students within a historical context of how they have been treated or mistreated. As teacher candidates, they need to know that and know the student. Our candidates need to have a historical context of groups
of people in Canadian society and how they’ve been either privileged or not privileged, how they’ve been oppressed, marginalized and so forth.

Glebe candidates are expected to consider how social justice knowledge translates into the curriculum and classroom practice as well as into interactions with parents and communities. Joshua explained that “we [teachers] just weave it however we can. And let’s make that the norm rather than what the norm oftentimes is, as you know, very, very Eurocentric. Let’s challenge that!” Implicit in the Glebe approach is the idea that awareness of social issues will motivate changes in teachers’ practice.

**Empowering novice teachers to meet the needs of learners**

Many of the Glebe teacher educators said that the purpose of diversity education is to teach candidates how to meet students’ needs by creating a sense of community and affirmative learning contexts. Neal exemplified this in an account of his Art classes in the B.Ed.: “I’m always reminding [the candidates] of that…that you have to…what you want to do is you want to make children feel that they’re part of the whole.” In her Math course, Carrie also teaches candidates to see learners as a starting place for curriculum content: “Don’t start from what you think [the curriculum] should be. Start from what you find out about [the students].”

Joshua explained that knowledge of the community, the learners, and their families is a significant element of teacher practice. Thus, initial teacher education should foster a willingness in candidates to learn from others and integrate this knowledge into the curriculum:

Whatever group you’re working with or population of students or wherever you decide to go, taking the culture of those kids and making that a part of every day as much as possible… So to me, that’s what diversity education is. It is teaching our teacher candidates to do that. To teach them to be willing to and want to go and absorb and learn all they can from their students and their families and then use that as a springboard. But it’s ITE’s job to get them to where they want to do that and can do that. And of course, it’s very hard.

According to Paula, embracing diversity education is often harder for novice teachers because they are afraid to stray from the official curriculum and unsure of their ability to weave in diversity education unless it is laid out for them. Thus, one of the goals of Glebe is to increase candidates’ confidence to take risks by giving them examples of how to do diversity education in relation to the official curriculum. Paula drew on her years as an equity consultant to explain:
With brand new teachers I found they were so… and for many reasons… one reason is overwhelmed. You know, “I just came out of teacher’s college, I have this curriculum to teach. The curriculum didn’t give me an example that had anything with equity. I can’t do it, so therefore, I won’t.”

Diversity education for some candidates is seen as confrontational because it challenges norms in society, candidates’ beliefs, and employment security (Dawson Salas, 2010). Taking risks in ITE asks candidates to go outside of their comfort zones, reflect on their beliefs and practice including social issues discussions in their lessons.

Joshua and Paula see diversity education content as sitting outside the Ontario curriculum as practiced in schools, therefore including it relies on the teachers’ confidence to introduce the information themselves. The goal in Glebe is to help candidates take risks in their practice, modify the curriculum, see opportunities within it, learn from their students, and build community. The question is how to give candidates the impetus to achieve this goal and, beyond this, as Paula explained, how to make diversity education about “good teaching”:

We [teacher educators] want them to walk away with a commitment. Remember I said that I walked away realizing that it’s a moral imperative? That’s what it is… To realize that, “I’ve got to do it.” It’s not an add on; it’s good teaching

At the core of Glebe’s approach to empowering novice teachers is the belief that diversity education is a philosophy of teaching rather than a set of tasks. It establishes a mindset for the candidates. Candidates also gain the confidence to establish a philosophy, learn from others, and in some instances, go beyond their comfort zones, to address learners’ needs in the classroom.

In summary, values of diversity, equity, and social justice are prominent both in the official Faculty policy and in Glebe’s approach to diversity education. Participants presented diversity education in ITE as multi-purposed—recognizing the complexities of diversity, challenging inequitable views, and building the novice teachers’ capacity as a diversity educator. At the same time, the teacher educators’ comments suggest different emphases of diversity education. Some, like Vanessa, saw equity and social justice work as core to their programming while others, like Steven, focused on community awareness. However, an overarching aim was to help candidates develop a professional philosophy that supports diversity, promotes social cohesion and can be enacted in the classroom.
Meeting the intended aims of diversity education also depends on the candidates' willingness and readiness to recognize diversity and commit to social justice work in education. As discussed later in this chapter, the teacher educators see candidates on a “continuum” of openness to diversity education. Negotiating this continuum is one of the emerging issues in Glebe in terms of linking the intended and enacted curriculum.

**Curriculum Content and Structure at Glebe: Integrated and Idiosyncratic**

This section presents findings on how and where diversity education is located in the Glebe curriculum. The program takes a multidisciplinary, but also an idiosyncratic approach to integrating diversity education in ITE. As a multidisciplinary practice, diversity education is clearly present in course content across many subject areas (Drake, 2000). As an idiosyncratic approach, ITE embeds diversity education in particular courses and Glebe educators take up relevant issues as they see appropriate within their subject areas. This section explores how diversity education has become a greater priority in Glebe. This section also discusses the location of diversity education in the course offerings and the teacher educators’ beliefs on how it applies to their courses.

Prior to this study, the Stanton B.Ed. program had an internal review of its program aims and course objectives. The coordinators and directors felt that the value of diversity education was well established and that its presence in the program was notable. Some instructors had embedded diversity education in their courses, and the program had hosted workshops and conferences on topics like peace building, social justice, conflict education, and English language learners. However, the coordinators still felt that diversity education could be better represented across the cohorts and by instructors. Miriam and the other Stanton University ITE leadership decided to move towards equity-based programming and away from what they characterized as the infusion, add-on strategies of the past:

I’d rather use [equity] based than infusion because infusion seems like an add-on. I think, when I’m working with teachers and instructors—when it feels like an add-on—we won’t get as far as when it feels like this is the foundation of what we’re doing.

The Glebe program is based on seven components: four core courses, one elective course, two teaching placements in classrooms, and an internship. Instructors and associate teachers
grade candidates through various forms of course-based and field-based assessment, none of which are summative exams. Candidates must pass all seven components in order to be awarded a B.Ed. degree.

The *Psychological Foundations of Learning* course is somewhat legislated by the Ontario College of Teachers and is really the only required course according to provincial standards. It focuses on child development, psychology, learner differences, and related policy. *School and Society* addresses policy and social issues in Ontario and Canada. The most intensive focus on diversity issues occurs in this course in which candidates are taught about the intersections of society and education.

*Curriculum and Instruction* provides background on the Ontario curriculum and how to teach particular concepts and pedagogy in various subject areas. Elementary teachers in Ontario are considered generalists and are expected to teach all subjects. Candidates complete a series of classes in dramatic arts, language arts, health and physical education, social studies, mathematics, music, science, and visual arts. Junior/Intermediate candidates (Grades 4–10) are also expected to take one additional subject course. They are preparing to teach in grades that may require educators to have a subject specialization.

In the *Teacher Education Seminar*, the candidates are taught about the professional, ethical and legal duties of teachers. The course covers a range of topics including classroom management, assessment, evaluation, and educational policy. It is also a space for topics like school district priorities, job searching, and interviews. In Glebe, candidates are also taught in this course about action research. The action-research project is a mandatory component of the program and teaches candidates to explore a question of interest on classroom practice. At the end of the year, candidates share their projects with a group of peers. The projects often address diversity, equity, and social justice issues in the classroom.

Table 15 shows where diversity education is located into the ITE program. The course descriptions indicate that values of equity and diversity are a core part of teachers’ professional
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60 The Ontario College of Teachers Act, Ontario Regulation 342/02 lists the minimum requirements for ITE. The list is general and can manifest differently in programs. ITE programs must offer theory, foundations, methods courses with practical connections to the field. Furthermore, “the teaching theory and foundation courses in the program include courses on human development and learning and on the legislation and government policies relating to education” (O. Reg. 432/02, ss. 3 (9), 11).
knowledge, and that these values can be addressed within each discipline. The *Curriculum and Instruction* program clearly intends to prepare teachers for “the diverse needs of every student” and outlines this in each subject. *Psychological Foundations* emphasizes students’ “diverse developmental characteristics” and promotes the individualized needs of learners. The *School and Society* and the *Social Studies* strand of the *Curriculum and Instruction* course both focus on teacher knowledge of differences as well as on the impact of society, families, and other groups on education. The descriptions highlight equity, diversity, inclusion, and access as key components of professional knowledge.
Table 15

Course Components and Connections to Diversity Education in Glebe’s B.Ed. Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Description from Syllabi/Program Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>All the course descriptions use the same language “X course enables candidates to understand and apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for designing and constructing effective programs to meet the diverse needs of every student.” The Social Studies description also notes: “Using the Ontario Curriculum documents, candidates in Social Studies <em>study human beings, their interactions, and the various environments in which they find themselves with an emphasis on interpretation, equitable and inclusive approaches and integration across all curricula.</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses</strong></td>
<td>Dramatic Arts, Language Arts, Health and Physical Education, Social Studies, Mathematics, Music, Science, and Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Seminar</td>
<td>Candidates explore their professional identity as a teacher’s foundations for continuing professional growth as an individual and as a member of the community. This course will focus on individual and collaborative processes (e.g., action research) that promote an integrated and informed understanding of teaching and learning through a variety of lenses, such as equity and diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Foundations of Learning</td>
<td>Its goal is to introduce teacher candidates to the key psychological concepts, such as intelligence and motivation, and their interrelations with the diverse developmental characteristics of the learner. <em>Candidates will also be encouraged to consider the independent and interactive roles of the student, the family, the school and society in the learning process.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>This course will help teacher candidates develop a critical awareness of the intersections among schools, classrooms, communities, and society within the changing context of the learning environment. The course addresses the varieties of students who enter the classroom in terms of their diverse social origins, cultures, identities, and social status. The course helps new teachers understand the ways in which their professional work (inside and beyond the classroom) helps prepare these diverse students to be active participants in a changing society. It engages candidates in an examination of the purposes of education, education policy, and of teachers’ responsibility to work productively with school colleagues and other adults to achieve equitable access, experiences, and outcomes for all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Course Description from Syllabi/Program Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Teaching Placements and Field Experiences** | Two Practicums  
(3–4 week placements) | The practicum consists of two main components: 1) orientation to schools, with a focus on school culture and school community; and 2) classroom practice. |
|                                 | Internship  
(4-week placement) | The Internship consists of field-based experience. It allows candidates to deepen and broaden their skills and knowledge in terms of the Standards of Practice (Ontario College of Teachers). |
| **Elective Course**             | A sample of diversity-related courses from the course calendar:  
Actively Educating for Social & Economic Justice; Anti-Racist Education Studies;  
Aboriginal Perspectives in Education; ESL Across the Curriculum; Gender Equity in Schools and Classrooms; Multicultural and Diversity Counseling; Approaches to Anti-Homophobia Education; Gifted and High-Level Development |
The ITE curriculum also includes an elective course. Candidates choose from a list of electives available that year. At the time of this study, more than half of these electives were connected to concepts of diversity and diversity education. Several of the courses look at strategies for diversity education such as conflict education and differentiated learning. Others look at diversity-related approaches like anti-racist and multicultural education. *School and Society* emphasizes “critical awareness of equity issues.” Its focus on candidates' “responsibility to work for equity” reveals a view of diversity education as both human relations and social justice. In the Internship, candidates are expected to attend to professional ethical responsibilities of care, respect, trust and integrity (OCT, 2010).

The *Practicum* consists of two placements of 3 to 4 weeks each in local elementary schools. During these placements candidates engage in school culture and classroom practice, and apprentice as student teachers under mentors (also known in Ontario as associate teachers). The Glebe cohort works with a network of 25 schools in both the Catholic and public school districts. Candidates have an opportunity to work in schools that vary in demography, size, and location; for example schools serving highly privileged communities, high needs neighbourhoods, and suburban areas. The final component is a 4-week internship—a self-directed component in which candidates find an opportunity to work in communities, schools, or organizations. Candidates can complete these placements anywhere in Canada or abroad. For example, 3 of the 6 teacher candidates in my case study were going back to their practicum schools, one was returning to her hometown for a placement, another opted for a non-governmental organization, and another chose an overseas placement.

As part of the Glebe experience, candidates are required to participate in a 1-day retreat. During the retreat, they participate in team building activities and learn more about each other to strengthen their sense of community as a cohort. At the time of this study, in line with the new mandate, the coordinators changed the retreat to focus on equity and culturally responsive teaching. According to Vanessa, one of the Glebe coordinators, the retreat enables candidates to share their fears and beliefs about diversity and inclusion in the classroom: “So that was almost our induction. That happened early in the fall, and our goal was for almost every single workshop that we have, we try really hard to infuse that equity-minded kind of philosophy.” The teacher educators' views about diversity education and how they address it in their courses also demonstrates the various ways diversity education is included in the Glebe curriculum. In the
following discussion, I show how multidisciplinary and idiosyncratic approaches are operating simultaneously in the program. Diversity education is part of several courses and subject areas. The idiosyncratic aspects refer to the various ways Glebe teacher educators approach content and pedagogical strategies in their courses.

John, for example, challenges the candidates in his *Physical and Health Education* course to think of physical education as accessible to students of all abilities. Different from traditional competitive approaches to sports and physical education, he encourages them to see their work in schools as an opportunity to build community by having students work together to achieve goals and appreciate that people have a range of needs and attributes. In one lesson, he stated before a lesson on cooperative games, “teaching for social responsibility is a part of how you conceptualize HPE.”

Lynn, the *Psychological Foundations* instructor, also sees diversity education as the study of individual differences. In her curriculum, she focuses on raising awareness of the types of cognitive and behavioural differences students can have (e.g., motivation, intelligence), the strategies teachers can use to meet their needs, and the importance of empathy:

So I talk about, in my last class we do individual differences, and I actually try to sensitize my students—and you can observe that [in your class visit]—as to what it feels like to have a language production difficulty.

At the same time, she feels that even though various differences are part of her course discussions, her primary objective is to prepare students in the foundations of psychology.

Vanessa teaches both the *Teacher Education Seminar* and the *Language Arts* strand of the *Curriculum and Instruction* course. In the *Teacher Education Seminar*, she strives to look at each topic through the lens of meeting the diverse needs of learners. In her “assessment and evaluation” lesson she talks about accommodating tools/rubrics for students with special needs. She sees her courses as spaces to teach candidates how to incorporate ideas about equity into their lessons and adopt diversity education as part of their teaching philosophies. Vanessa defined philosophy as “where your heart is.” She defined commitment to students as the affective, emotional, and moral compass of teaching. Each lesson or activity is an opportunity to challenge the candidates’ understanding of social justice or equity issues. As part of her practice, she will occasionally pause and give a brief lecture in response to the content. In one “equity
soap box” moment during a formative assessment lesson she paused to address the issue of the poor performance rate of low socioeconomic students on provincial tests:

If you have low expectations of your students then you create an achievement gap. We want high expectations of students regardless of a child’s background. It does not matter if they are from a single parent family, joint family, or any other kind of difference. You treat them the same in terms of expectations.

Vanessa believes that social inclusion, equity, and diversity education can be embedded in all aspects of teaching, from resources to evaluation methods.

Neal approaches diversity education from a curriculum focus on multiculturalism. He sees his course in Art Education as a way to teach candidates that visual arts are an opportunity to explore many cultures and histories. He wants candidates to draw on art resources and perspectives from all parts of the world rather than just the traditional Eurocentric focus:

I think they have to be cognizant of the fact that there is another world out there aside from North American values, the values that they’re brought up with, [and] that whatever things they bring into the art—the lessons—that could be more inclusive of other cultures.

Steven, who teaches the School and Society course, believes that teacher candidates must explore their own beliefs and assumptions before they can take on the role of diversity educators. He uses and promotes an inclusive education approach which he defines as building community, getting to know the candidates as individuals, and providing a safe space to discuss issues of difference in education. He does not see anti-racist pedagogy as part of his curriculum, however he does see it commonly used by others in the program:

What I have trouble with is when people approach multiculturalism and anti-racism in a way that accentuates difference and underestimates commonality…I think it’s highly racist in itself or ethnocentric in itself in that people really are not…they’re almost doing more harm than good in emphasizing difference.

All of the teacher educators share the view that diversity education is a philosophy of teaching that guides pedagogy. Paula explained that in her Social Studies course, the content is secondary to her view of diversity education. She sees the course as an opportunity to teach candidates to think critically about what they know, create a culturally responsive and relevant lesson on any unit in the History or Geography curriculum (e.g., Creating Canada 1850-1890 or
Natural Resources and Sustainability), and recognize how their pedagogical choices can include or exclude learners:

I don’t care if you’re teaching language. I don’t care if you’re teaching math. That’s how you have to teach if you’re going to work with kids. You have to think about who is in front of me. What am I teaching? Why am I teaching it?”

Carrie, the Math teacher educator, also sees diversity education as something that goes beyond a single course. It is a philosophy of teaching rather than a set of classroom strategies. It involves asking “what is learning actually all about and what is teaching all about? What does that mean?” Carrie’s approach to diversity education focuses on drawing students’ cultural backgrounds and their perspectives on learning into the curriculum. She believes that social justice education can be “contrived” if it is not a whole program approach:

So for me, to say math for social justice or social justice in math—well, you know I don’t buy it. I really don’t. To me, it’s contrived… I think it has to be more natural. You have to set it up so that learning occurs, so it becomes part of your whole program. And I think we have to help the [candidates] understand. So it’s about integration in the curriculum and how do you integrate and how do you thread those themes throughout what you’re doing.

For Carrie, a natural approach to diversity education makes it part of teachers’ daily practice rather than a separate priority or response to a trend in education.

The teacher educators use different orientations to diversity education in their courses. For example, Paula approaches Social Studies from an anti-racist and social justice framework. She sees this framework as key to her curriculum:

I talk about the fundamentals of social justice all the way to how to be specific in practice like culturally responsive and relevant teaching. …From understanding this is why teachers need to do this to the actual practice in the social studies classroom. I am altering the curriculum. I am modifying it. I am tweaking it. I am adding stories. I am doing all of that.

Steven, as stated earlier, builds the curriculum in his School and Society through an inclusive education perspective that focuses on mutual respect and community building. Joshua promotes a culturally responsive teaching approach in his programs. His philosophy is shaped by his years as an “urban elementary school educator” and his understanding that science is based on “cultural relevance” and “socio-political action.” At the start of his course he provides
candidates with eight readings. Five of these address diversity issues such as the importance of bridging science with urban students’ lives, the status of women in science, and the treatment of disabilities in science education.

The different approaches to integrating diversity education are seen as a benefit to the program. Vanessa appreciates that “everyone does [diversity education] in their own way.” When asked about how various approaches operate in a multidisciplinary program, Miriam, the program director, explained that the priorities of diversity, equity, and social justice do not change but the content and pedagogy of diversity education can vary from instructor to instructor: “I think it’s the obligation of the university to present multiple perspectives and for [candidates and teacher educators] to think about them together and for candidates to deal with that tension.” The tension means that candidates need to come to their own informed opinions on to how approach diversity education and social inclusion. In my course observations and communications with candidates, teacher educators did not discuss the varied approaches. I identified a range of approaches based on the teacher educators’ comments and modeling of diversity education. For example, Steven and John promote a curriculum of comfort and community. Paula and Vanessa ascribe to social justice approaches that see discomfort and exposure to inequities as a necessary part of the learning process. The latitude given to teacher educators to address diversity education as they see best reflects the openness of the program curriculum. Teacher educators are made aware of the program’s priorities for diversity education in foundations and subject courses, but given the freedom to approach it as they see best.

In summary, the ITE courses feature diversity education prominently in their curriculum. Some courses include it as part of core content; for example, the School and Society course is entirely devoted to issues of diversity and equity. The subject course instructors either approach their discipline from a diversity education perspective or ensure core content about diversity is included. What constitutes diversity education within a course varies from instructor to instructor, exposing candidates to several approaches. The coordinators see the various approaches to diversity education as a positive element in the program. A number of pedagogical strategies ensue based on teacher educators’ beliefs and their diversity education content choices.
Diversity Education Pedagogy in the Glebe Cohort

The findings in this section combine teacher educators' comments on their practice, candidates’ experiences of the pedagogy used by their instructors, and my own observations of the selected class sessions in Glebe program. Three types of pedagogical activities emerged from the data that guide the way diversity education is approached by the teacher educators. I define the first as pedagogical strategies of community. In this approach, the teacher educators use activities to build community with and among the candidates. I define the second as strategies of raising awareness. The teacher educators stimulate discussions or facilitate activities and experiences that help candidates gain perspective on their own views and the views of others. I define the third as strategies to develop critical thinking. The teacher educators encourage candidates to apply higher-order thinking to concepts of diversity and inclusion as well as self-reflexivity about their pedagogical choices in the classroom.

Pedagogical Strategies of Diversity Education

Building community

Community is present in many ways in the Glebe program. As part of diversity education, the teacher educators try to foster social bonds among the learners, throughout the cohort, and between themselves and the candidates. They use strategies like autobiographical presentations, classroom rules, and their own modeling to create community. Teacher educators believe these activities help candidates both value and recognize the many individual and group differences in the classroom, establish trust for exploring controversial issues, and take risks by sharing their identities.

Autobiographical presentations help candidates learn more about each other. For example, in Vanessa’s class the candidates made faces out of different materials representing an aspect of their personality or identity. She provided them with a list of statements. For example, if you put pink macaroni for your hair then it means you are a vegetarian. If you put a straw for your nose then it means you were born in Canada. In the end, the candidates crafted 75 faces with no two alike. The faces decorated the class wall for the duration of the year as a reminder of the individuality in the community. In interviews, the candidates praised the activity for showing them the range of similarities and differences in the group.
During the Glebe cohort retreat, the candidates present "All About Me" projects. In this activity, they prepare their life story in a creative way. For example, Sara wrote and performed a piano composition. Samantha designed a giant board game and, at every turn of the game, revealed a little bit about herself. The candidates shared their projects in small groups. Vanessa, the coordinator, sees this activity as a way for candidates to develop new bonds and create a support network in the ITE program.

In another activity, teacher educator Paula asked the candidates to write her a letter about their life experiences. This is her way of getting to know the candidates and creating a feeling of community with them. She first shares her own life story and the experiences that brought her to value social justice and an equity approach to education. After hearing her story, the candidates write their own. She sees the letters as a catalyst for candidates to explore their identities. She claimed many use it as a way to share their own experiences of marginalization with her. Paula sees her knowledge of their experiences as a key to her approach to diversity education. Knowing their backgrounds means she can make connections between the course content and their own life stories:

When they write me their little testimonials about their family…who’s been marginalized and hurt and lives in poverty, and all of that...at the time they are writing it to say to me, “Paula, so I understand.” Many times, the writing is to say to me, “So you didn’t know it. Well, I just need to let you know that I’m marginalized too.”

These examples of small group strategies and personal connections are important strategies for developing the overall attitudes of community in a large cohort (Solomon, 2000). In my course observations, John and Steven also used these small group strategies regularly in their classes. In part, they see it as a way for candidates to develop more intimate relationships with each other.

Teacher educators’ stories act as a model for their candidates’ explorations and connect the teacher educators to the candidates. Allie and Sara reported that they liked knowing about their teacher educators’ life experiences. According to Allie, “they become real people” rather than simply their instructors. Her comment implies that by sharing their own life experiences the teacher educators achieve greater personal connection. Both Sara and Allie recall a teacher educator describing her life experiences at the Glebe retreat. In their view, the teacher educator became part of the community rather than a facilitator of it.
Several of the teacher educators acknowledged the importance of community rules in creating spaces where candidates can take risks in sharing their views. For example, Paula believes that building community revolves around the norms and guidelines of course conduct, which in turn sets the stage for social justice discussions. She tries to create a space in which the candidates are conscientious contributors, partake in “courageous conversations,” and have the right to pass if they do not want to share.

Being “courageous” requires candidates to reflect on their contributions to class discussions. Paula asks them to use “post it” notes or write thoughts on scrap paper to test out what they want to say before saying it to the whole group. She sees this as an opportunity for candidates to consider their word choice and the impact of their statements. Courageous conversations also establish a particular environment. Effective participation is contingent on candidates’ understandings of voice, respect, and their own reactions:

So for me, I have to start there with the whole idea of courageous conversations and talking about norms. And setting up [with the candidates], “What would we do when?” and listing and creating this list of how we are going to respect each other and each other’s voice in this space. [I say to them] “Because I’m going to be bringing you things that are going to make you uncomfortable, and how are you going to react to that? If somebody says something uncomfortable, what is that going to mean to you?”

Paula tries to establish guidelines on how to listen to others while also bringing voices into the space. She wants the candidates to recognize that diversity education is not always comfortable. In one lesson, she had them watch a video about children’s views on indigenous representations in picture books. Establishing the ground rules of courageous conversations allows her to get into difficult issues like power, privilege, and marginalization in education. After the video she probed candidates’ own experiences with representations of indigenous groups in childhood, and how the video challenges their beliefs. As part of the conversation, three candidates shared their thoughts on colonial oppression in North America and its impact on the treatment of groups in the curriculum.

Lynn, a teacher educator, explained she uses prompts and encouragement in large group discussions to establish comfort. In one lesson, she asked the candidates to share their understandings of particular behaviours like hyperactivity or attention deficit disorder. She
reassured that “no question is wrong” and used the discussion to draw out misconceptions about social differences:

It's so important actually to bring out people's misconceptions and their errors because if one student has got it, a whole lot of other students have got that as well. And if you just suppress their misunderstandings, they’re still sitting there. So I sometimes say, “I'm so glad you brought that up. We can focus on this.” And I'll try and make them feel really comfortable.

Like Paula, Lynn sees both comfort and discomfort as part of creating and learning in a community.

Steven, a teacher educator, defined community as place where individuals know and respectfully relate to each other. Like Lynn, he sees establishing comfort as an essential part of diversity education. “I mean a major theme [of inclusive education] is the importance of getting to know your students and interacting with them and relating to them.” To give candidates an opportunity to learn from each other, he starts class 10 minutes after the scheduled time so they have time to chat. In his view, this unstructured class time is a community building strategy. Every class he also uses small and large group discussions to give candidates the chance to interact with each other.

Further, Steven is the only teacher educator that stated that he builds a more open learning environment by censoring his own voice in discussions:

But then we get into the main topics for the day and maybe look at the readings or whatever. Often we get a lot of whole class discussion going and really great discussion, like it’s amazing what they come up with and the ideas and so on. And if there’s anything they can say instead of me saying it, I think that I try for that as much as possible….And during those times, when they’re talking, you have to really be firm with yourself to not comment on every comment, to not come in and qualify everything.

Like Steven, his colleague Carrie believes creating an open learning community is important and occurs by letting candidates direct the course content. In doing so, candidates are sharing their knowledge with peers. However, open learning does not come without conflict for Carrie. After a course observation, she shared her inner struggle over the topic a group of candidates chose for a social justice presentation. The group had set up several stations including an online
questionnaire on prejudice. Carrie was hesitant because she was unsure how the other candidates would respond; however, she saw it as more important to have the candidates try and learn:

I was a bit nervous about that quite frankly because I didn’t want anybody to be offended in my class. So when they told me that they were going to [administer an on-line questionnaire to determine if you are racist], I didn’t want to say, “No, don’t do it.” Because I don’t want to stifle their ideas, and if they have a good point that they want to make…and it was a good point that teachers do have these sort of predisposed ideas, biases about children in the classrooms. On the other hand, there are students who are sitting there who are of that culture and I don’t know how people are going to react.

In the end, Carrie encouraged the candidates to go ahead with their presentation because she felt it was important for the candidates to be aware of their beliefs. Carrie’s emphasis on peer teaching aligns with her emphasis on having the students bring issues to the classroom that they feel need to be discussed.

In summary, community building is initiated and promoted by Glebe teacher educators, albeit for distinct purposes. The candidates are encouraged to share their ideas, and teacher educators try to model openness and create spaces for shared authority. Carrie defers to candidates in a time of uncertainty, creating a community that enables candidates to see her course as a place to test math social justice education ideas. For Steven, community activities are fundamental to his approach to diversity education. He uses activities to try and create bonds amongst learners and respect in the classroom, whereas for Vanessa using candidates’ life experiences teaches candidates about their cohort members’ distinct and shared traits. She also believes a community bond acts a springboard for their participation not only in her course, but also in their other courses. Paula and Lynn see community building activities as a starting point for more difficult conversations. Concomitantly, community activities are also contingent on the candidates’ perceptions and actions. I address this in more detail later in the chapter.

**Raising awareness of self, others, and equity**

This section focuses on pedagogical strategies that aim to raise candidates’ awareness of self and others. All the teacher educators defined self-awareness as knowledge of one’s personal identity, relations with others and biases. Further, Vanessa, Paula, Steven, and Joshua see self-awareness as reflecting on one’s position and identity. Lynn, John, Carrie, and Neal put
knowledge of others—individuals, communities, and the world—foremost. The underlying purposes are not only to have candidates develop an understanding of the dynamics of social difference, but also develop a sense of responsibility to address diversity education and empathy for their future students.

Self-awareness at Glebe centres on teaching candidates to probe and build understandings of their own identities. The All About Me project and the life experiences letters to Paula discussed above also serve as self-awareness activities. In these assignments, the candidates share their identity. Teacher educators then probe their identity constructs to build understanding of their status in society or their membership in multiple social categories. Sara, a teacher candidate, shared an example of an activity used by her teacher educators Vanessa and Paula:

We were given an illustration of a flower and on each petal you had to write something about yourself—about your social identity, like your age, your socioeconomic status, that sort of thing. So I think the purpose of that activity was to be aware of your multi-facetedness in terms of your diversity and how we differ in all these different facets.

The Glebe social identity flower activity is similar to the one used by Enid Lee in her teacher’s guide on anti-racist education. The primary aim is to have candidates understand their own status as advantage or disadvantaged in society. Candidate Sara’s comment recognizes one aspect of the activity—the complexity of identity, but does not remark on its inequity focus.

A more challenging aspect of self-awareness education is interrogating personal biases and assumptions. At the Glebe Cohort retreat, Vanessa presents candidates with facts, personal accounts, and statistics about inequities in education. She hopes this will lead them to question their beliefs and move toward a more informed perspective on their actions in their future classrooms. At other times, she uses open discussion on topics such as scholarships for university or visible minority recruitment to allow candidates to share their beliefs. A few of the candidates comment that these policies exclude them or their family members from participating. Vanessa tries to explain that equality and equity are not the same:

With the affirmative action example, we talked about identity and our own identity and what we bring [into the classroom]. And certain identities come with privilege when we live in a society such as this. And they came around. It was a big eye-opener for a lot of them. They changed their viewpoint. They were able to
see it from a broader perspective as opposed to just how it affects me or my family. It’s now “how does it affect the upbringing of our kids and everyone?”

In her words, awareness raising is “a huge paradigm shift” from many candidates’ views of themselves and the world.

Joshua uses a quick drawing activity and class discussion to help candidates voice and interrogate their beliefs. They have 2 minutes to draw a scientist in as much detail as possible:

So they all start to draw a scientist. And then out of seventy-some-odd students, we have five girl scientists drawn and maybe one scientist who would be a visible minority. So we talk about what message are we sending to our girls who are going into science-related fields. We know the message we are sending to our visible minorities when the examples that we have in our minds are all of a white man and that type of thing.

Joshua uses their drawings to show prevalent stereotypes of scientists. He wants the candidates to learn that their biases and assumptions can impact a student’s aspirations.

Neal uses a drawing activity with a slightly different purpose. He wants candidates to become aware of their beliefs but also broaden their awareness of different lifestyles in the world. In one lesson, he encourages candidates to ‘think outside the box’ on how houses are constructed:

One of the things that I do is when I introduce them to the whole idea of drawing, I have them draw a house, and they have to use a non-traditional line—[this is] just a little trick that I do. So they can’t use a straight line. And so they have to draw their house using the other two types of lines that exist, curved or zigzag. And at first, they feel very odd about doing that. They kind of question my motives for why I would have them do that.

He uses this activity to challenge candidates' cultural assumptions:

So I have a couple of reasons for doing it. One is that it frees them from the preconceived idea of what a house should look like because for most people a house still has the square and triangle for a roof, and that’s kind of the way we perceive a house. So it forces them to develop…to think of a different way that they can represent this house. And then, at the end of the whole thing, I introduce them to a book about houses around the world, and I point out that our perception of a house in North America may not be the same as a house in Afghanistan or in India.
Awareness also relates to knowledge of social justice issues in the world. Vanessa, for example, carefully chooses the readings for teaching candidates about literature circles. The junior novel *Bifocal*, for instance, is about two students who are struggling with racism and Islamophobia in their school. In small groups, the candidates read and discussed the book, and then prepared a series of lessons on it. Vanessa used their lessons to initiate class discussion on perceptions of the ‘other.’ In another example, she used a *Language Arts* class on text forms to prompt a discussion about how some groups hold more power in society than others:

It was using text forms and understanding how to teach text forms, but I did a spin on black history, and we focused in on the four black girls that were bombed and killed in the Alabama bombing by the KKK in 1963 I believe. And we talked about power and misuse of power. I wish you were there because it was such a great session. And I cried. But I wasn’t the only one that cried.

Vanessa also uses supplementary materials to help candidates extend the class discussions. For example, she posted two articles on the course listserv—one on gender issues in education and the other on the impact of reading on students—and wrote in her message to the candidates:

I am working on a social justice/literacy research project and came across two great studies about the critical importance of students’ interests when planning for teaching. We discussed this yesterday morning. You have the wonderful challenge of presenting subject content, and transforming education into an engaging and interesting learning experience for students!

However, according to several of the teacher educators, knowledge of an issue is not enough. Carrie, Lynn, Vanessa, and Neal all talked about the importance of perspective-building activities in which the candidates put themselves in someone else’s shoes. For example, Paula explained that “you can talk until you are blue in the face, but if you show them or let them experience it first hand, then that is when meaningful learning takes place.” Meaningful learning for Paula is transformative—it leads to personal and professional change.

Lynn explained that she runs activities in her course that simulate having a learning disability or behavioural need. In one class, she wanted the candidates to feel and experience challenges in speech production. She asked them to tell a story without using words that have the letter N. The candidates went through the activity fumbling for words and exhibiting signs of frustration. In debriefing, the candidates shared their discomfort with having to pause and think
about every word. They felt frustrated that they could not communicate what they needed to. Lynn believes experience has a more lasting impact on learning than receiving information:

It is most important to me that candidates’ experience and know what it is like so that they build their sensitivity and awareness to issues…to feel and understand what it is like to have a disability. It is one thing to give them theories, but with Google and the internet, information is at their fingertips. They can read up on anything, but really knowing what it feels like and experiencing it for a moment is something different.

John had the candidates walk to the university gyms in a scavenger hunt activity. He asked them to look for many things related to his course including accessibility ramps and gym culture. In the debrief, candidates explained how they observed a gender divide in the facilities and that the accessibility ramps were difficult to navigate. Many noted they had never considered the gym contexts at Stanton before, let alone the equity implications. John then gave them advice that he applies to many aspects of his pedagogy: “It is about crossing the threshold into the unknown.” He sees learning as having the confidence to take risks.

Vanessa uses the candidates' practicum placements as a way of exposing them to different communities and broadening their awareness of the world. The candidates are required to do two practicums. Vanessa and her fellow coordinators try to strategically arrange them in different areas:

So for example, some TCs wanted to be at Ferndale for the first term and Glenacres second term. [We said] absolutely not because you’re dealing with affluent/affluent. So we’d sit down with them and say, “You need to be experiencing a high-needs school. That’s important. It’s not only important for your resume, but it’s important for your development as a teacher. You need that experience.”

According to Paula, Joshua, and Vanessa, a large part of raising awareness involves asking oneself questions. Vanessa explained that, in one of her classes, she presented the candidates with statistics on the socioeconomic and cultural biases of standardized tests in Ontario. She hoped that through this activity, the candidates would begin to develop what she sees as the moral responsibility of meeting the needs of all learners:

So we have to look within ourselves as teachers. What are we doing wrong? So that was a big eye-opener for them. And then they realized, “Okay, because of
this data, we need to shift and change certain practices because we’re not meeting
the needs of certain groups.”

Across the courses, teacher educators address social issues based on gender, ability,
culture and economic inequities as part of this education about the other. For Steven and Carrie, awareness is tied to listening to learners and gaining knowledge about their backgrounds. For John and Lynn, it is the bridge between candidates’ own life experiences and their understanding of others' experiences. Based on Vanessa’s and Neal’s comments and my own observation in the ITE classroom, the candidates’ experiences are assumed as distinct from others’ experiences (cultures or inequities). Thus, in many courses, a perception and pattern of concepts or issues being new to candidates exists. Lynn, John, Joshua, and Neal use strategies that have candidates create a new experience within the program. These activities then become the springboard for discussions. Other teacher educators use “soap box” moments to raise questions or remind candidates they need to be aware of their own identities or a particular issue facing education. In many of the examples, they are hoping candidates will apply their new awareness to future practice. Taken together, the teacher educators in Glebe see awareness as a moral and professional responsibility of effective diversity educators.

**Developing critical thinking skills**

For the teacher educators in Glebe, critical thinking skills are a key element of diversity education. Vanessa, Paula, and John defined critical thinking as the ability to question the content and messaging behind texts or media. Vanessa called it “learning to read between the lines.” Carrie, Lynn, and Steven described it as the conscious deliberation of how to make learning and curriculum more meaningful for students. Joshua defined it as a process of challenging assumptions, defining what social justice means, and understanding how individuals are socialized into accepting hierarchies of power and privilege. His viewpoint is shared by his colleagues Vanessa and Paula. In their courses, teacher educators try to promote critical thinking as essential for understanding social issues, diversity, and the school curriculum.

All of the teacher educators agreed that the only way for candidates to learn how to ask critical questions is to provide engaging content. Readings on social issues need to be carefully selected to challenge assumptions. The content of class discussions needs to be relevant to candidates. In *School and Society*, Steven uses the conflicts candidates face in their practicums
over whether to teach holidays like Christmas. Lynn, in her Psychology course, uses case studies of special needs students to bring out the experiences of teachers and families. For the arts course, Neal uses the children’s book The Color of Home to teach a lesson about a refugee child’s experience of war, his art, and his transition to a new school in the United Kingdom. Both resources present perspectives on life experiences. In the follow-up discussion and activities, the candidates are asked to compare the experiences to what they see occurring in their practicum placements.

In one lesson, Vanessa taught the candidates about James Keegstra who is a former public school teacher from Eckville, Alberta. He was convicted for hate crimes because he taught anti-Semitic content to his students. She explained the case is commonly used in ITE to teach the limits of freedom of expression in the classroom. She then introduced the school boards’ anti-racist policies. Several critical questions were raised in the class discussion on how prejudice is addressed by teachers:

Candidate 1: Does the anti-racist policy drive “hate conversations” into private spheres? If so, then how can you address them as a teacher?

Candidate 2: What happens if I talk about my sexuality and being gay? Can I get in trouble for this? Am I protected?

Candidate 3: What happens if you promote hatred based on class? In the UN code you cannot be persecuted for discriminating against class.

The candidates raised questions of private versus public beliefs, class, sexual orientation and gender. Vanessa responded to the questions by reinforcing the policy’s role to protect students and teachers, reiterating their need to think about what safety means in the classroom, and reminding candidates that as teachers they are being held to a “higher standard.”

Teacher educators also use activities to prompt higher-order thinking and self-reflexivity. In a Social Studies lesson, Paula helped candidates question their thinking about First Nations communities through a series of activities. She first had candidates think about what they know about the Aboriginal community, the stereotypes they have heard, and the facts they know. She then asked them to identify the sources. What emerged from the discussion is that the candidates held a wide range of beliefs based on stereotypes. She then showed a video about images in children’s literature on Aboriginal communities. The reaction of the participants was
overwhelming humility; very few had ever questioned the source of their perceptions. This led to a discussion on the factors a teacher should consider when choosing resources for the classroom. Candidates expressed that, for the first time, they were critically examining their own teachings about the nature of community.

Teacher candidates recognize their teacher educators’ efforts to have them think critically. Preston gives an example from his Social Studies class. Karen had distributed several social justice-oriented lesson plans. This prompted him to think about who is represented in the curriculum. He believed that his instructors encouraged him to challenge his assumptions of official curriculum content as absolute:

[If] I'm teaching history [and] I'm teaching the Middle Ages, okay we are going to talk about European Middle Ages. But no, that's not necessarily so. Let's talk about the great cultures of the part of the world that we don't always know about. At that time China was a very advanced culture and there is a lot of great things you could do with that, and a lot of schools, there are a lot of students with Chinese heritage, and there is no reason for you to talk about European history when you can show another history that reflects the heritage of the students in the class or other parts of the world at different times. It doesn't only have to be about European history.

John models critical thinking by using “teachable moments” related to diversity and inclusion. In one class, the candidates did a fitness circuit where they had to move between various activities like doing jumping jacks, skipping rope, and tossing balls. As the candidates were working out, he spoke to them about the activity. He instructed them to pause and asked them to think critically about alternatives or modifications for people of varying abilities.

I asked them at each station, and they were in groups of perhaps three or four students going around to a series of circuits or stations. And at each station, I asked them to think about ways that you could modify the activity for learners of different abilities. So if you have someone who is struggling with this circuit, how can you tweak the activity so that they can find it challenging but still be able to do it.

Several educators model their practice by providing exemplars. Paula handed out a series of units she had designed for different grades using a culturally responsive teaching framework. She had candidates deconstruct the lessons in small groups and think about their reactions to
particular pedagogical choices. She then visited each group and provided her rationale for the
design.

John wants candidates to understand the choices teachers make in planning. By way of
example, he records his own experiences as their instructor. After each class, he posted his lesson
plan and his reflection on the lesson. In the lesson plan, he puts notes in the margins and flags
where he should make connections to values of inclusion. He interrogates his own experiences as
an example of reflective practice. In one reflection he wrote:

Skipping and other forms of aerobic activity occupy just as important a role in the
HPE curriculum, and are also as valid in terms of “worthwhile” activities. Dave
showed us ways to develop progressions from skipping and I really liked how he
showed how you could be an active participant without necessarily jumping.
When I was skipping, I felt a bit vulnerable in that I found it difficult to give
students suggestions on how to break down the skill to make it easier.

The teacher educators at Glebe use critical thinking as a tool for developing candidates’
diversity consciousness. Using a variety of approaches, the teacher educators encourage
candidates to raise questions about stereotyping and the messages they are communicating to
their students about particular histories or groups. Even though teacher educators value critical
thinking as core diversity education pedagogy, less obvious in the examples is their ability to
deeply address statements with candidates. Further, as Vanessa pointed out, critical thinking
requires a depth of questioning that not all candidates engage in: “Some of them are very safe,
and they just do very…it’s just touching the surface about social justice. It’s like, ‘Everybody’s
different. Let’s appreciate each other,’ where others choose to really dig deeper and challenge.”
She defined “deeper” as: “They’re doing some soul-searching. And they’re understanding how
teaching has to be explicit about stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, and critical thinking.”
Less clear from the teacher educators’ practices is whether they believe candidates are able to
effectively engage in critical thinking without prompting. This signals a tension in the Glebe
program about the role of ITE. Vanessa indicated in her statements that some candidates already
possess the skills, while others require significant support.

Challenges and Tensions of Diversity Education in the Glebe Cohort

The reported experiences of the teacher educators and candidates also highlight the
tensions and challenges of enacting diversity education in Glebe. Four areas of tensions and
challenges emerged from the study findings. The first is the range of experiences of community in the Glebe context. The second is the mixed response by candidates to diversity education in the program. The third concerns various perspectives on candidates’ interest in and commitment to diversity education on entering the program. Teacher educators believe that candidates enter on a continuum, which is defined by their readiness to take on the role of diversity educator. The fourth concerns the challenges of operating in a climate of transition. These tensions and challenges shape Glebe’s diversity education agenda, leading to important considerations for pedagogy and program design.

**Multiple Communities and Diversity Education**

There were 75 candidates in the Glebe cohort. The majority of the classes were held in a large room with the full group and candidates clustered in smaller groups of four to six around hexagonal tables. Classes were taught and experienced as a whole group, in half groups, and in small groups. After several observations, I began to see how the practices of teacher educators and candidates’ engagement created varying experiences of community and degrees of cohesion. In turn, the community dynamics shaped candidates’ experiences in the program and teacher educators’ perceptions of their diversity education pedagogy.

The whole community was evident by the physical presence of candidates in the classroom. Yet, their presence did not translate into whole participation in some of the program activities, particularly in discussions about diversity and social issues. According to several candidates and further reinforced by my own observations, the contributions to large group discussions were dominated by the same 10 to 15 students. Allie, a teacher candidate, explained that this group dynamic had been evolving since September. Over time, fewer and fewer people raised their hand to offer comments in large group discussions. She doubted that those who had become the most vocal in the large group represented the range of beliefs in the room, particularly her own. She related this lack of participation by most participants to an unwillingness to engage in conflict:

> After a while, there isn’t any real discussion that’s going on. In the beginning, everyone is really eager but by the end, it’s the same four people raising their hands and talking. You are given an opportunity. I’m not going to bash [the program]. If you had something to say, you are given an opportunity to say it. But what’s the point of saying it? Who are you saying it to?
Participation and openness to discussing different views can be part of raising awareness. The visible lack of participation by the majority of peers was a challenge for both candidates and teacher educators. Allie’s sentiments signal that she did not view the whole community as a place to explore ideas. The reduced participation over time also suggests candidates are reacting to their peers, teacher educators and/or other discourses in the programs. Glebe’s whole group dynamic raises an important question for diversity education pedagogy—whose voice is heard and not heard in the ITE classroom?

Several of the candidates and Steven, the School and Society teacher educator, talked about how candidates’ expressions of their religious values were seen as contentious within the class. During a class break, one of the candidates, Hailey, stopped me in the hallway to explain that Glebe’s approach to equity education was about the suppression of Christian values and beliefs. “It is all about listening to everyone else but us.” In looking at Hailey’s comment alongside Allie’s comment above, the whole community is not always seen as a place where people listen. In Hailey’s case, it is also about not being able to contribute her own perspectives. Both experiences signal a tension between what is intended by diversity education pedagogies and what is experienced.

Steven tried another approach in his course that led to a different form of community. By doubling his workload, he scheduled his classes twice a week and divided the candidates into two sections. He believes class sizes of 37 to 38 are more conducive to his course and his approach to diversity education. He sees whole cohort discussions as discouraging participation and believes that smaller groups offer opportunities to raise candidates’ awareness of inclusion issues and build positive relationships. As an example, Steven referred to the role some of the religious fundamentalist candidates had adopted in his course. He described some of their ideas as “way out there” at times, yet important to hear. Not only do their ideas provoke discussion, but they force candidates to negotiate their understandings of social acceptance and find a way to co-exist in the small community. In one class, a candidate commented on her frustration on the decreasing emphasis on Judeo-Christian holidays in schools. In these smaller classes, Steven
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believes candidates are at the very least putting social issues in education on the table. It gives them space to delve more deeply into their beliefs.

The candidates also formed cliques or smaller communities that created another dynamic in the program. The smaller communities were strong and even when the class was asked to divide into groups, the candidates tended to sit with the same peers. This practice signals a tension in candidates’ abilities to put into practice the inclusionary practices promoted by the program. It also challenged teacher educators to make their pedagogies of raising awareness more effective.

Five out of the eight teacher educators commented on this formation of groups in the cohort. Carrie, the math teacher educator, claimed that the candidates tended to sit in ethno-racial and age groups. Paula observed that the groups in her Social Studies course were based on social bonds. Vanessa explained that the groups had developed unintentionally: “I think once they formed their table groups, that was it. That's who they gravitated towards, which is nice but in a group of 70 to 75 kids not everyone can really understand each other.”

Like Carrie and Paula, the teacher candidates explained that the groups were deliberate choices and also had important functions in the community. Allie found a peer group on the second day and that group became her learning network for the remainder of the year: “You're talking to the same three or four people. You're working on the same projects together and you sign up for everything together.” Nisha commented that the small group communities were places of acceptance, but also rejection. She felt like a drifter or extra until she was able to find a home table:

When I came in at the beginning, I was one of those people that floated. I sat anywhere…I didn't find “a” group to sit with because people sat at the same tables and when you joined a group, it was like “oh you're an extra”….I just started talking to some people in the far corner. I found that was my community and that was the table that I liked. But I hated sitting somewhere else….Even the girls I went to practicum with, we had a great time but when it came back to the classroom, I wanted to stay with my group. I didn't want to go to different places. That's why you had to find a place in the class. If you didn't have a place, it sucked.

Karen, Audrey, and Sara also sat in the same groups for the majority of the program. Preston was one who moved around; however he recognized this was an anomaly.
Paula, the *Social Studies* teacher educator, felt that part of her responsibility as a diversity educator was to push candidates out of their comfort zones. She wove the challenge of the small group dynamic into her pedagogy:

Yeah, I broke that at times. Like I would number people and put them to sit at a different table. You saw the ones who resisted that. They’ve now made social bonds and wanted to stay [with their small group], and I’m like, 'No, you better go sit at that table.'

John, the *Physical and Health Education* instructor, also saw the group dynamic clearly from his first class with the candidates:

I felt in Glebe there were almost little cliques in the teacher candidates. And I could see that from the first class—who was working with whom—and that [the clique] wasn’t for everyone. But probably half the class had their own little group of three or four, and I could see that very early on.

John saw the small group dynamics as thwarting his intentions of having candidates experience strategies like cooperative learning:

The cooperative games were not just a chance to see how this could be taught in your class, but it also helped you to be cooperative with the other teacher candidates….They’re probably thinking of it a bit more as, “Well, I’ve got my friends. I know who I get along well with and whose opinions I tend to agree with. This is just how I can use this for phys ed. It’s not for my own personal community building in the program.”

These dynamics highlight some of the community tensions teacher educators and candidates experience in ITE. They impact pedagogy because teacher educators can only draw from a small group of volunteers for discussions. Although Paula and Steven see the community structures as an opportunity to model their beliefs about diversity education, John believes his pedagogy is less effective in a balkanized environment. The community dynamics were not something he felt he could change in his four *Physical and Health Education* classes. Nish and Allie consistently expressed that experiences of community impact diversity education at Glebe. They claim that regardless of whole, half or small group dynamics, a tension emerges as to what degree beliefs can be expressed openly or are welcomed in discussions. Their claims also support another tension that implicates pedagogy—the mixed reactions candidates and educators have to diversity education in ITE.
Mixed Reactions to Diversity Education

The teacher candidates reported mixed reactions to the various pedagogies used in the program. Preston, Sara, and Karen thought the class discussions were critical and raised their awareness of diversity issues, social justice, and culturally responsive lesson planning. Nisha, Allie, and Samantha, however, felt that their instructors were somewhat limited in their pedagogies and discourses. They felt the discussions were informative but not critically analyzed. Nisha walked away feeling like diversity-related discussions were tempered and censored. She wanted a pedagogy that teaches her how to think critically, something she experienced in her elective course on anti-racism but not in other parts of the program. She also sought an approach that not only “raises questions” but also teaches her “how to answer them.”

If issues are too touchy, they refrain from talking about them. They would rather us figure it out on our own. Or that was a good discussion, but they didn't realize that there was a lot of stuff unanswered.

Allie and Samantha also believed that having opportunities to work through questions together would have been more meaningful. As Allie commented:

We are all fairly educated, we can speak honestly and sometimes there was a lot of over-dramatizing and a lot of too politically correct and less critical discussion….It’s with the best of intentions, but there’s no critical thinking at all. It’s “this is how you should think, this is what you should teach, and just accept it as that.” And in that sense I was disappointed.

Allie felt that when controversial issues were raised, the teacher educators would default to a moral stance (e.g., racial profiling is bad, intolerance is bad, women are oppressed). At other times, raising awareness and community were hindered by what Nisha called “sugar coating” and “political correctness.” She believed her peers assumed inclusion as a given in Canadian society. Nisha’s experiences of discrimination based on her Indian heritage told her otherwise. She believed the permitted discourse prevented meaningful engagement with issues:

Sometimes I think they teach you “oh yeah it’s okay to be different, empowerment this and that.” I think sometimes that is all sugar coated. I think people don't know the reality sometimes, what's really out there, especially when you're not different and you blend in easily and you are the dominant race. You really don't know what it feels like to be different and what it feels like to be in that shoe because you never really felt it for your whole life. Sometimes in the
program, we talk about issues of diversity. It's easy to talk about these issues but it's really hard to understand them and it’s easy to say “yeah it’s good to be different, it’s good to be like this, teach like this.” It’s not the reality of what's out there.

The following exchange is from my observation of a discussion in Carrie's Math class. It supports Nisha’s earlier comment on how “touchy issues” are addressed by some of the teacher educators in Glebe. After a small group presentation on culturally responsive math practices, Carrie engaged the candidates in a whole class discussion. The discussion turned to international rankings for math achievement, the strong content knowledge of Chinese teachers, and China’s high performance on evaluations like TIMMS and PISA:

Candidate 1: I don’t think we should beat ourselves up about not achieving like some countries.

Candidate 2: Are they really doing better in math fields?

Candidate 3: China is doing pretty darn good.

Candidate 1: That is because they have a huge population of slave labour and get paid $3.00 a day!

Carrie: There are a lot of politically sensitive issues. We are not here to discuss the politics of it and we won’t get to data management if we do. We need to remember it is about serving our students. If you want to talk about it further, we can. You can meet with me or in a small group. Let’s take a break.

In a follow up interview, I asked Carrie about the exchange and her decision to end the class. She explained that she sees “changing attitudes” as beyond the scope of her work and that her role is to raise awareness relevant to math. She also did not feel she had the training to deal with the issues raised:

No, I don’t think that’s something that I should touch, quite frankly. I mean it’s like that comment that woman made today that was contentious, and who knows where it would have led to?! ….These are very personal deep-seated, deep-rooted values, morals, cultural values that you grow up with, that have been instilled in you for years to come. How do you change those values? How do you even recognize that you have those biases? And I don’t think that I’m a psychiatrist or a psychologist or a therapist. That’s not my job to do that.
Carrie does not believe that challenging biases is part of the scope of her math course or practice, though she does see her mandate as raising awareness about the importance of gender, culture, and social justice links to math. Her desire to have candidates know their biases, as evinced in the community example provided earlier, conflicts with her practices here. Her perceptions also signal a challenge between the desires of some of the candidates to go further, and the perceptions of some of the teacher educators that there are only certain times and places for this work in ITE. Carrie also addressed her uneasiness with tackling particular issues and whether or not it is the purview of the program.

**The Diversity Educator Continuum**

Some of the teacher educators see the candidates as being on a diversity education “continuum.” At one end of the continuum are candidates who appreciate differences, see diversity education as a way to meet the needs of all learners, and internalize the social and moral responsibility of the work. At the other end are candidates who do not see diversity education as a priority or do not understand it. The goal for some of the teacher educators is to move candidates along this continuum. Vanessa described this work as “not easy,” Paula said it is “hard,” and Joshua described it as “very tough.” As coordinator Vanessa explained: “I think there are certain students in my [cohort] that I certainly feel are further along the continuum. And when I say *continuum*, it's a big continuum.” Her goal is to generate educators who are committed to “making a difference.” At one point in our conversation, she concluded that she was unable to prepare all 70 candidates to be effective diversity educators. She was disappointed but also saw this as a somewhat unrealistic goal, particularly with the candidates who saw the profession as more about securing a position:

> Have we gotten there yet? Absolutely not. I don’t think we’ll ever get there … Others really want to make a difference. I’m hoping they’re more towards that end of the continuum where they really do want to make a heartfelt difference. But I still think that some of them are just at the beginning phase of “I just want a job.”

Vanessa uses several factors to assess a candidate’s location on the continuum. She looks at what they say in discussions about diversity, their level of awareness of others, the depth of the questions they ask about issues of social justice, and their commitment to social justice education in their course assignments and practicum placements.
Joshua defines the continuum by the breadth of candidates' awareness of inequities and their desire to take action:

Can I get them from there to action? Which ones can we get from here to action? And I found those who really see it already are involved with challenging the status quo and raising those difficult questions, and saying, “But this isn’t right.” Walking that tight rope as a teacher…although you have to be very careful politically…I mean they’re already generating those questions. There’s this huge gap between those who I would say get it and then the rest of them.

Like his colleagues, Joshua feels that the 10 months of the program and the short amount of time for his course are not enough to move some of the candidates along in their approach to diversity and diversity education:

I would hate to think that awareness is as far as we can get them, and perhaps that’s even a pessimistic viewpoint. And I certainly hope that we can get more beyond that, but in looking at where the students…as a teacher, we take students where they come to us and we move them. They come to us from wherever they’re at. And if a group of them is in this place that says, “There’s nothing wrong with society, there’s no racism, this is Canada, I’m a female but I get treated just like males,” et cetera, I guess in my mind, how far can we move them in six meetings of *Science*?

Paula also used the continuum to explain her understanding of diversity education and approach to pedagogy. She sees the task of moving candidates to the end point as a challenge for the Glebe program because of the many external forces at play, such as candidates' practicum experiences, their resonance with diversity education, and their own beliefs. She defines the end point as transformative action—a passion for diversity education as a philosophy of teaching:

I don’t think we can in 10 months. I’m going to be very honest. Some people, absolutely. Some people, absolutely. Some people, you can probably transform their lives in one conversation—that something you said just resonated so deeply with them that they're like “oh, my god, that’s so exciting. I can’t wait to pursue this more.” Off they go. But if somebody walked in on this continuum of understanding and they’re way over here and they don’t even see why we’ve got to do this, and when they go out in their practicum placements, none of the teachers around them is doing it, that’s a harder person to move onto the
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continuum to transformative action than the person who already felt “there’s a reason for me to do this.”

Like Vanessa and Joshua, Paula believes that reaching the end of the continuum is the ideal, but not all candidates are able to get there. Awareness is definitely possible for many, but not for all. This is a noticeable contrast to Glebe’s goals of striving for committed and active diversity educators in schools.

All of the candidates shared stories of peers who were less open to difference. Samantha was concerned that some of her peers, as teachers, may not be able to “check their biases at the door.” In her view, some candidates’ religious beliefs may lead to inclusion problems as educators. Nisha was concerned that some candidates in Glebe had never seen difference before so they did not know how to interact with others. Candidates also commented on the mixed feelings they had at the end of the program about taking action in the classroom and the world. As Karen said: “I found that this program is just the beginning; you have to go out and try things out and see if they work. I do appreciate what they did but you do have to try it with trial and error and learn things on your own.” Allie appreciated some of the awareness-raising activities and Nisha appreciated her anti-racism course, but overall they felt they were missing the strategies and tools to achieve the end goal of the continuum. They also felt that the emphasis on social justice eventually became what Allie called “white noise”:

So I think the curriculum was very socially conscious but it was forced and it’s almost to make you feel guilty in that sense and I don't think that prepared me at all….I still don’t know why we were doing a lot of things we did. We were just told to do it.

Samantha also felt like she did not have the tools to create change:

Maybe, because it’s locked in the back of my mind, but whether I’m going to attribute it to Glebe, I don't think I’ll be able to do that. I don’t think I had an eye-opening experience that made me change my views at any point or gave me the tools I need to go do something.

However, Sara felt that the focus on diversity education in the program had shaped her mindset on issues of equity:

I was on the subway the other day with a friend and there was an ad for something like immigration lawyers and my friend is like “as if the immigrants are going to
understand what that ad says,” and I was like “not all immigrants don’t speak English,” and I said “wait a minute, that was Glebe talking.” The whole social justice thing.

Preston did not feel his views on respecting others had changed, but that the program’s emphasis on teaching social justice was somewhat transformative. He walked away with a sense of responsibility to act for the marginalized and based this perception on several factors, many of which connected to the organization and structure of the program.

The continuum not only highlights pedagogical tensions, but also the tensions that shape diversity education. Joshua, a teacher educator, explained that the program and the faculty may need to reconsider their diversity education agenda and pedagogy:

And I really feel like as a group, we need to backtrack on how to make that awareness real and concrete for [the candidates]. Some pick it up along the way. But we’re competing with religious views, political views, what people have been ingrained with in their family and their own experiences. I mean we have them for 10 months and I think we’re competing with some serious forces. And to transform their beliefs in 10 months is, I think, an unreal expectation.

The teacher educators and candidates agreed that a variety of attitudes towards diversity education, diversity and inclusion exist in the program. If the concept of a continuum truly exists, it is also subjectively determined by teacher educators’ attitudes and priorities. Some of the views expressed in the classroom were cause for concern by both teacher educators and candidates. Teacher educators are also working in particular ITE structures and with complex social issues. All of the above impact candidates’ and teacher educators’ sense of what is possible and achievable in ITE.

**Changing Expectations and Diverse Approaches**

Diversity education has only recently become a high priority in Glebe. At the time of my study, both the elementary division and the cohort were in the process of transitioning to equity-based programming and making it a more integrated element in teacher educator practice. The perceptions of the faculty provide insight into the tensions and challenges stemming from the changing expectations.
One of the aims of the ITE leadership was to have faculty and cohorts link diversity education to their practices in more concrete ways. As Miriam, the program director of the elementary program, explained: “So this cohort is really going to look at the James Banks’ model, and every course instructor will touch on that in their teaching to make it come alive and the candidates see this model through lots of different lenses.” In line with Miriam’s view, the Glebe co-coordinators also believe faculty should adopt the new equity-minded, social justice focus as they see best. The teacher educators are fulfilling this expectation.

The teacher educators value the leadership’s increased emphasis on diversity education differently. For some it is part of their teaching philosophy and, for others, less so. Vanessa sees the Glebe faculty as “on board” with cohort’s commitment. Over the past 5 years, the program has also sought to staff its Faculty with “equity-minded” educators. All three novice teacher educators at Glebe—Joshua, Paula and John—reported that they were well aware of the priority on equity and social justice from the outset. Neal believes “it is part of your job.” However, John reported that he is not sure how many of his Physical and Health Education colleagues share the idea of diversity education being a “super high priority.”

According to Lynn, the challenge at Glebe lies in the emphasis on diversity education in the program and the amount of material she already has to cover in her course:

I think of what I've got to cover and what I've got to deal with and how for education [psychology and child development] are so crucial and critical for them to know. And then I think…why should [School & Society] then come and tell us to infuse it and to put more into what we do? I feel the pendulum is just swinging too far.

Joshua, John, Neal, and Carrie expressed similar concerns about the amount they need to cover in a course. To them it is unrealistic to make diversity education a strong focus of all courses. Carrie also posited that diversity education in math is ineffective if one does not have the content knowledge: “So gender and culture are important. However, if you don’t know how to use the manipulative in a classroom, it doesn’t matter how much you know about gender and diversity, you can’t teach math.” Joshua explained that there is just so much you can do in six class sessions, especially when candidates come in with little science education:

I’m hopeful that they’re getting [diversity education] in School and Society because I’m so limited on the time and there’s just so much science that they need
to know, and then pedagogy that they need to know, and content. Many of them haven’t had science since they took a course in their undergrad, and they just don’t know. So we work really hard with the content.

Steven, the School and Society instructor, argued that when confronted with time pressures teacher educators need to choose what is important. This is a humbling reality, especially when his course is seen as the primary location for diversity and inclusion studies. Steven’s priority is not solely diversity education because candidates need “a whole gamut” of knowledge:

The most important thing you can do in a course is help the students develop an integrated, feasible, sound approach to teaching and their relationship with the students, community building, program planning, and bringing those all together. And if they’re not getting [that whole approach] elsewhere, you’ve got to do it. You can’t afford to specialize in inclusive education as some separate thing if they’re not getting this other business.

Miriam, the program director, responded to the issue of workload:

People are not saying, “No, we’re not doing this.” he only way that might be felt is…which I think I’m hearing less and less…when it’s considered an add-on as opposed to integral to everything you’re doing. “But I have to teach this, this, and this and this, but I don’t have time to add the equity.” But now we’re really trying to talk about “what are ways you can do this, this, and this AND still look through the equity lens?” So that’s a little bit about the shift.

Essentially, the program stance is that teacher educators should be able to teach both their subject and diversity education. With support, they were beginning to see how this is possible. However, it still leaves questions about what is reasonable or appropriate to expect from a 10-month program and from faculty.

In summary, the tensions and challenges facing the program act either as motivators or barriers in terms of diversity education pedagogy. For example, the teacher educators and candidates found that the large group dynamic hindered cohesion and opportunities for speaking. Yet, it also allowed for smaller and unplanned relationships to form in the classroom. These different forms of community impact teacher educators' practice and is something they negotiate in their lessons, especially in activities that require collaboration or challenging candidates' beliefs.
The mixed reactions of the candidates to the pedagogy and messages in the program indicate that diversity education is engaging some, yet leaving others wanting more. Their reactions signal that although teacher educators communicate the importance of raising issues and taking action, going deeper is beyond the scope of the program and is something candidates need to do on their own. Several candidates appreciated learning about inequities, the importance and complexities of diversity, and their responsibility to all learners in the classroom. However, their sense of agency to take up this work in their own classrooms was somewhat constrained by the heavy “awareness” agenda. Several felt that they were leaving the program without the necessary tools, a sentiment that was shared by their teacher educators.

The teacher educators’ sense of what can be achieved in 10 months is an important part of the diversity education puzzle at Glebe. Joshua, Vanessa, and Paula feel the timeframe is ample for some candidates to “transform” and “become change agents,” but not for others. The teacher educators’ beliefs are closely tied to the attitudes and experiences that candidates have on entering the program. They see the candidates as entering on a continuum—a spectrum of knowledge and experience. In some ways it gives credence to the importance of teacher educators’ awareness work. In other ways, it leads them to believe that they are diffusing their efforts—reaching some and missing others. Although the teacher educators see diversity education as difficult, rewarding, and an essential part of ITE, they do not all see it as part of their domain. In addition to having different views as to where and how diversity education is incorporated, they have different perspectives on their role as diversity educators. For example, Carrie does not see it as her role to challenge prejudices and biases whereas Paula sees it as core to her practice. Carrie’s sentiments are partly founded on her own confidence and ability to be a diversity educator.

Overall, the Glebe program is encouraging novice teachers to explore and gain expertise in diversity education. The transition to increasing the profile of diversity education in teacher practice is also prompting teacher educators to test and try diversity education. Their choices seem to be part of the synergy of the program—a synergy that encourages them to adopt diversity education in ways that are personally meaningful and relevant.
Conclusion

The Glebe case captures a select group of participants and teacher educators in a time of transition. The transition is defined by the enhanced mandate for diversity education in the B.Ed. program—a mandate focused on preparing educators who value and practice diversity, equity, and social justice in their classrooms. The program presents diversity education as a moral, social, and professional responsibility.

Glebe’s newly established commitment to creating socially responsive diversity educators is a formidable task for a 10-month program. The official ITE curriculum promotes a multidisciplinary, integrated approach to diversity education and has explicitly marked areas for diversity education in the foundations and subject courses. However, this integrated approach varies from instructor to instructor. The Glebe faculty is a mix of novice and experienced professionals, each with their own interests and agendas for diversity education in their courses. Some focus on candidates’ awareness of differences, whereas others concentrate on political and social action in the classroom.

All of the study participants reported a commitment to the Faculty of Education’s aim of creating agents of social change in education. However, the findings also revealed a pushback to this aim. For example, Lynn resented the increased emphasis on diversity education in her course, believing she was already doing enough to highlight diversity in her subject content. Steven chose to sift out inclusive education content in favour of other aspects of professional education that he deemed more important.

Within the program, pedagogies of community, raising awareness, and critical thinking are used as foundations of diversity education. Teacher educators use activities such as modeling practices of diversity, engaging candidates in debate, reminding them to take action, and encouraging them to take risks. However, the different patterns of participation and the tensions reported by the candidates suggest that the Glebe context is not perceived as a safe and welcoming space for all to engage in these practices. A significant factor if one is trying to help candidates become diversity educators and build capacities for social change. Even if it is welcoming, teacher educators struggle with the responsibility of ensuring that effective educators graduate from the program. Glebe presents an ambitious and complex approach to diversity
education in ITE in the Ontario context. A program that is a testament to how diversity education curriculum negotiates, faculty engage, and candidates respond to transition.
This study explores how ITE programs prepare teachers for diversity and inclusion in elementary schooling. Diversity education in ITE is shaped by curriculum models and practices (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; Zeichner, 2011), the desired qualities of the diversity educator (Grant & Gibson, 2011; Nieto, 2006), and the challenges of preparing beginning teachers for their professional responsibilities. In Chapters 5 and 6, I analyzed the Indian and Canadian primary cases separately. These cases described the curriculum, pedagogical activities, and challenges of enacting diversity education at Rani College in New Delhi and the Glebe cohort in Ontario. In this chapter, I present a more complex picture of approaches to diversity education through a cross-case analysis that also includes the secondary sites in each region.

Rani and Glebe clearly commit to diversity education. As part of this commitment, they advance particular images of the diversity educator through policy documents and curriculum practices. These images, in turn, speak to the challenges of doing diversity education in ITE. Indeed, as I reviewed the four themes I used for the case studies of Rani and Glebe—program aims, content and structure, pedagogical strategies, and tensions—I was struck by how often the programs and participants relied on their visions of the diversity educator to drive their practice of diversity education. The teacher educators, teacher candidates, administrators, and policy makers frame their practices in relation to either: a) who they think diversity educators should be as individuals, or b) who they think candidates should become through the professional capacities developed in the program.

Comparing my data on policy statements, participant beliefs, and observations of practice yielded three distinct images of the diversity educator. I then looked at how each image related to the structure, pedagogy, and challenges of diversity education in each program in this study. Analyzing the production of images allowed for a deeper comparison of approaches. It also enabled me to identify elements such as concepts of diversity education, teaching activities, and participant experiences that other comparative studies address only sparingly.
This chapter discusses my comparative analysis of the two primary sites (Rani and Glebe) as well as the secondary sites—Forefathers University and the River Institute in New Delhi, and Baldwin University and Thompson University in Ontario. However, because I did not observe teacher practice at the secondary sites, the discussion does not include pedagogical activities at these sites. Instead, I reference these sites as a way of showing how their images of the diversity educator are similar to or different from those at Rani and Glebe. The secondary sites provide greater regional insight into diversity education in Delhi and Ontario.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section—*Images of the Diversity Educator*—describes the various images of diversity educators at play in the primary cases. I identify these images as: a) the affirmer, b) the conscious practitioner, and c) the social reformer. Each image highlights different conceptions of diversity, inclusion, professional knowledge, and social action. Each image also encourages candidates to understand their role in schools, how to implement curriculum, and how to engage in reflective practice. Rani and Glebe have different views about these images because of their respective sociocultural beliefs about diversity and ITE.

In the second section—*Curriculum Integration*—I compare how Rani and Glebe prioritize and facilitate diversity education through: 1) structural strategies, and 2) content and pedagogical strategies. The first part explores how leadership, program design, and faculty engage in curriculum integration. For example, Rani integrates diversity education into both its ITE courses and field experiences, gradually building and revisiting candidates’ experiences over the 4 years. However, at Glebe, teacher educators select where and how diversity education is integrated into the 10-month program. The second part compares content and pedagogical strategies at the two sites. For example, the Rani program focuses on developing both the self and the professional capacities of diversity educators, whereas Glebe focuses on developing candidates’ abilities to plan for diversity education in the classroom.

---

63 The data from the four secondary sites are based on interviews with teacher educators and candidates. A short profile of these sites is provided under “Program Selection” in chapter 3.

64 Each of the sections in this chapter draw on themes used Chapter 5 (the Rani College case) and Chapter 6 (the Glebe Cohort case). The first cross-case analysis section, images of the diversity educator, relates to aims and beliefs guiding program in the themes: objectives, structure, content and pedagogical activities. The second section relates to curriculum integration and draws comparisons from the primary case themes of structure, content and pedagogical activities. The third section draws on findings on tensions and challenges in each program.
The third section of the chapter—*Challenges of Developing Diversity Educators in ITE*—addresses the complexities of engaging candidates in the process of becoming diversity educators. Both Rani and Glebe struggle to affirm the identities of certain candidates, overcome candidates’ reticence to participate in activities, and give them the confidence to implement social reform. These challenges indicate that programs are struggling to validate desired images of the diversity educator both in their own practices and in the minds of their stakeholders.

My cross-case analysis identifies images of diversity educators as ideological, practical, and experiential approaches to diversity education in ITE. It explores how these images are prioritized by program policies and participants, developed through program structures and pedagogical practices, and seen as a source of tension. The findings demonstrate that although the Indian and Canadian programs in this study are unique, they share approaches and challenges in preparing diversity educators for pluralist societies.

**Images of the Diversity Educator**

The image of the diversity educator is a powerful framework for considering approaches to diversity education. It enables us to understand how various capacities, expectations, and areas of expertise intersect to generate teacher identities and ideological stances. According to Thiessen and Pike (1992): “An image is a root metaphor whose fundamental elements capture, delimit, and shape the identity and practices of teachers” (p. 3). Images can be “expressed verbally or demonstrated through action” (Clandinin, 1986). They can derive from curriculum orientations (Miller & Seller, 1985), diversity education orientations (Cochran-Smith & Demers, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), pedagogical practices (Stewart-Rose, 2008), or the *in situ* analysis of identities in political, cultural and educational context (Clandinin, 2006; Levine-Rasky, 2001). Thus, images are shaped by both internal and external factors.\(^{65}\)

A common practice in ITE is to base curriculum recommendations on the desired image or professional identity of the educator. Teacher education literature defines images of the diversity educator through national or regional policies on professional development (e.g.,

\(^{65}\) In this analysis, I use image and identity interchangeably. An image of a diversity educator also refers to a professional identity as a diversity educator. The literature on teacher identities is robust and scholars see the development of self and professional identities as core to ITE (see Britzman, 1993; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992, 1996; Rodgers & Scott, 2008 as examples).
NCTE, 2010; OCT, 2009), theoretical frameworks (e.g., Cochran-Smith, 2004; Nieto, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), and discipline-based recommendations on diversity education (e.g., Bierema, 2010; Grant & Khurshid, 2009). Further, ITE programs themselves define and reinforce images of the diversity educator via their pedagogical and structural choices. In Darling-Hammond and Bransford’s book, *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (2005), Hammerness et al. argue that:

> Preparation programs deliberately and inadvertently reinforce the development of different kinds of teaching identities as they emphasize various aspects of what it means to be a teacher and as they place student teachers in different environments where they will see certain kinds of norms modeled. Though not always explicitly considered, this aspect of preparation is critically important, as the identities teachers develop shape their dispositions, where they place their effort, whether and how they seek out professional development opportunities, and what obligations they see as intrinsic to their role. (p. 384)

Thus, ITE uses images of the diversity educator to guide curriculum planning and practice. ITE can also generate models of the diversity educator through its practices. These images can be a deliberate part of a program's approach to diversity education or can develop unintentionally through participants’ program choices or beliefs. Either way, ITE is contributing to novice teachers’ sense of their capacities and responsibilities as diversity educators.

In responding to the question of who diversity educators *should be* or who they *should become* through ITE, the candidates and teacher educators in my study often identified certain capacities and practices. Capacities refer to a teacher's knowledge, skills, and attitudes; for example, knowing the backgrounds, cultures, and needs of their learners (Gay, 2002; Niyozov & Pluim, 2009; Ryan, 2006). Skills involve abilities such as teaching critical thinking or how to communicate effectively (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Forlin, 2012). Attitudes refer to dispositions and affective elements such as empathy, caring, and open mindedness (Banks et al., 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Nieto, 2006).

Mission statements and program planning documents also specify key qualities of diversity educators. For example, at Rani, the program director explained that the syllabus is designed to “develop candidates’ understanding of multiple perspectives and have an open mind.” Stanton University’s ITE vision statement says that graduates “will begin to demonstrate”
that “they understand themselves as change agents and community members committed to act in socially just and environmentally responsible ways” (Stanton University, 2011).

Images of the diversity educator also guide how teacher educators in ITE construct learning opportunities and model teaching. Rani educator Neeraj believes education is a “political act and not neutral,” and therefore that elementary teachers should be critically conscious individuals who respond to inequities in education. However, he also feels that many candidates enter the program with static views of the profession and thus are unprepared to effect change: “People don’t want to feel uncomfortable [as teachers]. They are happy with whatever is. We are teachers. We are professionals. We are not social reformers. Why should we talk about identity, or why should we talk about diversity?” His ITE class activities centre on “agitating” his candidates to a point where they learn to question social conditions and develop their own stances on issues. His goal is to help them see their agency and gain voice: “If you believe that education is the one which can bring change, then you need to take a stand.”

Teacher candidates also imagine their future as diversity educators in relation to the images put forward by their programs. Glebe candidate Sara sees herself as an educator who embeds equity and social content in the elementary curriculum. Rani candidate Meenal describes herself as a change agent who implements curriculum reform. She echoes the Rani perception of change agent and sees herself as making inroads into broader systemic agendas in education: “I do not say we [teachers] can change the whole world but then we can take few steps towards it.”

Program aims and teacher educator intentions inspire broadly shared images of the diversity educator. In the next section, I define the three images—affirmer, conscious practitioner, and social reformer—that emerged from my comparative analysis. Table 16 shows the conceptions of diversity, social inclusion, diversity education, and social action associated with each image.
Table 16

*Three Images of the Diversity Educator: Cross-case Analysis of Rani and Glebe*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Affirmer</th>
<th>The Conscious Practitioner</th>
<th>The Social Reformer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conception of Diversity</strong></td>
<td>Sees diversity as a lived reality of many social identities to be experienced positively by all.</td>
<td>Sees diversity as a complex reality of social identities and beliefs shaped by civic, professional, moral, and sociocultural forces.</td>
<td>Sees diversity as hierarchies of social identities. Diversity leads to an inequitable reality where some individuals/groups are privileged and others disadvantaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conception of Social Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Social inclusion begins with the individual and spreads to the broader society. Sees pluralism as being part of the classroom and the community.</td>
<td>Views social inclusion as the individual and the collective coming together. Sees pluralism as fulfilling the civic and professional responsibility to maintain social diversity.</td>
<td>Begins with collective views of equality that filter down to the individual. Sees pluralism as using one’s agency to help achieve and maintain social equity among groups and individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conception of Diversity Education</strong></td>
<td>Develops individual identity and social relationships. Focuses on building learner confidence, sense of community, and recognition in the classroom. Uses the learning environment as a space to develop confidence.</td>
<td>Develops multiple forms of consciousness: civic, professional, moral, sociocultural, and emotional. Focuses on teaching students how to engage in critical reflexivity and continually seek out new knowledge. Uses the learning environment as a space to develop awareness.</td>
<td>Develops knowledge of social issues from equity, equality, and rights perspectives. Focuses on teaching students to understand their ability to negotiate the school system and the new curriculum. Uses the learning environment as a space to develop agency and to engage in social reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Action</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on interpersonal relationships and community building in the classroom. Uses inclusive practices and validates all differences in the classroom. Focuses on peaceful co-existence and mutual respect.</td>
<td>Focuses on being mindful and putting diversity and inclusion at the forefront of students’ minds. Models commitment as a critically reflective and cognizant educator. Pursues further study and investigation.</td>
<td>Focuses on addressing social issues and inequities between learners or the world at large. Presses for curriculum change in the classroom and school. Uses his/her agency inside or outside the classroom to make change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below I describe the distinctive features of the three images. The bulk of the discussion focuses the diverging aspects within each image. These distinctions provide insights into how actors, policy, practice, and sociocultural beliefs shape or interact with the images in ITE. In closing this section, I consider the similarities and differences across the three images conceptions of social inclusion and social action.

The Affirmer

Diversity educators who adopt the image of affirmer support difference and foster inclusion in the classroom. Indeed, teacher educators at Rani and Glebe often described the diversity educator as someone who values diversity and respects others. The ITE aims for diversity education in both programs also include teaching candidates to ‘empower learners.’ In reviewing this data, I was reminded of Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) profile of the culturally responsive educator who “affirms students” in the classroom by validating both dominant and non-dominant cultures, valuing minority cultural norms, respecting cultural differences, and “believing all students have knowledge that can be used as resources in the classroom” (p. 36). In addition, Rani and Glebe participants emphasized the need to serve all learners and build community in the classroom.

The affirmer believes that difference and pluralism are positive social realities and that social inclusion is fostered through a community of peaceful co-existence and mutual understanding. Consequently, these teachers use diversity education to build students' confidence, encourage positive classroom relationships, and ensure that students are recognized in the learning environment. They see diversity as a broad concept. The teacher educators and candidates in this study spoke about diversity as a “lived reality” (Rani), “more than culture” (Glebe), and comprised of many social “identities.” The course descriptions included preparing candidates for “individual” and “group” differences in the classroom. At Rani, readings and assignments also asked candidates to explore intergroup and intragroup differences.

The beliefs of the administrators and teacher educators impacted how the image of the affirmer was conceptualized in each program. Across the two sites, their views differ in three ways: conceptions of diversity, the learning environment and respect in education. For diversity,
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66 I use “affirmer” as a short form for “the diversity educator in the image of the affirmer.” The “conscious practitioner” and the “social reformer” are also short forms.
Rani teacher educator Lopa echoed the sentiments of her colleagues that knowledge of regional, gender, and socioeconomic differences comes naturally to most candidates in India: “It’s actually something that you learn to deal with as you grow up in India…you see that there are so many different kinds of communities coexisting at the same time.” Although Indians can be insular in their choices and communities, the pluralism of society is evident and unavoidable. Thus the affirmer works toward preserving what the program director identified as “the ease of which we have been living over generations.” Given that diversity is "something you grow up with" in India, the ITE emphasis is on teaching candidates that diversity and pluralism are positive forces in society.

By comparison, the Glebe teacher educators in my study believed that candidates’ conceptions of diversity and pluralism are less developed. In their view, the heterogeneous nature of society is not obvious to some candidates nor is the co-existence of multiple communities fully appreciated. For example, Glebe candidate Nisha and program director Miriam claimed that Canadian discourse often associates diversity with some forms of “visible difference,” specifically race and ethnicity. In response, the School and Society course aims to help candidates “recognize society more broadly in terms of diverse social origins, cultures, identities, and social status.” Glebe candidate Vanessa also believes that part of the responsibility of ITE is to help candidates see diversity as many social identities in a classroom: “Even though maybe all the kids look alike in [their] surface features, hair color, their identities are still very different.” The Glebe teacher educators begin by teaching candidates to see diversity as part of their social reality, and pluralism as a long-standing concept in the country.

The affirmer sees social inclusion as integrating individuals into a community. Rani and Glebe both cultivate candidates’ experience of the program by grouping them into “batches” or cohorts that serve as professional learning communities. Glebe educators Steven and Vanessa focus explicitly on “community-building activities.” In their programs, the retreat and overnight trip are designed to develop stronger bonds among the candidates and between the candidates and faculty. According to the teacher educators and candidates, the affirmer achieves community by supporting all learners in the classroom and establishing a welcoming learning environment.

Yet Rani and Glebe take slightly different approaches to building a learning environment. According to Rani teacher educator Vidya, diversity educators are encouraged to make the
classroom a “space for empowerment;” that is, a site for building confidence and a place where learners see themselves as eligible for schooling. The Rani teacher educators stressed the importance of retaining first generation students in the classroom and preserving their access to education by not perpetuating social prejudices toward traditionally excluded groups.¹⁶⁷ Rani teacher educator Neeraj observed that diversity educators discourage practices that “push [the marginalized] out of the classroom” such as ignoring their questions or providing them with inadequate resources. It also means creating a physically safe learning environment. Rani math teacher educator Gayatri explained that candidates renounce corporal punishment: “[The Rani graduate] would certainly not do those things or even anything close to that. The way they speak to the children it is in a way that I think they are trying to build a rapport of mutual respect.”

At Glebe, the teacher educators and candidates also emphasized the diversity educators’ duty to ensure a “safe” learning space. Lynn, the Psychology instructor, defined "safe" as a place where students can “be themselves” in the classroom. John, the Physical and Health Education instructor, identified it as a space where students are engaged in “positive experiences” and work together to achieve goals. Similarly, for teacher educator Steven, it is a space for “mutual understanding.” Although both programs see the diversity educator as establishing an emotionally safe and welcoming space, the Glebe curriculum and candidates’ conversations did not address the physical safety of students in the classroom in the same way as the Rani participants did.

As affirmer, the diversity educator has the capacity to choose topics, issues and resources that include one or more aspects of various student identities in their curriculum practices. Yet this capacity functioned differently in the two contexts. Glebe teacher educators see it as a way of ensuring that all learners are validated by the curriculum and thus that their social identities are reflected in education. For example, Math instructor Carrie wants candidates to use pedagogical activities and curriculum content that draw on students' “cultural beliefs.”

At Rani, diversity educators include students’ cultural backgrounds in the curriculum as a way of reinforcing their legitimacy in the classroom. For example, teacher educator Gayatri specifically uses an article by Carraher, Schliemann, and Carreher (1988) in her course that

¹⁶⁷ In India, confidence is essential for groups that have traditionally been pushed out of the system and feel that formal education is not for them. Historically excluded groups include children with special needs, first generation learners, religious minorities, girls, and lower castes and classes (GOI, 2006; Khader, 2008; NCTE, 2005).
reports on a Brazilian street vendor’s understanding of math by linking it to discussions of the Indian context. As explained in the Rani case study, her rationale is to encourage candidates to see their marginalized students as learners who “already have knowledge” from home, employment, or other environments.

Policy documents in both programs aim to prepare educators who “appreciate and respect diversity” (Rani) and “respect all learners in the classroom” (Glebe). For example, Glebe Art instructor Neal echoes his colleagues when he explains that respect involves “making sure that we treat everyone with dignity and that they all have an opportunity to be dealt with fairly, that they have an opportunity for advancement, that they have an opportunity to fulfill whatever goals they have.”

Across the ocean, the Rani participants believe respect is linked to seeing all learners as capable. For Rani candidates Ela and Anu, the belief in a student’s ability to learn is associated with high expectations—the understanding that the student will succeed and do so at a high level. Teacher educators and the new NCERT (2005) curriculum see diversity educators as challenging the deficit view that some learners and communities are uninterested in or incapable of formal schooling.

Rani also adds another element to the affirmer’s stance on respect, one that links to new curriculum policies in the Indian context. Teacher educator Gayatri states that respect is achieved in several ways. The first is the absence of physical harm and the second is “in the way they talk to students.” For example, like many of her peers and instructors, candidate Rajani believes that respecting learners requires the diversity educator to challenge sociocultural perceptions of the teacher as the only source of authority and knowledge. Respect is mutual between teachers and students: “It is a give and take phenomenon…if you want respect it is essential that you give respect.” Teacher educator Vidya believes that she and her colleagues model respect as both a mindset and a distribution of power. She claims that candidates learn to see: “how much of an authority figure I am…how much I look upon them as friends and collaborators in education, co-learners rather than people I have to ‘talk down’ to. How much I respect them as having their own things to say.” Thus, in this image, the diversity educator moves teachers from being the sole authority in the classroom to having a shared authority with students. As affirmer s, diversity educators see the classroom as a negotiated environment.
Participants at the secondary sites in India (Forefathers, River) and in Canada (Thomson, Baldwin) also invoked the affirmer image. All agreed that diversity educators should demonstrate “respect, openness, and appreciation.” For example, Forefathers teacher educator Singa stated that teachers should know “how to deal with diversity, how to respect diversity, and how to help children to learn to respect each other.” Similarly in Ontario, Baldwin teacher educator Ruth said: “It’s definitely an orientation toward respect for everybody in the classroom. That is just fundamental for diversity in learning styles, in background, in ability levels, in everything…It’s that respect [for everyone] and respect for themselves as teachers—so having that climate of making sure that the classroom is a safe place.”

The secondary sites also exhibited some differences from Rani and Glebe. For example, in India, Rani candidates saw their work as benefiting “all children.” Yet, Forefathers and River participants had narrower perceptions than Rani participants about whom the affirmer serves. Himan, a River teacher educator, interpreted the affirmer as serving “special needs learners” or “girl” children. Shilpa, a River candidate, understood her role as serving “slum children.” However, the participants at all three programs in India agreed that the affirmer is serving first generation students in the classroom.

The degree to which a student’s background is seen as a resource in the classroom was also a point of difference. For example, Forefathers candidate Vanni said, “If you are teaching first generation students, you can relate [the subject matter] to their daily lives.” Schooling must be meaningful to the learner, but this might not include learners as a source of knowledge in the classroom. Similar statements about “knowing students' backgrounds” and “knowing your learner” were cited in all three programs in India, but the Forefathers and River programs also suggest that the diversity educator as affirmer approaches curriculum from the text rather than from students' knowledge.

---

68 At Forefathers University, I interviewed Bachelor of Education candidates and teacher educators from the one-year program. The River Institute has teacher education for elementary and secondary candidates. I met with teacher educators and candidates from the two-year Diploma in Elementary Teacher Education program. Thomson and Baldwin are universities in Ontario that offer various streams of teacher education. I interviewed teacher educators and candidates from their elementary level one-year Bachelor of Education programs.

69 The term ‘first generation’ refers to children who are the first in their families to attend formal schooling.
In Ontario, teacher educators and candidates from the secondary sites agreed that “community building” is a capacity of the diversity educator, thereby reinforcing the view expressed at Glebe. However, they also made a distinction between what Thomson candidate Ambika called “community in the classroom” and what Baldwin educator Rachel called “community engagement.” According to Jamie, a Thomson teacher educator, community engagement requires the teacher to go beyond the classroom and into the neighbourhood to ask: “how do we increase parent engagement, community engagement, to the end of impacting—positively impacting—student achievement.” For these teacher educators and candidates, community is a broad concept extending beyond the classroom to the world outside.

Taken as a whole, the image of the diversity educator as affirmer is positive and hopeful. Diversity education is about valuing identities and fostering human relations, and applies to all learners in the community. Social action involves an ongoing effort to encourage learners in the classroom to be engaged and empowered.

The Conscious Practitioner

Building social, political, cultural, critical, and emotional consciousness is often cited in the literature as a fundamental aim of diversity education in ITE (Bucher, 2010; Gay, 2002; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Consciousness is being aware of and sensitive to teaching about diversity. Gay and Kirkland (2003) suggest that it constitutes “thoroughly analyzed beliefs” and the “careful monitoring of both personal and instructional behaviours about the value of diversity” and diversity education (p. 182). In addition to talking about the role of affirmer, the teacher educators at Rani and Glebe also invoked the role of the diversity educator as a conscious practitioner. Lakshmi from Rani believes that it is through her teaching that candidates make the “unconscious leap” to using a “conscious strategy” to understand diversity and inclusion. In this case, conscious refers to the commitment to be more informed about one’s beliefs or socializations. Glebe teacher educator Paula reminds her Social Studies candidates that, as diversity educators, they must commit to being critical thinkers and continual learners. She wants them to learn to say: “I take some sort of responsibility to what it is I’m being taught, like I actually make some kind of conscious effort to engage with that learning.” The diversity educator as a conscious practitioner is a distinct approach to diversity education in ITE.
Conscious practitioners understand diversity and pluralism as a civic and professional responsibility. Social inclusion means ensuring that people are open to exploring and embracing social differences. Diversity education is taught by presenting information and experiences for reflection, thereby expanding candidates’ mindsets of how they see themselves and others. The capacities associated with this image include: being aware of civic and professional responsibilities, being sensitive to the needs of others, engaging in reflexivity, and continually seeking out new knowledge. In this image, social action is achieved by probing how individuals see their world and by making them mindful of their duty to support diversity and inclusion in society.

The primary case policy and program documents envisage the diversity educator as closely connected to national and regional values of freedom, rights, and protections. At Rani, one of the inauguration letters states that the program must remain “anchored to the constitutional values” and candidates’ democratic duties. Similarly, at Glebe, ITE documents cite the Ontario Human Rights code as the basis for implementing diversity education in the program.

However, the programs differ in who defines civic consciousness and how it is taken up in practice. Rani mandates that courses like Contemporary India teach about political histories, conditions of poverty, and democratic freedoms in India. In the Glebe curriculum, the School and Society course covers multicultural policy in Canada; however, civic or politics awareness are not part of the required content.

Rani’s sense of civic democratic awareness is connected to India’s independence era priorities of social equality, particularly the need to challenge the postcolonial legacy of the Hindi-English divide. Rani reinforces social equality by promoting the use of both Hindi and English in its courses. Both program policy and teacher educators recognize the value of skilled multilingual professionals in government schools. At Glebe, civic awareness is not tied to an educator’s language, but to their acceptance of groups such as new immigrants or religious minorities.

According to Matthews and Jessel (1998), reflexivity is a deeper analysis of practice that “encourages [candidates] to think about their assumptions and self-history” in relation to their views and the classroom (p. 235).

The inauguration letters are part of the programme guide, introducing readers to the genesis and aims of the Bachelor of Elementary Education at Sahara University.
Although national and civic values establish a collective social agenda, the Rani and Glebe programs also recognize that educators have their own moral values on the treatment of individuals in society. Morality seems to be defined by the participants as secular rather than religious. However, in both countries, if individual values conflict with constitutional values of pluralism, conscious practitioners should defer to national values in their practice.

The content and teaching in both programs reinforce candidates' professional obligation to diversity and inclusion. This obligation provides motivation and justification for the conscious practitioner’s actions in the classroom. In both Canada and India, this obligation is set by accrediting agencies, legislation, and the formal curriculum. For example, the Glebe program stresses the educator’s responsibility to “focus on diversity” (OCT, 2013, para 6). The Rani program also stresses “teaching for diversity” (NCTE, 2010, p. 19). Furthermore, while Rani teacher educators reinforce government policies on “caring” and “sensitive” teachers (see NCERT, 2005), their Glebe counterparts highlight awareness of the “moral, equity-minded, and inclusive” capacities of professionals cited in Ministry of Education policies and the Ontario College of Teachers ethical standards (OCT, 2006; OME, 2009a).

The Rani and Glebe programs also portray the conscious practitioner as being aware of the customs, living conditions, and intergroup relationships of the communities represented in their schools. The programs want candidates to understand the plight of marginalized communities. At Rani, candidates develop this awareness through visits to communities and different types of schooling (private, non-profit, and government). According to Social Science teacher educator Lopa, the slum visit reinforces awareness of multiple social realities:

The [slum children] don't have the same opportunities as other kids and to see that so closely was the entire idea of this project, because we all know about it in some way but to go and meet these children who are living this life…so you realize there is life outside of [your own] and people who are really struggling every day.

The Rani program highlights gender, ability, and class issues at government schools in Delhi. By comparison, Glebe teacher educators and candidates use global frames to examine local issues. They identify inequities in other countries as a means of understanding social issues in the urban Ontario context. For instance, Glebe program coordinator Vanessa uses examples of racial discrimination in the United States to start a discussion about the treatment of groups in Canada. The global frame also tries to foster in candidates a sense of global citizenship. For
example, a presentation in Carrie’s math class discussed workers’ wages in clothing factories in Bangladesh. In his Arts course, Neal incorporates literature on refugee experiences in other countries and the impact of war on families.

The image of the conscious practitioner centres on self-awareness. Both Rani and Glebe encourage candidates to become aware of their views and biases toward others. Glebe Science educator Joshua argues that candidates must be able to recognize and overcome their “denial of privilege” \(^{72}\) and the belief that “if you work hard, you’ll do well.” Like Joshua, Paula and Vanessa believe candidates’ faith in meritocracy hinders their ability to see how social hierarchies work. Thus, denial acts as a barrier to actualizing the role of the conscious practitioner.

The conscious practitioner is able to relate to others emotionally, thus requiring sensitivity. Rani makes the development of “empathy” and “caring” part of the core curriculum. Teacher educator Lopa describes the focus on sensitivity as helping candidates to become “more intelligent human beings who know what they are doing and why they are doing it.” Human Relations educator Sadhaka articulates her own and also the program’s position: “I think that awareness comes when one is first in touch with oneself.”

Although teacher educators at Glebe make some effort to promote emotional awareness, it is less explicit or consistent than at Rani. Science teacher educator Joshua believes more attention should be paid in ITE to emotional dispositions as these allow candidates to connect with the lives of others: “We need to somehow instill a sense of empathy with our teacher candidates as well, not sympathy by any means, but empathy so that they can better understand life through the shoes of their students and their families.”

Rani program director Indu believes social action includes a “proactive” stance: “looking at life differently, looking at children differently, looking at society a different way.” Similarly, Glebe program coordinator Vanessa reinforces the importance of mindset as a form of action:

[The values and skills] need to be so ingrained into the way [teachers] think, into the decisions they make. And it needs to be about inclusion and understanding and tolerance and acceptance and appreciation of differences and of diversity.

\(^{72}\) Blum (2008) and McIntosh (1998) argue that denial of social privilege prevents individuals from internalizing or accepting knowledge of inequities.
And it’s not something that you learn overnight. It’s continually evolving and becomes stronger as you become a better teacher.

Across the Indian and Canadian sites, teacher educators and policy makers agree that diversity educators should be “aware.” Simi, a teacher educator at River, explained that: “We talk about equality and equity in the sense that we say that despite diversity, people [must] have equal opportunity to education.” Mona, a teacher educator at Forefathers, explained how she raises awareness in her language arts course: “I somehow this year and before find that I use the space to address such issues of caste and class and oppression. We for example discussed some of the readings and we made linkages with schooling and society.” Forefathers candidate Zafia stated: “I know many students who have changed their views—and fairly convincingly really. So that is what the course is all about.”

Consciousness then is defined at these secondary sites in India as knowledge of social inequities. However, missing from their image of the conscious practitioner is their own privileges. For example Forefathers’ candidate Sudeshna was the only teacher candidate from the secondary sites who acknowledged awareness of privilege:

See you [as a teacher] are privileged, you have a house, you are provided for, you have food, clothing, shelter and everything. There are some children in society who are marginalized, underprivileged and don't have access to such kinds of facilities.

Her statement implies that awareness of inequities and privilege leads her to recognize these advantages but not necessarily address them. However, one’s privilege does not seem to be a significant part of ITE practice, policy, or practitioner beliefs at Forefathers or River.

In Canada, the majority of the secondary site participants agreed that beyond awareness of difference, educators need to have knowledge of how “power, privilege, and inequity” operate in education. As Baldwin educator Vincent explained: “I think one of the key things for candidates is just to be aware that there is a world outside their own square block so to speak—the way they were raised, the types of teaching they were exposed to.” And as Charles, a teacher educator from Thomson, argued: “People, because they have been members of society, believe

73 In Canada, Baldwin and Thomson offer a similar program to Glebe in terms of candidate cohorts based on themes, divisions, or values of social justice, equity and diversity. Thomson also offers cohorts dedicated to diversity education. Three of the candidates and one teacher educator in the study were part of the dedicated cohorts.
they know a great many things about society. But it’s surface-level knowledge. It’s not deeper knowledge.” However, getting beneath the surface is complex and, according to Vincent, depends much more on the values and skills of individual teacher educators than on program priorities:

> Not everybody has [diversity] expertise or that background. I mean we can put a course outline together, but you and I know you can have readings, you can have things that you want covered, you can have equity and diversity on your course outline. That doesn’t mean it’s going to really get addressed in a meaningful way.

Teacher educators across the Canadian sites lamented that there is not enough time in their 1-year ITE programs to cultivate the critical awareness and consciousness they desire for candidates. To compensate, they rely on images of the diversity educator as a willing and resourceful “life-long learner.” As Clea explained: “You have to pretty much be aware, on your own, and find and go to any conferences you can, and talks. So you have to be proactive.”

The image of the conscious practitioner represents teachers who have a clear sense of civic, social, emotional, moral, and professional awareness. As practitioners, they are keenly aware of the professional and civic duties needed to promote social cohesion. Their classroom practice is enhanced by the desire to inquire into and learn about diversity and social inclusion. By comparison, the next image of the diversity educator—the social reformer—suggests that social action needs to manifest in more overt political ways.

**The Social Reformer**

The policies of both the Rani and Glebe programs also invoke the image of the social reformer. According to Rani’s ITE prospectus, candidates have the potential to “trigger a chain of desirable changes in the system” (Sahara, 2001). Similarly, Glebe lists among its program outcomes that candidates will “understand themselves as change agents and community members committed to act in socially just and environmentally responsible ways” (Stanton University, 2011).74 Teacher educators also believe that diversity educators as social reformers

74 The term social reformer is more common in India than Canada and is often associated with activist/educationalists like Gandhi and Ambedkar. Earlier in this chapter, Neeraj from Rani uses the term “social reformer” to describe the role he desires for his candidates in the program. In looking across the two cases, although Glebe participants favour the term “social justice educator,” they seem to see this as equivalent to the “social reformer” image espoused at Rani.
are cognizant of their political agency. For example, both Rani teacher educator Neeraj and Glebe teacher educator Joshua argue that candidates are entering a reality where “education is political” and where diversity educators need to use their “political will” to raise social issues and bring about fundamental changes in school and society.\(^{75}\)

The diversity educator as social reformer sees diversity through the lenses of equity, equality, and justice. Rani Human Relations teacher educator Sadhaka explains: “In teacher education we are trying to make them—asking them—to be sensitive about the disadvantaged, and [understand] the gap between access, equity, and opportunities.” In India, the disadvantaged are the socioeconomically deprived, girls, and other minority communities who attend government schools. At Glebe, graduates are similarly expected to leave the program with an understanding of “how systemic/institutional practices dis/advantage social groups/learners and ways that [teachers] can work with others to counter inequalities” (Stanton University, 2009).

In this image, diversity education focuses on developing capacity for agency. The diversity educator as social reformer is aware of his or her power to be critical of social practices, be political, and act for social change. In particular, the teacher educators at Rani and Glebe argue that the role of the diversity educator is to challenge oppressive practices in the classroom. This social agenda permeates all subject areas, thereby upholding the “anti-discriminatory” focus of official school curriculum in Ontario and the focus on “equality and social justice” in Delhi. In this image, social action involves addressing social issues and inequities among learners or in the world at large, acting on one’s agency, and pressing for curriculum change in classrooms and schools. The social reformer uses political diplomacy to negotiate fundamental changes in the system. For example, as discussed in Chapter 5, the Rani focus on deprived government schools is a long established agenda and results in candidates learning to support the communities in the Delhi area.

At Glebe, the scope of social action is somewhat broader than at Rani. The Glebe ITE curriculum states that it prepares teachers for "all schools.” However, in teacher educator practice, this includes only private schools and secular public schools. Glebe does not explicitly

\(^{75}\) Fundamental changes to the system are a form of systemic change and apply to “improvements needed in education” that manifest at the school decision level (Holzman, 1993).
serve the Catholic public system. Similarly, from my observations at Glebe, the teacher educators did not address how the agenda of social reformer would manifest in the Catholic public system. This is important because Catholic interpretations of equal rights for same-sex relationships can differ from nationally and provincially legislated interpretations. Glebe candidates are taught to see social reform in secular schools and, in some cases, at elite private schools. However, in my observations, conversations about social reform in the Catholic system were noticeably absent in employment expectations and anti-discriminatory policy discussions.

Rani and Glebe frame social issues differently. The curriculum at Rani has a local focus, whereas Glebe’s curriculum has a mix of local and global content. Not only does this frame apply to how social issues are interpreted, but also to the social actions of the reformer. The Glebe candidates see their actions as impacting communities in other countries. For example, they held a bake sale to raise money for the victims of the 2010 earthquake in Haiti and organized another event to build a school in China. By comparison, many of the teacher educators and candidates at Rani tend to see their sphere of influence as “the child and the school” in which they find themselves.

Teacher educators at Rani and Glebe also differ in their conception of the form that social agency should take. At Rani, many of the teacher educators and candidates view personal and professional agency as concomitant. Teacher educator Vidya, for example, argues that females need to see marriage as a choice rather than as a duty. She expects female candidates to take action in their homes as well as in their classrooms. However, this view of agency is not as explicit at Glebe. The changes candidates are asked to make relate more to the classroom rather than to their private lives. Thus, in the Glebe program, there is an implicit separation of personal and professional agency, with a greater concentration on social reform in schools.

---

76 Glebe is not one of the ITE program’s Catholic-focused cohorts. Candidates can opt in their program to take an extracurricular course that prepares them for this sector of the Ontario public system. Teachers must be Catholic and complete a course on Teaching in the Catholic System in order to be eligible to teach in the Catholic board.

77 Catholic schools embody values of “respect, tolerance, inclusivity, love, and respect thy neighbour” and “affirm diversity and the interdependence of the world’s people” (Ontario Catholic Schools Trustees Association, (n.d.), p.3). Callaghan’s (2012) research on select LGBTQ youth experiences in Canadian Catholic schools found that interpretations of Catholic doctrine supersede the public system’s secular values for tolerance and respect of LGBTQ relationships.
At both Rani and Glebe, candidates are encouraged to embrace the image of the diversity educator as social reformer by implementing recent curriculum changes. For example, at Rani, teachers are expected to adopt child-centred pedagogies for social change. Candidates plan and deliver lessons that focus on probing gender issues in the community. According to NCERT (2005): “‘Child-centred' pedagogy means giving primacy to children’s experiences, their voices, and their active participation” (p. 13). The rationale for this change is that more students, particularly marginalized students, will be engaged in education and, in the process, challenge patterns of exclusion (GOI, 2010; NCTE & NCERT, 2006).

At Glebe, the program policy emphasis is on social justice. Teacher educators Vanessa and Paula also encourage candidates to focus on equity, equality, and justice in the curriculum by identifying the “big idea” for a lesson. Neal addresses the importance of adding “non-Western civilizations” to the arts because “unfortunately that is still the predominant model that schools tend to use.” The diversity educator as social reformer adds to, amends, challenges, or omits parts of the curriculum that do not promote pluralism as social equality. Thus, in both programs, social reformers use the curriculum as their primary tool for social change.

The two programs also differ in how they envisage social change taking place. As shown in the case study of Rani, although collegial action for social change is desired, the diversity educator as social reformer is seen as embarking on a lone endeavour within the system. Although the Rani candidates are the first generation of the “new cadre” of teachers, making them leaders of the “new system,” they felt “alone” in the reforms they tried to make in their school placements. By comparison, Glebe policy and teacher educators present social reform in education as a much more collegial act. The program practices and policies promote collective agency; that is, “working with others to counter inequalities” (Stanton University, 2011). For instance, Vanessa encourages her candidates to act for and with each other for social change. She shared a story of how the candidates used fundraising to address social reform as a group:

Well, they did a lot of research on the human rights and the rights to education. And they wanted to build a school in China...They decided as a community

---

78 System-wide curriculum policies were established in Ontario through the Inclusive Education Strategy (2009a) and in Delhi through the New Curriculum Framework (2005) and Rights to Education act (2010). Prior to these directives, subject-based curriculum guides and official textbooks were revised to address inclusive education for Delhi’s elementary and secondary students.
within that class that they felt that they could work towards that goal. They took bags. They designed them with a certain visual arts technique, and then they made posters, and they designed a website. There were all these wonderful visual arts components in it, and they were doing it for social action.

Of the three images of the diversity educator present at Glebe and Rani, the image of the social reformer is the least evident in the secondary sites. All of the teacher educators at Forefathers describe diversity educators as having the “political will” to challenge what teacher educator Fariq describes as “the complacency that has set into the [Indian education] system.” Her colleague Singa explains that educators who want to challenge the system are needed because “there is a lot of deepening of democracy that is required here.” However, another colleague, Farahnaz, is mindful of resistance to reform, especially by “teachers who…have very traditional methods [and] have not read or reflected on what is new because they find the [current] arrangement very comfortable.” The teacher educators at River do not see themselves as challenging the system either through their ITE practices or in their comments on the qualities of the diversity educator. The River Institute wants to prepare teachers who are “inquirers into their practice”, “aware of social equality”, and implementers of “child-centred learning,” but not necessarily teachers who raise social issues with their students.

At Thomson University in Ontario, social reform discussions are an integral part of the curriculum for cohorts specializing in diversity education, but not for the program as a whole. As Jamie, one of the teacher educators in these cohorts, commented: “I definitely think we have a portion of the graduating population that leaves very passionate about issues of equity, about issues of justice, and they are ready to take on these ideas and issues in education.” At Baldwin, diversity education is less confrontational and more about seeding the possibility of social reform. Evin’s approach to diversity education captures what many of his colleagues see as the scope of their work in the program: “Try to show respect for teachers as flawed people but potential vehicles for change who at least are wanting to help in some way.” He sees his goal as trying to "increase [candidates'] understanding so that they're more likely to teach sensitively and take on some of the important equity work that needs to be done in schools.”

The image of the social reformer is the most challenging of the three images to the overall system because it requires teachers to address social issues in the classroom even though these issues may be confrontational. At Rani and Glebe, teachers frame social action within the
confines of the new official curriculum, their classrooms, and schools. Diversity educators in this image are not reinventing structures outside of the classroom or going beyond official curriculum agendas to engage in social reform. Although the participants at the primary sites believe the system is ready for the social reformer to take charge in the classroom, the participants at the secondary sites offer a more sober view of the system’s readiness for change.

Summary

The three images of affirmer, conscious practitioner, and social reformer represent ITE visions for novice educators. However, each image emphasizes different aspects of diversity: the affirmer’s need for positive views; the conscious practitioner’s need for civic, professional, moral, and social responsibility; and the reformer’s need for educational and social change. This does not mean other elements are not present within an image, only that they are not prioritized. For example, affirmers may be aware that students face oppression based on identity, yet they focus on the “positive” elements in the classroom.

These images influence how ITE programs approach social inclusion. For the affirmer, social inclusion begins with the individual, moves into the classroom community, and then to the larger society. For the social reformer, it is the reverse. Social movements lead to curriculum reform and social inclusion means maintaining equity among individuals. For the conscious practitioner, social inclusion is the convergence of individual and social agendas that shape one’s perspective of the world and sense of social responsibility.

My findings on Rani and Glebe reveal that each image involves a distinct perspective on social action. The affirmer locates the site for social action as the classroom learning space, the conscious practitioner as the mind, and the reformer as the curriculum content. For affirmers, social change is achieved through the daily affirmation that students belong and are empowered as individuals, as well as through the challenging of traditional perceptions of individuals/groups by society. Conscious practitioners define social change as a commitment to learning about social issues, the self, and the implications of this learning for practice. Social reformers aim for social change by implementing a curriculum that engages questions of agency and equity in the classroom.
Some would argue that the conscious practitioner and the affirmer are relatively apolitical images of the diversity educator compared to the social reformer. However, this is not necessarily the case. The Rani affirmer is engaging the socially excluded and challenging the treatment of groups in India’s democratic society. The conscious practitioner supports national/regional agendas and values, and makes them central to his or her practice.

The secondary sites do not replicate the three images in their entirety. On the one hand, these sites support elements of each image in their own contexts. On the other hand, they suggest that ITE and the education system are not prepared for some of the values and actions that the images promote. In the next section, we will see how Rani and Glebe use these images of the diversity educator to guide learning opportunities within their ITE programs. In the final section, we will see the tensions and challenges that arise from the ways in which teacher educators and candidates enact and internalize the images.

**Curriculum Integration of Diversity Education in ITE**

The previous chapters revealed that diversity education is core to many aspects of ITE programming at Rani and Glebe. Faculty of Education policy at Glebe states that its ITE program is “strongly committed to social justice in everything it does” (Stanton University, 2009, p. 3). Similarly, Rani policy reinforces that its ITE program prepares teachers to support “secularism, justice and pluralism” in Indian society (Sahara, 2001, p.9). Many scholars such as Gay (2004), Cochran-Smith (2004), and Zeichner (2011) argue that policy commitments are one of many dimensions of the integration of diversity education in ITE. Integration is also informed by ecological, structural and practical dimensions of ITE such as the school curriculum, climate, values, and admissions. The National Council of Teacher Education in India (1991) states that curriculum integration is “components-based” and centred in “different foundation (theory) courses, specializations, and practicum-field work” (Panda, 2005, para. 21). In my study, the frame of integration narrows to how diversity education is included in ITE features and pedagogy, and reflected in candidates’ program experiences.

In this section, I compare how Rani and Glebe use: a) structural strategies, and b) content and pedagogical activities to facilitate the integration of diversity education curriculum. In the first part, I examine how the substantive features of both programs create a foundation for diversity education curriculum. The secondary sites offer regional perspectives on curriculum
integration, specifically with respect to regulations and standards in ITE. In the second part, I focus on how content and pedagogical activities seek to develop candidates into affirmers, conscious practitioners, or social reformers.

**Structural Strategies**

Structural strategies for integrating diversity education set the foundation and conditions for developing candidates as diversity educators. Both Rani and Glebe prioritize diversity by presenting their ITE programs as multidisciplinary and by using admissions procedures to recruit candidates prepared to engage in diversity education. At the same time, the two programs differ in terms of ITE leadership approaches, design, and faculty commitment to diversity education programming.

Diversity education has been part of the Rani program from the outset. The focus on diversity and inclusion was set in the norms and guidelines in 1997, and has been sustained ever since. The original vision of the program as stated in inauguration materials, program planning documents, and by the director is reinforced in teacher educators’ comments about course objectives and the program’s overall purpose.

Glebe’s structural inclusion of diversity education has been a more gradual process. The priority was set at the institutional level in 2005. However, only recently have all the elementary cohorts been asked to engage with it deeply in their aims and course activities. Although the leadership at Glebe reinforces these priorities, faculty are left to adopt them as they see best.

Both Rani and Glebe’s leadership choices support the integration of diversity education. Indu, the Rani program director, was part of the Bachelor of Elementary Education program planning team and has an institutional knowledge that she uses to guide the faculty. The teacher educators rotate leadership roles bi-annually. The faculty also co-teach courses, thus reinforcing their familiarity with how diversity education is done across coursework in the ITE curriculum.

---

79 The challenge facing the program at present is that teacher educators are voicing the need for reform in the program vision and admissions processes. However, the mechanisms for supporting changes that were present in the early years of the program (e.g., annual meetings with colleagues across sites, professional development opportunities) are no longer available. Rani teacher educators feel that program supports do not allow space for evolution of diversity education or the programs aims.
Miriam, the Elementary ITE program director, uses a “relational leadership” model. At the start of the year, she asked the ITE cohort coordinators to consider how they could incorporate diversity education into their existing program structures. Her office provided faculty with professional development activities and resources to help them learn how to integrate diversity education into their planning. As a result of these actions, Vanessa (cohort coordinator) chose to increase the profile of diversity education in her cohort. Based on these leadership choices, Glebe became more closely aligned with the broader institutional values of “equity, diversity and social justice.” The priority was set at the institutional level and foregrounded by leadership. At the same time, the coordinators had discretion as to how much it was applied. Therefore Glebe takes a relational approach to leadership and Rani takes a more structured approach. In both cases, the directors are trying to build teacher educator capacity for diversity education while simultaneously reinforcing ITE policy.

Rani and Glebe also differ in the way diversity education curriculum is integrated into their ITE components. At Rani, it is integrated into several components across the 4 years: course work, extracurricular activities, and field placements. The program design stipulates multi-component programming (integration in all areas of ITE), a multidisciplinary focus, and linking across theory and practice courses (bridging ITE and the field). Furthermore, the course outlines (syllabi) specify where diversity education occurs in the content and assignments. Teacher educators can enhance the content but are bound by the set syllabus.

By comparison, Glebe has a more decentralized and idiosyncratic structure. Only two of the seven ITE components—the School and Society course and the Teacher Education Seminar—are listed in the program guide as key sites for diversity education and perceived as such by several of the teacher educators. Instructors of subject-based courses are expected to integrate diversity education into their content. As such, it is the teacher educators rather than the institution that determine the course syllabi. They are the ones who truly decide where, when, how, and to what extent diversity education is part of Glebe courses. The result is that candidates receive different exposure to diversity education from course to course. In comparison to Rani,

---

80 Even though the course descriptions are accredited by the Ontario College of Teachers and sample syllabi are provided, the instructors have flexibility in how they design their course. Some consultation with other instructors occurs but some of the faculty in this study reported that they did not attend the meetings. If they did attend, it was more to share what was happening in their course rather than determine cross-program requirements or discuss how diversity education should be included in their courses.
these realities make curriculum integration of diversity education at Glebe a subjective and less systematic practice.

Structural strategies at Rani and Glebe also shape instructors’ commitment to integrating diversity education into their courses. In the words of Rani director Indu, the “diversity question” is central to teacher educator practice at Rani. In comparison, Glebe teacher educators are more variable in their commitments. For example, John, the Physical and Health Education instructor, commented that diversity education was not "a super high priority” among his colleagues. Joshua, the Science teacher educator, said that he struggled to include it in his course content due to the limited sessions he had with candidates. Program director Miriam suggested that ITE needs to hire faculty committed to equity and social justice in order to increase integration across the components: “It’s not [only] how you would teach math. It’s how would you teach equity. What are the equity issues in a math pedagogy course?”

The sociopolitical contexts of teacher education in India and Canada also influence how programs approach the integration of diversity education. For the most part, the educators and candidates from the secondary sites perceived Rani and Glebe as strongly diversity-focused institutions, unlike the majority of ITE programs in their respective regions. In India, the instructors at Rivers and Forefathers said that diversity education needed to be legislated or “imposed” on ITE in order for it to have a presence or priority in the program. Their comments reflect the highly regulated nature of ITE in India where every syllabus is stamped and approved, thereby resulting in limited flexibility in planning. As Farahnaz, a teacher educator from Forefathers, said: “It is not in the official [NCTE] curriculum. It is not in the syllabus. So it is not in the [Forefathers] system." And as Ali, another Forefathers teacher educator, observed:

[ Diversity education] will be taken more seriously if the National Council of Teacher Education takes a special agenda that inclusiveness and diversity has to be practiced, and they then require some reports from the department on what did they do for diversity. Accountability…that will make a difference.

---

81 In India, River Institute and Forefathers offer discussion of diversity issues in the Gender in Education and Emerging India courses. River also offers extracurricular workshops for candidates on disability and women in education. In Canada, Baldwin offers one mandatory diversity education focused course with extracurricular components like workshops on equity in education. Thomson offers specialized cohorts that receive diversity education across all components (e.g., courses and field placements). The three Thomson participants from the specialized cohorts saw ITE heavily focused on diversity education whereas the seven who were in the non-specialized cohorts reported "not a single course on it" or saw it as “missed content” in the program.
The participants at both secondary sites in India argued that there is little “political will” by teacher educators or administrators to reform how diversity education is addressed in ITE.

In Canada, secondary site participants felt it was important to integrate diversity education in field placements, program values, and course work. Nevertheless, Vincent, a teacher educator from Baldwin, was skeptical about what actually happens in practice: “I find it a little bit hypocritical that every faculty has gone out of their way to talk about social justice in their mission statement. I wonder how many of them really give it real credence.” Despite his reservations, the Ontario integration question revolves around whether diversity education should be addressed uniformly across ITE or whether it should be similar to the Glebe model; that is, left to teacher educators to incorporate as they see best. Clea, a teacher educator from Thomson, shared her mixed feelings on the standardization of (diversity education) curriculum:

They are starting to develop course kits for everyone in [the Thomson ITE pathways], which means that things will be good in that everybody’s doing the same thing, but not so good in that whatever the university decides to focus on, [then] that is what the teacher educators will have to cover.  

Across the secondary sites in Canada and India, structural strategies were related to the question of how diversity education should be integrated in ITE rather than where it is located in the program.

Rani takes an institutionally established approach to curriculum integration of diversity education, whereas Glebe takes a more subjective and non-systematic approach. In both cases, curriculum integration is more than what, where, and how diversity education is located in ITE. It is also connected to teacher educators’ understanding of their responsibilities, and their ability to implement diversity education. Sociocultural and political forces also influence policy, course work, professional development opportunities, and leadership. Collectively, these structures establish a platform for integrating diversity education. Whether these structures are linked to developing images of educators as affirmers, conscious practitioners, or social reformers is less clear. These images are more directly cultivated through pedagogical activities.

82 Identifying information such as the particular pathways for ITE and the titles of leadership positions have been changed.
Content and Pedagogical Strategies

Content and pedagogy provide a perspective on how ITE programs integrate diversity education curriculum. The teacher educators at Rani and Glebe introduce candidates to content through similar methods such as readings, lectures, class discussions, guest speakers, and media. Candidates at both sites also make their own contribution to the content, especially in class discussions. However, the findings also demonstrate that Rani and Glebe differ in many ways, particularly in the number of learning opportunities that link diversity education to field experiences. They also vary in how they include community and the public space in ITE learning. This section explores in more detail how Glebe and Rani’s practices lead to similar and distinct approaches for developing the affirmer, conscious practitioner and social reformer in the two contexts.

Developing the Affirmer through ITE

This section explores the pedagogical activities used at Rani and Glebe to develop the image of the diversity educator as affirmer and establish the candidates’ skills for creating positive learning environments. My findings show that Rani activities focus on teaching candidates to emotionally affirm learners in the classroom while Glebe activities focus on including learners' experiences in the school curriculum.

A feature of both programs is that teacher educators use pedagogical activities that inform candidates about multiple social identities, particularly marginalized identities based on ability, language, religion, and gender. The aim of many of these activities is to encourage candidates to develop celebratory views of these identities rather than to see diversity from a “difference-blind” approach or see students as homogenous. Glebe differs from Rani in that it includes content on groups (e.g., indigenous populations) to help candidates learn about cultural practices, festivals, histories, and heritages. Rani teacher educators tend to use content on groups
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83 The use of technology such as media clips, online resources, and power point presentations was more common at Glebe than at Rani. The candidates at Rani were also exposed to content through field visits, and arts-based activities such as plays.

84 “Difference-blind” refers to ignoring students' heritages and social identities in an effort to see students as equal or as “all the same.” Scholars like Delpit (1995), Gay (2000), and Banks (2004) argue that difference-blind or color-blind practices perpetuate inequity because they negate a person's core identities.
(e.g., child labourers) to demonstrate that a population is part of the primary classroom and should not be excluded from it.

The image of the affirmer links to developing candidates’ understandings of how various social identities are constructed and perceived in society. At Glebe, instructors mainly teach forms of difference by highlighting an example of a single experience of a social identity. For example, Vanessa's novel study asks candidates to read about the refugee experience of a Muslim Canadian homosexual teen. The study stands alone rather than being seen as one of many experiences of an identity. Rani teacher educators, on the other hand, stress multiple constructions. For example, Vidya shared with me a Gender and Education assignment that asks candidates to explore how women's roles are portrayed in the media and in the home. She uses class discussion of the assignments to help candidates generate multiple images of women's roles. She hopes that through this activity, candidates will gain a greater understanding of the variety of female social identities and the intersection of these identities with religion, class, or caste.

At both sites, teacher educators remind candidates to view all learners as legitimate members of the classroom and not perpetuate deficit perspectives of communities. At Rani, the program components are also designed to have candidates interact with communities that test these perceptions. For example, the “slum visit,” the alternative school visit, and Sadhaka’s ad hoc assignment where candidates interview “mela festival” (underprivileged) children are intended to give candidates exposure to children and parents from poorer communities. Through these experiential activities, candidates learn about life in poverty and the barriers to accessing schooling. In part, the purpose of these activities is for candidates to better understand that children from all walks of life can choose, stay, and succeed in schooling if they are part of supportive learning environments.

Glebe’s focus is less on diversity studies and more on activities that focus on having candidates be mindful of particular learners and responsive to diversity in their lesson planning. For example, Joshua’s science assignment asks candidates to plan for English as a second language learners when designing a homework lesson that students can do with their parents. Another example is John’s practice of having candidates stop during his Physical Education rotation activity to consider how they would modify a particular fitness task for students with
different abilities. Candidates are also taught how to use cultural information in lessons. In his
*Arts* course, Neal uses photos of different types of homes. He explains that these photos reinforce
the diversity found in Canada and the world, and thereby challenge local cultural assumptions
about the concept of home.

In both contexts, candidates have some opportunities to develop the affective qualities of
the affirmer, particularly how to respect diversity. Rani uses role playing and community visits to
help candidates understand and learn how to exhibit respect toward others. For example, Rani
candidates described a self-development activity in which they role played consoling a peer after
a loss. As the participants reported, learning how to communicate fostered bonds and greater
respect both for their peers and the people they met in their field visits. At Glebe, respect seems
to be more about communicating in the ITE classroom than a skill explicitly developed through
course activities. Paula, the *Social Studies* teacher educator, reinforces her ITE class discussion
guidelines by asking candidates to “listen to each other” as a form of respect. Steven believes he
"models respect” for the candidates and that they in turn practise it with their peers:

> I think that modeling is really the most effective way. I think that the instructor,
whether it’s here at Glebe or in the school, the teacher, they show through their
own interactions with the student…what it means to really be interested in
somebody as a person rather than in a certain race or whatever.

At both Rani and Glebe, establishing a supportive learning environment is a strategy
modeled for the candidates rather than explicitly taught for use with candidates’ own students.
Teacher educators cultivate candidates’ experience in the program by making them members of
cohorts; that is, by building professional learning communities. Teacher educators at Glebe like
Steven and Vanessa focus explicitly on “community-building” activities. Vanessa asks
candidates to design an “All about Me” activity to share with peers at the retreat. Extracurricular
activities such as the retreat and overnight trip are seen as events where candidates develop
stronger bonds among themselves and with the faculty.

In summary, the image of the affirmer is most developed through diversity studies and
human relations activities. These activities teach candidates to express positive attitudes toward
difference and incorporate these differences into the curriculum. Teacher educators want
candidates to learn from their example what it is like to be affirmed, to have representative
content, and to learn in a community. Rani also creates learning opportunities for candidates
outside the classroom and uses these public spaces to foster their ability to value and connect with members from different communities. Glebe teacher educators focus their activities on the ITE classroom, encouraging candidates to replicate their practices in their own future classrooms.

**Developing the Conscious Practitioner through ITE**

The conscious practitioner is reflexive, cognizant of diversity and inclusion in society, and committed to learning about social issues. Rani and Glebe teacher educators address the role of the conscious practitioner through the study of social issues, social privilege, biases, civic responsibilities, legislation, and professional policies. They develop candidates’ civic and professional duties through readings and case studies of national legislation, human rights charters, educational policy, and professional standards. In both programs, ITE content covers laws in short lectures or online modules. Constitutional rights and freedoms are taught through case studies of violations and abuses of these freedoms by schools, teachers, and citizens. However, although Rani and Glebe share teaching approaches, they differ in their objectives. For example, Glebe educators focus on providing content for critical thinking about social issues, whereas Rani educators focus on pedagogical activities that stimulate multiple forms of self-awareness. Other differences include the types of questions raised and the methods used to foster inquiry.

Rani and Glebe raise candidates’ awareness of sociocultural issues by focusing on the conditions of groups in the education system, the cultural practices of particular communities, and the lack of educational opportunities for certain individuals/groups in society. The majority of the course activities I saw during my observations presented social issues as tensions and challenges. The teacher educators suggested that sociocultural awareness is about understanding the challenges of social integration. Even the classroom case studies conceived by Glebe educators like Steven and Lynn who value cohesion and community led to discussing the social implications of recognizing some groups in the classroom and not others. Thus, ITE pedagogical activities construct the conscious practitioner as someone informed about the benefits of inclusion, yet mindful of the hardships facing some communities.

Rani and Glebe activities differ in their approaches to concepts of social hierarchy, barriers, and privilege. Rani educators raise the question of who and what perpetuates
hierarchies, and connect course content to candidates' experiences. The pedagogy includes classroom discussions, practicum debriefs, ad-hoc reminders, and lectures. As mentioned in Chapter 5, Neeraj, Lopa, Vidya, and Sadhaka each offered examples of content that address why a particular social identity holds a higher or lower status in society. Lopa gave an impromptu lecture to her candidates on why Hindi and English have a higher status in the country than regional languages. Lakshmi simulated, for the same cohort, a Hindi-only activity so candidates could understand what it is like to be marginalized by an instructor’s choices. Her colleague Neeraj explored through class discussion the social implications of holding a particular surname in India and how status is perpetuated through social norms like arranged marriages.85

In comparison, the classroom interactions at Glebe were less likely to address “how” hierarchies or barriers are constructed in connection to candidates' lives. This content was addressed most often in course assignments and reflection papers. The teacher educators focused, instead, on having candidates identify representations of hierarchies. As mentioned in Chapter 6, teacher educator Joshua addressed the dominance of men in science by asking candidates to “draw a scientist.” After a guest lecture in Vanessa’s course, candidates did a timeline activity to consider how the residential school system impacts the access of First Nations communities to the current education system. In both cases, although the activities focused on how sexism or racism operates in education, the discussions began with the content rather than the candidates' lives. Joshua and Vanessa left the probing of power and social hierarchies to written assignments. Thus, with the exception of Paula's course, the Glebe candidates are often left to make the connection on their own between their lives and deeper questions of power or how groups achieve their hierarchical status.

The conscious practitioner has a keen sense of self. Indeed, at both Rani and Glebe, the teacher educators used activities that developed candidates’ self-concept.86 Neeraj’s lesson on identity in education asked candidates at Rani to consider their “misinformation” about South Indians and where they had learned it. Paula’s lesson asked candidates at Glebe to question the source of their perceptions of aboriginal communities. Yet, as other examples in the case studies reveal, Rani teacher educators devote more of their course activities to asking candidates to

---

85 In India, surnames are associated with caste, class, and religion.
86 Self-concept is knowledge of one’s beliefs, biases, and identity construction.
articulate and deconstruct aspects of their identity, values, and understanding of others. This can be attributed to the aim of cultivating self-awareness and reflexivity. Teacher educator Sadhaka describes self-awareness as “examining our own stereotypes.” Candidate Janvi says it is about “getting into your soul,” whereas Neha, another candidate, describes it as “the study of our emotions.” As these examples illustrate, Rani activities focus on increasing consciousness of personal beliefs, emotions, and actions. For instance, in the Theatre workshop, a role play on empathy encouraged candidates to study their body language. In their journal entries, candidates were asked to reflect on their understandings of the communities they visited as well as on themselves. Neeraj and Lopa used class time to probe candidates’ stances and emotions on issues. The Rani program activities suggest that candidates' personal growth in ITE is as important as their professional growth.

In comparison, the examples of self-awareness education at Glebe are geared to candidates’ sense of professional identity. Glebe’s 10-month program focuses on how candidates’ values influence their classroom choices rather than their personal beliefs. For instance, in every course, educators asked candidates’ to reflect on their future practice by discussing the strategies they would use to foster inclusion, writing narratives about their beliefs as teachers, or reflecting on lessons they had taught. In School and Society, the philosophy of education assignment asked candidates to explain their beliefs “as inclusive educators.” Nisha’s submission was typical of how candidates are asked to connect their personal histories to professional understandings:

I often felt excluded from the students and teachers because I was disengaged from the material we were taught. More than often I was unable to relate because I came from a different ethnic background…The clash between school verses home left me confused and frustrated with my identity which ultimately left me segregated in the classroom. Essentially, as a teacher I must teach material that is engaging and addressing the needs of my students while still meeting the official curriculum expectations.

As Nisha’s comment demonstrates, Glebe activities try to contextualize self-awareness as a matter of future practice. By comparison, Rani activities develop both personal awareness and the relationship between candidates' personal and professional self.
Critical inquiry is the cornerstone for developing the conscious practitioner as a lifelong learner of diversity and inclusion. Rani and Glebe teacher educators differ in how they foster candidates’ interest in critical inquiry. Rani educators ask candidates to develop their skills through assignments and daily classroom interactions. For example, in all of his courses, Neeraj gives his position on an issue and asks candidates to come back with a researched counter-argument. In Year 2, candidates explore childhood by designing and conducting research for an assignment in *Observing Children*. The following year candidates do a newspaper analysis of a social issue in education. Rani educators develop candidates’ willingness to explore by asking them to analyze and seek out what they want to learn within a given frame.

At Glebe, many ITE assignments are based on self-directed inquiry and reflection. In her *Math* course, Carrie gives candidates a list of topics related to diversity education. The candidates teach their peers about the topic in a group presentation and then reflect more deeply on the topic through an individual written assignment. However, as teacher educator John explained, the candidates do not always engage in critical inquiry, even if it is part of the assignment. Reflecting on how candidates responded to reviewing a *Physical and Health Education* website for its attention to diversity, he commented: “I think they saw it as just an add-on part, and a lot of them didn’t even acknowledge the issues related to social justice or diversity on the website.”

Teacher educators at Rani and Glebe clearly invoke the conscious practitioner by encouraging candidates to develop new perspectives and analyze their moral, professional, social, and civic responsibilities. They position the diversity educator as a cognizant person, suggesting that mindfulness of diversity and inclusion is in itself social action. Glebe teacher educators prioritize awareness of professional practice while Rani teacher educators spend more time deconstructing with candidates why and how barriers occur in society. Although their strategies differ, they share the aim of helping candidates develop a keen awareness of diversity and social inclusion in education.

**Developing the Social Reformer through ITE**

The social reformer is aware of social issues, aware of being a change agent, and aware of the equity and the social justice elements of the official school curriculum. At both Rani and Glebe, pedagogical activities focus on building candidates' confidence to engage with social
issues in their classrooms. Yet they differ in their approach. Rani activities focus on teaching candidates to understand their agency and begin using it in their placements. Glebe activities focus on teaching candidates how to plan social justice lessons using the Ontario curriculum.

To generate interest in reform, teacher educators at both Rani and Glebe ask candidates to discuss prominent social reformers. At Rani, course readings include advocates of equal rights and role models from marginalized groups who have challenged oppression. For example, teacher educators Neeraj and Lopa reference Ambedkar who campaigned for dalits and women, Gandhi who challenged British colonial rule, and the non-governmental organization Eklaviya that promotes access to education for rural communities. At Glebe, Vanessa presented videos in her Teacher Education Seminar on Ontario youth from Attawapiskat and on the American civil rights activist Rosa Parks.

Like the affirmer and the conscious practitioner, the social reformer is aware of social issues. This awareness in turn implies a direction for social action. For instance, awareness of the barriers facing girls in education is meant to prompt Rani candidates to challenge gender divides in their practicum placements. At Glebe, Lynn addresses stigmas about learning disabilities to help candidates become advocates in the classroom. An important social issue addressed by teacher educators in both contexts is Islamophobia. At Glebe, Vanessa cites this as her rationale for choosing a novel on false accusations of terrorism. Steven’s class addresses the treatment of Muslims as part of religious accommodations, and candidates in the Math course discuss it as part of cultural difference. At Rani, Vidya believes candidates are “socialized” to be prejudiced against Muslims, and Sadhaka makes Muslim education central content in her course. Both hope that, through ITE, candidates will be poised to challenge inequitable practices and prejudices in their future classrooms.

The teacher educators in both programs use pedagogical activities to foster candidates’ sense of agency. Paula from Glebe and Sadhaka from Rani refer to agency as the ability to make choices and take action for social inclusion and social equality in the classroom. Rani teacher educators also see agency as using one’s voice in the ITE program. For example, candidates Anu and Meenal said they are not allowed to be “backbenchers” in their courses, and “must speak.” Lopa, the Social Science teacher educator, teaches candidates that they must contribute to discussions. Neeraj, in his courses, teaches them to “be agitated” and to “fight back.” The teacher
educators encourage candidates to learn to use their voice by probing and questioning for responses. At Glebe, candidates’ use of voice is encouraged but not required. The teacher educators assume that candidates will share their views if they wish.

Rani teacher educators also use pedagogical activities to encourage candidates to ‘border cross.’ Border-crossing asks people to engage with new communities and overcome their fears (Giroux, 1998; Solomon et al., 2007). Sadhaka and Lakshmi build candidates’ “comfort” and “confidence” to border cross through assignments like the "multiple childhoods study" and workshops on disability education. The ability to border cross is particularly relevant for teachers working in government schools and with communities starkly different from their own. Similarly, although it is not a significant part of Glebe teaching strategies, John commented on the importance for candidates of “crossing the threshold” into unfamiliar spaces and communities.

Rani teacher educators also use dissonance to spur social action. Lakshmi and Sadhaka help candidates reconsider “what they know” by pushing and probing until they are "at a point of confusion.” These dissonance-focused activities have two aims. The first is to inspire critical inquiry and the need for social reform. The second is to reflect on possible actions. For example, Vidya encourages candidates to take their sense of dissonance into society and ask others “why” they perpetuate particular social norms. Neeraj and Lopa encourage candidates to avoid being complacent and to “rebel” against inequitable practices in the classroom.

At Glebe, the focus is on building candidates’ professional confidence to incorporate social justice content into the elementary classroom. Teacher educators foster this confidence by providing candidates with resources such as the journal "Rethinking Schools." Paula shared at least one elementary-appropriate resource on a social justice issue in each of her Social Studies lessons. She spoke to candidates about how to use this resource in the Ontario curriculum and provided a lesson plan or activity idea.

Candidates at Glebe are also asked to imagine their future practice as social reformers. For example, John asks candidates to teach Physical and Health Education from an inclusive
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87 Rethinking schools is a non-profit organization in the United States that focuses on inclusion, equity and social justice for all learners in public education systems. It publishes educational materials, newsletters, and magazines for classroom teachers.
perspective rather than from the usual "high performance" focus on athletic ability and achievement. In one activity he asked them to imagine their future practice by challenging how different abilities are included in lessons. Paula asks the candidates to use the current curriculum to plan a unit on social justice. Vanessa’s novel study assignment asks candidates to generate “social justice” activities by focusing on a big idea like equity, equality, prejudice, power, or human rights. Although candidates are encouraged to use their lesson plans during their practicum placements, it is not mandatory. They are, however, asked to submit a reflection with their lesson plan that discusses the imagined challenges they would face and the adaptations they would make.

Rani teacher educators are not as explicit as Glebe educators in directing candidates to create lessons on social justice. However, they do want candidates to take ownership for their knowledge and develop the confidence to create curriculum. They inspire candidates to see teaching and learning differently by asking them to challenge their previous experiences of education. For example, Neeraj, Lopa, Lakshmi, and Sadhak all stated that candidates "should not take their word as authorities" and should seek out answers to questions for themselves. Neeraj asks candidates to search for authors who write on themes such as “alternative education” for marginalized groups. Vidya, in her Gender and Education course, gives each candidate a different reading so that they learn to discuss from multiple perspectives and share new understandings of womanhood. These activities teach candidates that a single text is not the authority and encourage them to move away from the traditional practices of textbook learning found in India.

Candidates at Rani are also asked to take action in the classroom by planning and testing new curriculum activities that follow the mandates of “inclusive education,” “peace education,” and “challenges to marginalization” in the new curriculum model (NCERT, 2005). For example, in their final year, they prepare a resource bank of teaching and learning materials that they leave at their practicum schools for partner candidates to use. The act of creating resources like math games and storytelling lessons, using them with students, and then sharing/leaving them with their school partners not only contributes to social change, but also builds much needed resource materials for government schools.
In both programs, teacher educators engage students in conversations and practices to develop their confidence as social reformers. At Glebe, this is achieved by inspiring candidates to engage with the antidiscrimination focus of the Ontario curriculum. Candidates study social justice resources and learn to generate related lessons. At Rani, ITE activities expose candidates to new ways of teaching and learning. The Rani program takes a more experience-based approach to this learning, supporting the new NCERT curriculum. The candidates also gain skills by practising and building their understandings of agency. Overall, Glebe offers a curriculum where candidates plan for and imagine their role as social reformers, but have few opportunities to take action.

**Summary**

Images of the diversity educator as affirmer, conscious practitioner, or social reformer guide beliefs and practices of diversity education in ITE. The pedagogical activities described above demonstrate the complex ways in which these images are developed and experienced within a program.

The pedagogical activities point to similarities in how programs develop the three images. Teacher educators want candidates to have experiential learning of diversity education as part of their programs. Candidates are cohorted and teacher educators like Lynn and Lakshmi simulate learning activities that have candidates “put themselves in someone else’s shoes.” The three images are taught through informational lectures and “equity” comments made by teacher educators. These activities ensure the message is given, but they still raise questions as to how it is received.

The pedagogical activities also represent different understandings of community. Rani sees it as critical to actively expose candidates by having them enter communities, meet others, and learn in public. Glebe takes a less explicit approach where diversity education is not as focused on community connections, but more on learning about communities through course content and through their experiences with each other.

Overall, the activities show that Rani places a great deal of emphasis on cultivating the social reformer. Although Glebe also favours this image, I observed fewer examples of teacher educators developing it in their course activities. This is in part due to the length of the program. The 4-year program at Rani provides more opportunities to develop candidates’ capacities than
the 10-month program at Glebe. The Rani program is also able to scaffold learning so that personal inquiry is part of early teacher development in Year 1 and 2, and the personal and practical connections are part of Year 3 and 4.

The model and length of the programs also suggest different approaches to teacher learning. At Rani, images of diversity educators are developed over time by asking candidates to begin by understanding core concepts in relation to themselves and society, and then applying these understandings to practice. Glebe, on the other hand, approaches image development by asking candidates to begin by exploring concepts and then applying them to school-based curriculum, and/or their own beliefs in a single lesson.

At both sites, the images of the affirmer and conscious practitioner are strongly represented in pedagogical activities. As affirmers, candidates learn to relate better to others. As conscious practitioners, they learn to develop reflexivity, inquire into the impact of social issues, and fulfil their responsibilities as citizens and professionals. At Rani and Glebe, the images are not only part of program visions but also part of program practice. The teacher educators’ choices of content and teaching strategies determine how the three images are developed. Most importantly, their collective practices indicate that diversity education can be seen through multiple images within a program. Their choices in turn let candidates see and live the possibilities for diversity education in their own future classrooms.

**Challenges of Developing Diversity Educators in ITE**

Rani and Glebe both face challenges in preparing diversity educators in their programs. These challenges are based on how programs represent and implement the three images of the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer. First, ITE mandates and course descriptions suggest that teacher educators are themselves expected to be diversity educators in the program. Thus much depends on their beliefs and abilities, the choices they make in their pedagogy, and the images they model for candidates. Second, program structures also influence how the images are perceived and received.

My findings reveal that some candidates feel excluded by the ideas and pedagogical activities used in the program. They are offered a selective view of diversity or do not feel their identities are affirmed. Their experiences and instructor’s practice suggest that programs can find
it challenging to model the role of affirmers. Other candidates feel frustrated by their teacher educators’ approaches to raising awareness, leading to tensions in how they develop as conscious practitioners. Program and practice choices result in some candidates ‘tuning out’ of lessons on diversity and inclusion in education. Further, some teacher educators and candidates find it challenging to adopt the image of the social reformer. The image is difficult to embrace not only because it does not align with their personal views, but also because they see the system as not ready for social reform. In this section, I elaborate on the tensions and challenges associated with the images of the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer. Although the focus is mainly on Rani and Glebe, I also draw connections with my findings at the secondary sites in both regions.

**Representing the Affirmer in ITE Content and in Practice**

Although teacher educators at Rani and Glebe promote the diversity educator as an affirmer, my findings show that they do not address or only superficially address some social identities in their teaching. This means that the programs are challenged by their ability to model the affirmer both in content and in practice. The content challenges relate to which social identities are included in course discussions. The practice challenges relate to pedagogical activities and the social dynamics that occur in ITE.

Rani and Glebe’s content choices indicate that some social identities receive more attention than others. Although the programs address identities based on gender, region, culture, dominant religions, and abilities, they exclude or limit attention to identities based on low socioeconomic status, English language proficiency (ESL), and sexual orientation.\(^{88}\) The challenge in terms of content is whether social identities are positioned as core or peripheral, and how well candidates are prepared to address “all learners” in the classroom.

The treatment of social identities reflects the teacher educator’s position as affirmer. For example, LGBQT issues are peripherally included in course content at both of the primary sites. As Rani candidate Neha commented: “Homosexuality is not appreciated” and is considered a

---

\(^{88}\) Sexual orientation refers to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, intersexed, queer, questioning, and Two-Spirited community (LGBTITQQ2S).
taboo in Indian society and in the program. My observations of Neeraj's Basic Concepts of Education course revealed that although he stated that diversity includes “sex as male, female, transgender and eunuch,” he did not take this up at any point in the subsequent five classes. When Aarti and another candidate tried to do a program assignment on the LGBQT community in India, their supervisors disapproved. As they explained, they wanted to make a bulletin board display on sexuality and the recent Indian Supreme Court rulings that decriminalized consensual sex between men:

The theme that was selected by us was this thing only—gays and homosexuality—because it was very popular at the time. Whenever we talked to teachers and said, m’am may we put [homosexuality] on the board, they would say “it depends on you.” But we can get from their physical gestures and [tone] that they don’t want us to do that thing. They want us to do any other thing but not this. They didn’t directly tell us you don’t or you can’t do this kind of thing, but from their physical gestures we got to know that they don’t want us to do it.

The candidates did not complete the assignment and the board remained empty for the remainder of the year. Aarti’s decision and her reading of her teacher educators’ disapproval reinforced that LGBQT issues are peripheral to the program content.

During one of my field visits to Glebe, a candidate complained to program coordinator Vanessa about the lack of LGBQT representation in the curriculum. Vanessa responded that the program is constrained by time. She feels the limited space in the curriculum makes for tough choices as to who is represented: “There's so much to learn in education as a teacher. There's no way that a Bachelor of Education program is going to be able to teach it all in 10 months, let alone actually 8 months [of course work].” Indeed, I observed that although gender and aboriginal identities were raised in the majority of ITE courses at Glebe, LGBQT identities were only raised in two instances. Teacher educators are responsible for making choices in their course content, and thus have discretion to address some identities and not others. In turn, these choices lead to the program modeling the affirmer for some identities but not for others.

---

In Canada, LGBQT is considered an abbreviated acronym for LGBTTIQQ2S. In India, the most common reference in the literature is LGT. The LGBQT community was frequently raised or cited as underrepresented in ITE content across all six sites. Other identities also cited as underrepresented include age, body type, migrant, urban, and rural communities.
The selective representation of social identities leads to some candidates feeling unprepared to support “all learners” in the classroom. For instance, Allie, a Glebe candidate, captured several of her peers’ sentiments when she explained that ITE needs to better include particular social identities, especially those that are met with prejudice in the classroom: “It’s hard when you encounter [homophobia]. In your Grade 8 classroom you hear ‘oh you’re gay’ or ‘you’re a fag’ all the time and you actually want to address it.” She felt unprepared to support the LGBQT community in practice, even though she is expected to address family diversity as part of the Ontario curriculum (OME, 2006).

Rani candidates also express reticence in being able to affirm “all learners,” particularly those who are child laborers or over-age for their grades. Although they are told by their teacher educators that these learners are part of the school population, they do not feel prepared to address the challenges of absenteeism, bullying, and trauma that these learners present in the classroom. The senior candidates reported that content on these social identities was not part of their courses, yet these learners were part of their final year placements. In their view, Rani is not fully acknowledging the realities of affirming school diversity.

Rani and Glebe also struggle to invoke the image of the affirmer in program practices. At Rani, for example, candidates commented on the divide between Hindi and English speakers in the program. Tanvi, a Year Two candidate, feels her Hindi peers are being neglected as part of the ITE community: “In our classroom, we have students from different backgrounds. Some students speak Hindi, some English. The Hindi and Sanskrit students feel they do not matter.” The more senior Hindi candidates in the program also expressed alienation from aspects of the curriculum, raising questions of access and equity in the program. For example Priya, a Hindi speaker, explained that she is unable to get readings in her language, even though the program is supposed to be bilingual. As a result, she felt disadvantaged. She and her fellow Hindi candidates had to raise their concerns with faculty in order to receive greater representation:

Then we spoke to our teachers and they started speaking in Hindi. So it helped us get conceptual clarity and then even when we read the English material, we could understand it to some extent. In first year I got 58% marks and in second year it was 68%. It is not that teachers do not attempt to give us readings in Hindi, but they are not available.
Even though changes were made in response to the criticism, it is telling that both first-year and fourth-year candidates still feel that their Hindi-speaking peers are not being affirmed in the program.

In another incident at Rani, candidates Aarti and Kavleen felt that their visually impaired peer Renu was also at a disadvantage. Kavleen stated that the assignments are mainly “sight based.” In her view, the program underserved Renu, thus making it difficult for her to succeed in the course work. Lopa, a new teacher educator, admitted she found it challenging to accommodate Renu in the class, especially when many of the texts are not available in Braille. Once again, the candidates observed how access and equity are not fully engaged in ITE.

Similar concerns about affirmation and exclusion were raised at Glebe. For example, candidates Karen and Hilary felt that the program’s approach to diversity education was marginalizing Christian members of the community. They felt that Glebe’s equity policy was “anti-Christian” in practice. Karen felt marginalized by how class discussions about the “problem with celebrating Christmas” were addressed by her teacher educators and peers. She believes that their critique of Judeo-Christian dominance in the curriculum caused her to “hide her faith because it might offend.” In Karen’s view, the program’s image of the affirmer as all-inclusive did not include her identity or beliefs:

People should be able to think about that sort of thing, but for some reason the equity policy does the opposite in my mind and makes everyone feel more uncomfortable. No not everybody. People who take their faith more seriously than others.

When Karen and Hilary’s comments are considered alongside Joshua’s comment in Chapter 6 that diversity is “anyone but the dominant,” ITE is promoting a particular image of the affirmer. This practice raises the question of how dominant groups are addressed in diversity education. It seems that the idea underlying the Glebe approach is that the affirmer supports the marginalized by disengaging or challenging the dominant in the community and in content. This contradicts the image of the affirmer as someone who diversifies all representations of diversity in the curriculum.

Across the secondary sites, participants reported challenges related to the treatment of social identities in their ITE programs. For instance, River teacher educator Himan has never
considered including LGBTQ issues in his Emerging India course because, as he said: “I don’t think it’s apt for this course. It is a course for elementary education.”\(^{90}\) In other words, if a social identity is not deemed part of the community candidates will be entering, it is not seen as content for the ITE program. None of the River teacher educators cited it as relevant to their course content. However, there is another issue here. At Forefathers, 2 of the candidates associated sexual orientation education with sex education. Like Himan, 1 of the candidates explained that “the students are too young” to learn about LGBTQ issues and then asked me when sex education is taught in Canada. In so doing, he demonstrated the common misconception that teachers have to address sex education in teaching about the LGBTQ community to children (Rosen, 2014). In Canada, many of the secondary site candidates also felt that some social identities were neglected in content and practice. For example, Thomson candidate Ambika commented that diversity issues beyond special needs were not really addressed in her ITE cohort: “If someone brings it up, then we’ll talk about it. It’s not the professor saying, 'Okay, how can we make it culturally relevant for blank-a-blank students?’” At Baldwin, candidates Heather, Jennifer, Wayne, and John said that they rely on their intuition and not their program for how to affirm and represent learners in the classroom. They, as well as their teacher educators, also implicated institutional practices in the program by pointing to the “lack of diversity” in the ITE population, particularly the lack of visible minorities.

In India, the secondary site participants did not really address practice-based challenges to the treatment of identities in ITE. However, there were two exceptions at Forefathers. One candidate pulled me aside to say that although the ITE policy promoted pluralism, his religious status as a Hindu was ignored: “They say they want you, accept you, but it is not true” (Fieldnotes). Teacher educators Singa and Farahnaz also felt that their colleagues fail to acknowledge or build on the life experiences that candidates bring with them.

Overall, my findings from the primary and secondary sites demonstrate that advancing the image of the diversity educator as affirmer is not without challenges. The attributes that Rani and Glebe see as pivotal to this image—representing many social identities, ensuring access and

\(^{90}\) The candidates commonly referred to the B.El.Ed. as a “course” like in a course of study. They are referring generally to all their classes rather than a particular class.
equity, and validating candidates in teacher practice and the community—are also the main sources of tension in content and practice. I posit that program choices on the treatment of social identities in content and practice challenge what “all learners” truly means in ITE.

**Engaging the Conscious Practitioner**

Teacher educators at Rani and Glebe both see developing the conscious practitioner as challenging, particularly if candidates are not ready to engage in the work. Rani teacher educators noted that their probing and dissonance activities make learning an emotional experience for some candidates. The coordinators also said that these activities are not always “easy” or well received. Learning about social inequities and challenging one’s beliefs is a complex and intense process. Some Glebe candidates believe that developing awareness is not about their readiness, but more about needing the time and space to come to their own conclusions about issues. At both Rani and Glebe, the pedagogical activities are marked by an intensity that candidates sometimes respond to with reticence rather than openness. My findings demonstrate that some content and pedagogical activities undermine developing this image of the diversity educator. The challenges centre on missed learning opportunities and on the tensions of helping candidates negotiate their emotions, dissonance, and feelings of security in ITE.

Many of the Rani teacher educators believe that the candidates entering the ITE program are naïve about the social realities of India. According to Indu, the program director, the candidates have been socialized by a system of education different from Rani. Thus they are confronted with “unlearning what they know,” a process that both candidates and teacher educators acknowledge as difficult. Sadhaka, a veteran teacher educator, noted that sadness, frustration, and anger are a reality of the ITE experience, particularly after candidates do the "slum visit" assignment:

Many students have found that it is a fairly emotional [experience] and have emotional outbursts in fact when they come back and understand why is it that these people are being deprived or why is it that [children from slums] are not being able to access certain kinds of opportunities.

Candidate Kavleen felt guilty about introducing the students in her practicum school to Rani methods: “I felt like [I was] giving them the emotional security and then once they had the [foundation], I just snatched the emotional security away because I had to go back [to Rani]. I
felt kind of very selfish and I hated myself for that.” Her sense of guilt was echoed by other candidates who also felt they had created, albeit temporarily, safe learning spaces for their students. In addition, she felt she had to cope with her feelings on her own in the program. Although the teacher educators acknowledge the emotional burden that candidates experience, they do not often address how they help them see the emotional journey as a productive part of the learning process. Vidya, the Gender and Education instructor, was an exception to this. Vidya tries to make her classroom a space where candidates work through the awareness of poverty, prostitution, and corporal punishment that they witnessed in their placements. She believes that if they cannot “learn to cope” then they will be unable to realize the depth of awareness of diversity that the program promotes.

In comparison, the teacher educators at Glebe struggle with consciousness activities on equity, social justice, and diversity awareness because some candidates disengage from these activities. Some are uncomfortable with both the teaching methods and the associated messages. Furthermore, the teacher educators do not always realize this disengagement is happening, which compounds the challenge. The findings in Chapter 6 revealed that candidates feel teacher educators’ reminders to be equity-minded are at times problematic and ineffective. According to Allie, it eventually sounds like “white noise.” Nisha said that, for her, the message was “not new” and as someone who came with “an anti-racist orientation” it was “not for her.” In her view, the Glebe program focuses on raising awareness of diversity in society rather than challenging candidates’ biases. In these instances, the forms or depth of consciousness that teacher educators promote in relation to the conscious practitioner is called into question.

Other candidates at Glebe attribute their disengagement to the lack of space in the program to generate new awareness or develop their understandings. As noted in Chapter 6, the candidates feel teacher educators often push critical discussions of social issues to after class or individual reflection. According to Gay and Kirkland (2003) “personal and inner reflective dialogues are important, but they need to be accompanied by similar dialogues with others” (p. 184). Thus, candidates are only partially engaging their potential to develop as conscious practitioners in ITE.

Candidates also report that the same people speak up during every large group discussion. This means fewer opportunities for hearing a range of views on social issues. Allie and Karen
also argue that their teacher educators expect candidates to be “politically correct.” This hinders the ability of candidates to speak freely and to challenge dominant discourse because they are espousing “what [the teacher educators] wanted to hear.” Nisha and Samantha also feel that their teacher educators avoid pursuing social issues in order to avoid conflict in the classroom. This claim is supported by my observation of Carrie curbing a discussion in one of her Math classes. Candidate Karen also explained that teacher educators seem to communicate a hidden agenda: “It was like this is the way it is, say what you have to say, but don't ask too many questions.” The candidates felt that different views were not welcome or seriously considered, thus impeding their opportunities to create new awareness in the ITE classroom. Pedagogical choices and ‘politically correct’ discourse hinder possibilities to probe ideas in the classroom. They also block learning opportunities for all members of the ITE classroom to have critical conversations with each other.

In some instances, the content teacher educators presented in relation to the image of the conscious practitioner did not resonate with candidates’ beliefs. For instance, Allie, a Glebe candidate, commented that the generalizations about white privilege presented in her Social Studies course did not reflect her own experiences:

And the whole privilege thing—saying 'oh you're lucky you're in university'—and yes but a lot of us, I know I put myself through university. I worked labour and you know I did stuff, and I don't feel like I should feel guilty because I'm in school. That’s something I did for myself.

However, teacher educators do not see their pedagogy in the same way. Vanessa, the program coordinator, believes candidates’ negative reactions to awareness-raising activities reflect their lack of readiness for the work. Her view is shared by teacher educators Joshua and Paula who believe candidates enter the program with different backgrounds and levels of commitment to equity, social justice, and diversity. Their colleague Steven, however, argues that educators need to move away from the "blaming pedagogies" that see candidates as riddled with bias and prejudice. I observed Vanessa, a Glebe coordinator, exhibit an example of blaming in one of her classes when she interrupted a class discussion to tell a candidate his view of a particular community “was just wrong.” The resulting silence was likely the opposite of what she had intended. Morally superior attitudes cause candidates to become unreceptive to content. Teacher educators Steven and John believe a gentler community-focused approach would keep
candidates interested in the content and learning. Both are essential for any image, but particularly for one that sees to develop a candidates’ sense of inquiry and commitment.

At the secondary sites in India, the challenges of developing the conscious practitioner are less about candidates’ emotional needs than about “fitting” the related content into the curriculum and contending with candidates learning the content simply for exam purposes. Thus, the teacher educators at these sites are concerned that candidates are not developing the reflexive skills needed for awareness. Farahnaz, a teacher educator from Forefathers, states outright that ITE is failing to prepare candidates with the awareness needed to be diversity educators:

In a way [candidates] need to develop capacities to address multicultural and diverse classrooms, and also understand the classroom dynamics. If you talk to our students here, they are not aware of the challenges that are there in the classrooms. They are not able to identify the challenges and reflect upon the responses of the children. [Bachelor of Education programs] only prepare them to deliver the lesson. That is what is happening.

The candidates at the Canadian secondary sites share similar stories of reticence and disengagement. This manifests in how teacher educators and candidates perceive the barriers to teaching consciousness in ITE. According to Evin, who taught at Stanton before going to Baldwin, teacher educators are partly to blame for candidates’ disengagement because they preach values of equity and social justice rather than teach candidates how to relate these values to their own beliefs:

So they try to compensate for society doing bad work in terms of equity and diversity by force-feeding their students the right answers on equity and diversity. And sometimes that’s bad pedagogy. It may be very noble, but it’s preaching; it’s bad pedagogy.

I certainly saw when I was at Stanton University that sometimes it actually increased resistance and caused students to burrow in with their doubts rather than put those doubts on the table and then have them work through.

Like Glebe candidates, the Thomson candidates in the three inner-city cohorts also commented that they felt disengaged and alienated by constant reminders in the program “to act for social justice.” Scott explained that the multidisciplinary diversity education approach does not work for him because he hears the same messaging over and over again:
They push it a bit too much sometimes. They have to know when to back off a bit…. because if everyone’s pushing at the same time, one course will be covering the same thing that another course covers. When it gets repetitive like that, people just start tuning out.

The 3 candidates became desensitized to the social justice refrain—the exact opposite of what the program is trying to achieve.

Like Glebe candidate Allie, Shona believed her teacher educators at Thomson took a superior stance in their discussions of power, privilege, and race in society. The content of diversity education, particularly anti-oppression education, prevented her from connecting to the conscious practitioner’s goal of commitment. Thus, the inability to connect limits developing a necessary disposition for this image:

Now I can understand that we are trying to create a better world. But the means by which they are trying to create that better world actually makes a person become more disconnected to it as opposed to feeling as we’re part of something of a greater vision.

The beliefs teacher educators have about candidates’ capabilities and readiness to learn can also hinder their efforts to raise awareness. Evin, a teacher educator from Baldwin, explained that his colleagues need to see their candidates with respect rather than from a deficit perspective:

Try to show respect for [candidates] as flawed people but potential vehicles for change who at least are wanting to help in some way. So how can you increase their understanding so that they’re more likely to teach sensitively and take on some of the important equity work that needs to be done in schools.

Nevertheless, Evin’s view of teachers as "flawed" can also be seen as a deficit stance. This raises questions about teacher educators’ attitudes toward their candidates and their potential to be diversity educators.

In summary, my findings indicate that candidates are challenging some ITE methods that prevent them from coping with new awareness or easily engaging in related activities. Teacher educators have some responsibility for this disconnect by perpetuating deficit views of candidates or using indoctrination rather than welcoming approaches. The findings demonstrate
that when teacher educators do not consistently model or critically reflect on their own practices, they can hinder candidates from developing the capacities of the conscious practitioner.

**Identifying with the Social Reformer**

The main challenge posed by the image of the social reformer is that candidates and teacher educators struggle to identify with the political agenda of social change. Rani candidates feel that the social action they are expected to take in their placements is not always welcome or possible. Similarly, some Glebe candidates feel that the expectations for social reform create additional pressure for beginning teachers. Teacher educators also have different responses to this image, with some rejecting it entirely in their own practice. Teacher educators and candidates posit that ITE needs to reconsider what is possible based on their comfort, expertise, and the realities facing new teachers.

Despite the fact that Rani places the image of the social reformer as central to its program vision, the candidates find it hard to follow suit. Rani candidate Meenal shared an experience that typifies this struggle. In her placement, she tried to engage in reform by implementing the NCERT curriculum for her Class 7 students. After some time, she felt the learner-centred pedagogies she was expected to use “were not successful. Sometimes we feel the material was not enough, or maybe we are not practicing it right.” Her associate teacher believed that challenging gender norms does not serve the realities of middle school, thus communicating disapproval of her initiatives. As a student teacher, Meenal felt uncomfortable challenging her associate’s conventional practices. She also felt overwhelmed by expectations to bring about changes in the classroom without the associate's support. By the end of the placement, the power differential led her to use conventional teaching methods such as blackboard exercises that involved copying from the course books.

Meenal's teacher educators Vidya, Navneet, and Sadhaka are aware of the conflicts that she and other Rani candidates experience with this expectation in their practicum schools: the candidates are apprenticing in the government system for only a short time; the associate teachers do not necessarily model or encourage reform; the candidates themselves are new to using their agency as reformers. According to Vidya: “An individual teacher, particularly an intern going into the classroom, cannot really make that much change in the situation.”
The Rani candidates are alternately hopeful and discouraged about what is currently possible in education. They recognize that they will be the ones to take on the education system and this brings with it feelings of excitement and trepidation. Four of the 9 candidates recounted that their families had told them to leave their ideas regarding women’s rights or Muslim equality in education “at the college.” A 2008 Rani graduate I met shared that, on entering the system, she felt underprepared for the isolation and loneliness that comes with championing equity issues in a context where others are not working toward the same goal. She eventually left teaching to do educational research.

Like Rani teacher educators, Vanessa at Glebe is concerned about not finding adequate models in the education system. Yet, the concerns at Glebe about the image of the social reformer are different from those at Rani. The emphasis on raising awareness by teaching about inequities and social action made candidates Samantha and Allie feel there is undue pressure on beginning teachers. As Allie explained:

Okay well it’s this whole you are a teacher, you are given a role to change the world and you should feel bad for things that have happened and we will work hard to change what’s going to happen. Yes, I believe in making a mark, leaving a mark, but at the same time you have limitations and it seems like a lot, especially when you're new. It’s a lot on your plate and you can barely keep your head above water, and to have that piled on.

Samantha believes that, as a new teacher engaging in social reform, she would not be accepted in her rural Ontario community. The anti-oppression education agendas advocated by Glebe would make her future colleagues reject her:

I want to eventually work out there and live in the country, but I’m fearful that coming out of teachers’ college and working in a small town with my great big ideas that I’m going to get shut down …. I feel if I go in there, headstrong, bells and whistles, I’m going to get looked at like I’m nuts.

At the same time, Samantha is worried that she will become like her rural colleagues. She portrays the community as fearful of other cultures because newcomers are rare in the town. For example, she shared the story of a Pakistani family that moved in. The family was “feared” in the community...
community because they were culturally and racially “different” from nearly everyone else. Although Samantha has grown to value social justice, equity, and cultural awareness in education, she is also hesitant to model it in her future classroom.

Like Meenal at Rani, Glebe candidates also struggle with the role of the social reformer in their placements. For example, Nisha wrote in a practicum reflection that her associate teacher did not want her to use non-European texts. His students were all of European descent and he felt the texts she had selected would not be relevant to them. As she wrote: “We still have a long way to go to educate students, teachers, and administrators about what inclusion is and what it means.” Nisha, Samantha, and Allie are reconciling how to adapt the image to their context and classrooms.

The struggle to identify with the social reformer, however, does not belong solely to candidates. Glebe teacher educators are also trying to figure out how to engage this image in ways that make sense with their beliefs. Carrie, the Math educator, explained that she sees some of the course content and program expectations like exploring biases as “beyond her expertise.” Steven, the School and Society teacher educator, sees his colleagues’ anti-racist agendas as “persecuting.” He believes that his own less confrontational views of diversity education are not “popular” or welcome at the Faculty. Lynn, the Psychology teacher educator, sees political reform for some groups as a strongly held personal belief, but one that she should not impose on candidates or make part of her practice. In each of these cases, the image of the social reformer is less a priority than the image of the conscious practitioner or affirmer.

The Rani teacher educators do not share the same tension of trying to reconcile the social reformer with their ITE practice. In their teaching, Navneet, Lakshmi, Vidya, and Sadhaka all build on their expertise as activists working for marginalized communities.92 The opportunity to teach several components of the program and to team teach gives them a sense of where diversity education content fits in relation to other courses. As newcomers, Lopa and Gayatri see themselves as "learning along with the girls" in terms of reforming Indian education. They have the space to bring their expertise into the college setting but also learn through supervision and assignments how to meet program goals, thus moving beyond the models of authority they
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92 Several of the Rani teacher educators were involved in social activism outside of the program. For example, Sadhaka engaged in advocacy for people with disabilities in India, and Vidya and Neeraj for women’s rights.
experienced in Indian education. As a collective, the Rani teacher educators exhibit greater comfort and are less critical of the image of the social reformer than their Glebe counterparts.

The teacher educators from the secondary sites reinforced the challenges expressed by the Rani and Glebe participants. In India, the River and Forefathers teacher educators reported that social reform is not easily adopted within schools in the region. The image of the social reformer is deemed both “new” and for the “next generation” of teachers. Singa from Forefathers argued that social reform in education is a “civil rights movement.” As a teacher educator, she recognizes that reform-oriented diversity educators must be cautious because “going against the grain, the problem is that it is the element that no hirer wants. The employer does not want it, and yet without it you cannot do diversity education. The trick is to get in despite that [reality].”

In Canada, Baldwin and Thomson teacher educators recognize the social reformer as one of the images operating in ITE, but believe it is hard to achieve. As Thomson teacher educator Jamie commented: “To digest all [the elements of social reform] and then to make sense of it and then to find a way to work with that to change practice and implement things in schools all within a year has got to be hard.” He suggests that teacher educators and candidates should see the goal of programming differently. Candidates should be seen as “learning to start the process” of engaging with political agendas rather than being expected “to accomplish them within the 1-year time frame” of ITE.

Overall, 2 of the Glebe candidates and several of the Rani candidates had reservations about the image of the diversity educator as social reformer. These candidates perceived teachers at schools as unsupportive or unresponsive to this image. When we examine Karen, Allie, and Samantha’s experiences alongside Meenal’s, we see that they are struggling to identify with this image. Some of the Glebe educators also struggle with interpreting the image of the social reformer in their program and whether or not they are responsible for addressing it in their practice. Meanwhile, their Rani counterparts see themselves growing into the capacities needed to support and adopt the social reformer in their practice. In both the primary and secondary sites, ITE is seen as a space to develop the social reformer even though challenges exist. I would argue that these challenges are not necessarily barriers, but opportunities to develop other capacities needed to pursue social reform such as resilience. In the end, despite policy and
program visions, ITE practice shapes candidates’ rejection of the social reformer as part of their future practice.

Conclusion

The findings from Rani, Glebe, and the secondary sites offer insight into how ITE programs use the images of affirmer, conscious practitioner, and social reformer to frame expectations of the diversity educator and diversity education. All three images focus on social change for greater inclusion in the pluralist contexts of India and Canada. At the same time, each image offers a different way of approaching inclusion, the learning environment, and social action in the classroom. The secondary sites indicate that these images are interpreted locally, regionally, and within the context of particular ITE programs.

ITE program structure and methods of integrating diversity education into the curriculum set the foundation for developing images of the diversity educator. The highly structured nature of ITE in India gives Rani teacher educators a clear mandate and tools to achieve the three images in their practice. The fluid and autonomous nature of ITE in Canada allows Glebe teacher educators to interpret diversity education, and subsequently the images, as they see fit. The tension between teacher educator autonomy and standardizing the integration of diversity education is evident in the programs at the secondary sites as well.

Teacher educators filter program priorities through their own pedagogical beliefs, which gives candidates a variable experience of diversity education in ITE. At both Rani and Glebe, candidates deepen their understanding of diversity-related issues and their moral, professional, and social responsibilities to be diversity educators. Teacher educators try to build candidates’ understandings of what it is like to learn in respectful, safe, reflexive, and critically engaging contexts. However, there are major differences in their approaches.

The first is that the program design and teaching strategies approach teacher learning and image-based diversity education differently. Rani offers a gradual approach where concepts, meaningful connections, and their practical application are developed both in sequence and simultaneously. Glebe on the other hand develops these three elements in connection to images simultaneously. The second difference is that Rani instructors expect candidates to test and try approaches in context. Glebe teacher educators, on the other hand, use learning approaches that
develop candidates' abilities to plan and imagine diversity education practice. Contributing to their unique approaches are views of experiential learning and community engagement. Rani sees candidate’s learning more actively in public spaces, while Glebe concentrates on developing candidates' understandings in the ITE classroom.

The findings demonstrate that the three images of the diversity educator are operating concurrently within each program. At both Rani and Glebe, the intention is to prepare diversity educators who are affirmers, conscious practitioners, and social reformers. However, the findings also suggest that through their practices and curriculum choices, teacher educators are developing the affirmer and conscious practitioner, but less so the social reformer.

How these three images are negotiated in ITE is evident in the challenges that the program visions, pedagogical activities, curriculum decisions, and participant attitudes present. Rani and Glebe struggle to ensure equitable representation of social identities, affirm all candidates, teach consciousness about diversity, and support social reform. These tensions raise questions as to whether Rani and Glebe’s approaches to diversity education are indeed modeling the practices and forms of social action they hope their candidates will adopt themselves as future teachers.
CHAPTER 8
IMAGES OF THE DIVERSITY EDUCATOR:
A FRAMEWORK FOR DIVERSITY EDUCATION IN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

Diversity education scholars from around the world argue that attention to diversity and social inclusion is essential to ITE curriculum (Ball & Tyson, 2011; Banks et al., 2005; Ghai, 2005; Richardson & Gallagher, 2010). Diversity education can benefit all by acting as a catalyst for social cohesion and probing the dynamics of diversity. Consequently, ITE bears significant responsibility for ensuring that novice teachers are prepared to practise diversity education in their classrooms. At the same time, comparative education scholars are calling for greater insight into how diversity education unfolds in different ITE programs and responds to the complexities of social cohesion (Craft, 1996; Nieto & Bode, 2008; OECD, 2010). In Delhi and Ontario, school reforms and curriculum have positioned teachers as social change agents in education (NCTE, 2010; OCT, 2006; OME, 2009c). As a result, the need for diversity education as a foundation of professional knowledge has become a priority in both regions (Dewan, 2009; OCT, n.d.).

This study explores the similarities and differences in diversity education in ITE programs in India and Canada. In Chapters 5 and 6, I discussed the programs at Sahara University’s Rani College and Stanton University’s Glebe Cohort. In Chapter 7, I compared their approaches to diversity education and also included insights from neighbouring programs in each region—Forefathers University and the River Institute in India, and Thomson University and Baldwin University in Canada. In particular, I examined four aspects of diversity education: a) concept, b) structure, c) pedagogy, and d) how these three elements connect to the challenges of implementing diversity education.

In this final chapter, I discuss the cross-case findings and their significance to diversity education. First, I consider how the findings address the four subquestions of my inquiry. The subquestions provide the focus and boundaries for my comparison of the six programs and frame the response to my main research question on the similarities and differences of ITE approaches to diversity education in India and Canada. In the second section, I turn to a key finding—images of the diversity educator—to explore connections with the literature and how these images create a framework for broadening our understanding of diversity education. I follow with the
limitations of the study and possibilities for future research. I conclude by reflecting on the possibilities my research opens for improving diversity education in ITE.

Responses to the Four Subquestions: Comparing Diversity Education in ITE

Rani and Glebe see diversity education as a tool for reinforcing particular values about social diversity in a pluralist context. Both programs emphasize positive views of diversity, the need for equity and equality, and the educator’s moral and civic responsibilities for social cohesion. Both consider diversity education a significant priority and integrate it across many aspects of their programs. The secondary sites also see diversity education as essential professional knowledge, albeit with different emphases and experiences.

In this section, I present a comparative analysis of the programs based on the subquestions that guided my research:

1. How are diversity and diversity education conceptualized in ITE programs?
2. How is diversity education addressed in the structure of ITE programs?
3. What is the pedagogy of diversity education in ITE programs?
4. What are the challenges of diversity education in ITE programs?

The aim of my analysis is to extend our understanding of diversity education in ITE. I focus on the findings from the primary sites and also include relevant examples from the secondary sites.

Conceptualizations of Diversity and Diversity Education

In response to the first subquestion, both the Rani and Glebe programs use a broad definition of diversity similar to national and regional policies that base social difference on ethnicity, religion, culture, male and female genders, sexual orientation, age, indigeneity, ability, and socioeconomic class. In addition, they address prominent differences in their respective educational contexts. Rani, for example, focuses on caste, first generation learners, and regions of India. Glebe focuses on citizenship status, race, and differences between Ontario and other parts of the world. In both cases, diversity is presented primarily as individual and group differences, with Rani giving greater attention to intergroup and intragroup distinctions. Using a
broad definition enables the two programs to teach diversity as a complex and multifaceted concept.

Rani and Glebe also have similar understandings of the desired qualities of the diversity educator. These understandings are based on their conceptions of diversity, social inclusion, diversity education, and social action, and translate into dominant images that shape the aims and learning opportunities of the program. Both programs invoke images of the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer. The affirmer focuses on empowering students, reinforcing positive views of diversity, and building community in the classroom. Conscious practitioners focus on developing mindfulness of diversity and the implications of social issues for their life and practice. The social reformer focuses on implementing diversity education curriculum for systemic change.

The images are metaphors for who the diversity educator should be or become. They reflect the societal values of each region and the educational priorities and mandates of the individual institutions. At the same time, they capture certain shared features of the two pluralist contexts. I came to understand Rani’s and Glebe’s approaches to diversity education through these images. When constructed and deconstructed, they serve as a powerful analytic tool for exploring how diversity education is framed, enacted, and experienced in ITE. I address this in more detail later in the chapter.

**Diversity Education in Relation to Program Structure**

Each program integrates diversity education in ITE, yet approaches it differently. At Rani, the approach is prescribed and specific. Courses are centrally designed and include descriptions of assignments and lists of readings. The aim is to build coherence across cohorts, maintain diversity education as a priority, and ensure the consistency needed for the exam system. It uses a spiral and interdisciplinary approach to diversity education. Diversity and social inclusion are introduced in the early years of the 4-year program and are revisited in later years. For example, the focus on identity is evident in the early year course Human Relations and Communication and again in the upper year course Basic Concepts of Education. Diversity
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93 In many courses at Rani, candidate progress is determined by “internal” and “external” exams. The external exams are written by all candidates in the B.El.Ed. program whereas the internal exams are determined by faculty at the College.
education teachings are also connected to field-based assignments and “practicum courses.” In addition, candidates have opportunities to teach in a variety of schools and observe how inequity occurs in society. By focusing on duration and integration, this approach creates a significant opportunity for planning, locating, and building concepts of diversity education in ITE over time.

Glebe also integrates diversity education in many of its courses, though in a shorter 10-month timeframe and in an idiosyncratic way. Diversity education is located in foundations courses such as *School and Society* and in subject courses such as *Math* and *Social Studies*. Teacher educators can design their own courses guided by course descriptions. Indeed, the educators and administrators in my study reported that the course syllabi are determined by individual interests and expertise in diversity education. Concepts such as cultural awareness are presented across courses and addressed by teacher educators in their subject areas. Teacher educators do so in distinct ways rather than in a connected one. As at Rani, course assignments and activities address diversity education. However many of these activities take place in the ITE classroom and do not require fieldwork. Candidates can choose to ‘enhance’ their experiences by opting for an elective in diversity education. In my view, the short and compact nature of the Glebe program encourages a more varied approach to the integration of diversity education in ITE.

Rani and Glebe also use other structural strategies such as mission statements, admissions procedures, hiring practices, and field partnerships to enable diversity education. Administrators at both sites cited diversity education as their priority. As Pang and Park (2011) observe, administrative support can be key to effective integration of diversity education. Rani also uses team teaching to build faculty capacities for diversity education and knowledge of program aims. Such opportunities reinforce program commitments to diversity education and can improve teacher educator practice (Nieto & McDonough, 2011).

However, these methods of integration also reveal limitations. Rani’s prescribed approach leaves some teacher educators feeling the program is not evolving or adapting to the employment needs and interests of the candidates. Glebe’s less prescribed approach makes it difficult to establish a shared belief system among the faculty and a cohesive theoretical framework for diversity education. Coherence and adaptability are deemed essential characteristics in the literature for achieving quality diversity education in ITE (Cochran-Smith,
Even though structures prioritize diversity education across courses and, at Rani, also across components, they also lead to notable challenges in each context.

**Diversity Education Content and Pedagogy**

Course content and pedagogical activities are connected to desired images of the diversity educator. Rani and Glebe teacher educators offer candidates learning opportunities that either model or nurture their capacities to be affirmers, conscious practitioners, and/or social reformers. To facilitate the image of affirmer, they incorporate diversity studies and human relations activities into their courses that help candidates learn in a community and also learn how to express positive attitudes toward difference. Rani focuses on harnessing candidates' existing understanding of pluralism in society and serving marginalized communities, while Glebe tries to raise candidates’ recognition of difference in a community and in the classroom.

To facilitate the image of the conscious practitioner, Rani and Glebe teacher educators concentrate on developing candidates’ interest in learning about difference and social issues. They expose them to information about particular communities and encourage them to develop the skills to study their own identity and other forms of diversity. At Rani, matching social issues education (e.g., linguistic dominance) with pedagogical activities (e.g., simulation of a lesson in a Hindi only classroom) occurs in several places in the program. The teacher educators use consciousness raising activities to help candidates develop the self-confidence to be diversity educators and enhance their sensitivity to others. Thus, Rani makes the affective skills of diversity education an important part of its program—an aspect of ITE that is often overlooked (Dolby, 2012; Lea, 2009; Parameswaran, 2007).

At Glebe, activities that promote the image of the conscious practitioner focus more on fostering candidates’ sense of professional and civic responsibility for diversity and inclusion. The teacher educators raise social issues like gender bias or racism for discussion in course content and assignments. They anchor these discussions in the educator’s duty to provide secure learning spaces for students and opportunities for success. They also link them to the treatment of diversity in schools and in the curriculum.
In relation to the social reformer, some Rani faculty teach about social activists and encourage candidates to engage in curriculum reform. Some Glebe faculty teach candidates to develop knowledge of social justice resources, learn how to introduce social issues into the classroom, and imagine their future practice by infusing social justice themes into their lesson planning. At both sites, the content focuses on non-violent examples of reform. Although not explicitly stated in the data, this modeling suggests that candidates should adopt a similar orientation in their own teaching.

Overall, the pedagogy at Rani is linked to activities in private and public spaces; that is, to candidates' personal lives, the classroom, the community, and a range of schools. As noted in the literature, community engagement is a powerful tool for diversity education when used appropriately and respectfully to support mutual learning (James, 2010; Scholefield, 2006; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Rani candidates interview students and/or families and also conduct learning activities with a range of students. In some cases, these activities are intended to help candidates overcome their “fear of the other” (Kumashiro, 2001). Both the program and the candidates seem to benefit enormously from these partnerships. However, I also question if they are mutually beneficial for the community.

The pedagogy at Glebe focuses mainly on developing candidates’ professional capacities in the classroom. The teacher educators provide community building activities, diversity education lessons, classroom relevant resources, and stress the importance of critical thinking (Banks et al., 2005; Finney & Orr, 1995; Ladson-Billings & Brown, 2008). In both programs, however, the content and activities also raise some of the wider challenges of diversity education.

**Challenges of Diversity Education in ITE**

The challenges reported by the participants illustrate the difficulties programs have in communicating the three images of the diversity educator to candidates. Some of these challenges related to putting ITE intentions into practice. Others offer a way of understanding how the images can be developed more deliberately in programs. In this section, I discuss the most significant challenges that arise from ITE efforts to enact diversity education in their programs and prepare candidates as diversity educators.
In relation to the image of the affirmer, the programs struggled to affirm and represent the diversity of the candidates. These struggles raise interesting questions about who is ‘selected’ or included in the ITE curriculum. For instance, although cultural and cognitive differences were addressed in the Canadian programs, and religious and gender differences were addressed in India, other social differences such as transgender identities and sexual orientation were not evident in the curriculum. Consequently, both the teacher educators and the ITE content introduce only certain forms of diversity even though a broader view is operating conceptually in the program.

At Rani, some candidates commented on the Hindi-English divide in the program. At Glebe, some of the participants noted the lack of minorities among the candidates. Some felt that their own life experiences such as sexual orientation, religion, or immigrant history were not fully addressed or part of course content. Their comments support existing literature on the challenges of including candidates in ITE who identify as newcomers (Gambhir, 2008b), as English Language Learners (Uys, Reyneke, & Kaiser, 2011), or as racial minorities (Levine-Rasky, 2000). Their comments also signal a tension in ITE programs. Some scholars see this tension as an opportunity to engage deeper questions of social exclusion in ITE (Davis & Sumara, 1997; Solomon, Manoukian, & Clarke, 2007; Taylor & Sobel, 2001). However, for the most part, educators at Rani and Glebe did not build on these tensions as ‘teachable moments.’ If they did—by addressing, for example, Hindi-English inequities—candidates still reported that it is a tension in their program. Teacher educators or course activities do not always model what is taught to the candidates about sensitivity or community, leaving some candidates feeling vulnerable in the program. Thus, at both sites, ITE is not consistently affirming individuals in the program.

Conscious practitioners are expected to develop self-awareness and attention to social issues. Exploring personal or social beliefs can be an intense learning process. In both programs, the pedagogical activities supporting this image at times resulted in emotional difficulties or candidate resistance. These reactions can be attributed to candidates’ lack of readiness to take on controversial issues or to a clash between their personal beliefs and the program's ideological stance (Kelly & Brandes, 2001; Solomon & Daniel, 2009). For example, some Rani candidates had difficulty processing their experiences of social issues, such as teaching students who were child labourers. Others had feelings of guilt after field activities/placements. These findings
support the literature on candidate resistance to diversity education (Cook, 2014; Deer, 2013; Levine-Rasky, 2000; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). However, the candidates in this study were not opposed to diversity education. Rather, they were looking for more support in putting these values into practice and more opportunities to explore them in depth or learn to align them better with their own beliefs.

In relation to the image of the social reformer, some candidates and educators in the study expressed discomfort with raising controversial issues in the classroom. Many of their comments reflect concerns raised by novice teachers in the literature—the feeling that schools are not ready to engage in social reform (Cochran-Smith, 1991); the fear that they will be questioned or unsupported by colleagues in the classroom (Dawson Salas, 2010); and, for some, the belief that expectations of social reform are simply too much to expect of beginning teachers (Cook, 2014). At Glebe, some of the teacher educators felt they were not well qualified to teach social reform. Others, like Steven and John, saw social reform pedagogies as more confrontational than helpful in preparing teachers for diversity education. Their comments confirm the challenges raised in the literature on program expectations for social reform and teacher educators' ability or desire to engage in such practice (Goodwin & Kosnik, 2013; Gorski et al., 2013; O’Hara & Pritchard, 2008).

The idea that ITE programs “impose” beliefs was raised at all three sites in Ontario by either the candidates or teacher educators. The Glebe program wrestled with creating a learning space in which candidates could develop their own understandings of diversity-related content. For some at Glebe, as noted in the literature, diversity education came across as forced rather than invitational or inclusive (Dolby, 2012; Gorski et al., 2013; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001). The Rani candidates did not express the same views; however, some commented on conflicts between home values and program values, thus needing to leave new understandings “at the door.”

An understudied challenge that emerged from my findings relates to teacher educator beliefs. At Rani and at all three sites in Ontario, comments by some of the teacher educators ironically revealed deficit perspectives of candidates. In both contexts, the teacher educators felt that candidates were at “the beginning of the continuum,” full of “biases,” or “needed to unlearn all they had learned.” Their comments suggest that the deficit or beginning point of the learning
continuum refers to candidates who are “difference blind,” unaware of social issues, and/or have not had exposure to other communities. Some educators even doubted the potential of some candidates to be diversity educators at all, which contradicts discourses of the teacher as “learner” or “empowered.” They argued that ITE cannot adequately prepare all candidates for diversity and inclusion, especially if the candidates themselves are not committed to the pedagogy. Further, many in Ontario felt they were teaching in a busy program that creates few possibilities for interactions with candidates and to develop diversity educators in ITE.

A key finding of my research is that the ITE curriculum poses challenges in terms of effectively engaging the values of the three images of the diversity educator. The evidence suggests that, if viewed through these images, the content that programs teach can also lead to tensions. Some teacher educators and candidates found it difficult to connect aspects of the images with their own beliefs, identities, and practice. In summary, the ITE cases provide valuable insights into program approaches to diversity education in both regions.

Images of the Diversity Educator:
A Framework for Comparative International Research in Initial Teacher Education

In this section, I discuss images of the diversity educator as a way of conceptually anchoring diversity education in ITE. In the first part, I return to Sleeter and Grant's (2009) work in order to draw comparisons with my findings and propose a different framework for diversity education. My view of diversity education differs from Sleeter and Grant's view and thus provides new insights on program approaches. In the subsequent parts of this section, I focus on three key concepts of my framework—that images of the diversity educator in ITE: a) take the form of three dominant images, b) are all grounded in social action, and c) occur simultaneously in multiple ways in programs.

Comparisons to Sleeter and Grant's Multicultural Education Framework

I begin by discussing the similarities and differences between Sleeter and Grant’s framework of multicultural education and the new image based framework that emerged from my study. In Chapters 1 and 2, I explained that diversity education can be framed in various ways: a) as a discipline-based pedagogy such as intercultural or urban education (Cushner & Brennan, 2007; James, 2010); b) as a set of program structures, policies, and processes (Cochran-
Smith, 2004; Zeichner, 2011); c) as a teacher learning model (Anderson & Ching, 1987; Beck & Kosnik, 2001); d) as a foundation of professional knowledge (Banks et al., 2005; DeLuca, 2013; Howard & Aleman, 2008); and e) as images of the diversity educator such as the culturally responsive teacher (Gay, 2000; Kumashiro, 2009; Levine-Rasky, 2001; Nieto, 2008).

Recent editions of Sleeter and Grant's *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class and Gender* (2007, 2009) helped me to understand school-based responses to diversity and inclusion. Their framework has also been applied to studies of teacher education (Cockrell et al., 1999; Jenks et al., 2010) and discussions of practice in ITE (Gorski, 2009; OECD, 2010). The structure and thoroughness of the framework, as well as its use by other scholars, made it a significant reference for my study. I also saw it as a tool for analyzing participant views and program practices in my primary case studies.

However as I progressed in my study, I realized that Rani’s and Glebe’s approaches to diversity education differed from Sleeter and Grant’s conceptualization of multicultural education in school contexts. The Rani and Glebe programs take their understandings of diversity education not from a single orientation, but from an eclectic approach based on images of the diversity educator. These images are constructed by practices that intentionally and unintentionally define who diversity educators should be or become. Consequently, “images of the diversity educator” became a key theme in my study.

According to Sleeter and Grant (2009), multicultural education is a philosophical, theoretical, and historical engagement with diversity in American society. Their typology consists of five approaches: 1) Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, 2) Human Relations Education, 3) Single-Group Studies, 4) Multicultural Education (or Pluralist Studies), and 5) Multicultural Social Justice Education (or Social Justice Education). Each approach has a particular sociopolitical view of inclusion with the first approach—teaching the exceptional and culturally different—promoting “assimilation” and the other four approaches gradually “changing mainstream society” (p. 29). Their text invites readers to “think through which approach makes the most sense,” thereby suggesting that they can choose which approach to support. However, Sleeter and Grant clearly advocate for ‘multicultural social justice education.’ In their view, it is the most progressive approach because it prioritizes social change in schools as well as in society:
Multicultural social justice education shares with Single-Group Studies an emphasis on social issues, a concern with representing interests of oppressed groups, and its desire to mobilize young people to work actively for social justice. It shares with Human Relations approach an interest in developing cooperation among students and a concern for developing student self-concept. And it too, desires to eliminate stereotyping, but it does not view as particularly effective the use of lessons about stereotyping or attempts to deal with stereotyping without changing the social sources of stereotypes. As is true of Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, this approach agrees that teaching should start where students are, should relate to their experiential background, build on the language and learning style they bring from home, and develop more effectively students’ mastery of basic skills. But it diverges from the approach in its long-term purpose. (pp. 217–218)

Several similarities exist between Sleeter and Grant’s focus on approaches to multicultural education and my own focus on images of the diversity educator. First, we both base our work on a broad conception of diversity and on particular views about social inclusion. Second, we both include educational practices that have varied purposes and a range of pedagogical strategies. Third, we both see that “the reforms that educators have advocated bear different names but are directed towards common practices” such as making schools “fairer and responsive to the needs of students” (Sleeter & Grant, 2009, p. 33). In comparing the three images from this study to the five approaches identified by Sleeter and Grant, I see possible connections to human relations education, multicultural education, and social justice approaches. However there are also a number of key differences between approaches and images, ones that, in my view, are more important than those suggested by a few connections.

Focusing on images of the diversity educator differs conceptually from Sleeter and Grant’s framework in several ways. First, my framework emerges from empirical work in two pluralist countries of the world and from participants in a selection of ITE programs. In contrast, Sleeter and Grant (2009) refined their 1988 framework through an evolving analysis of their writing, their experiences, and research primarily from American sources. Second, my framework enters discussions of diversity education from the vantage point of the diversity educator as opposed to progressive views of diversity in society. Sleeter and Grant see their typology as a history of diversity education in American society. In contrast, each image is a distinct and current construct of the diversity educator and represents a particular approach to diversity education. Third, the images in my framework begin from a different view of pluralism.
Sleeter and Grant attribute assimilationist values to some of their orientations, but my approach assumes diversity educators have moved beyond these values to see individuals/groups working toward interdependence in society (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013). Specifically, Sleeter and Grant associate ‘teaching the exceptionally and culturally different’ and ‘human relations’ with assimilationist views that “seek to eliminate minority cultures and make everyone like [dominant] White, middle class people” (p. 69). However, my framework locates discussions of democracy, pluralism, and social change across all forms of diversity education. Sleeter and Grant see these values as relevant to only two of their approaches (multicultural education and social justice education). Finally, the concept of images offers a comparative approach to diversity education in ITE that begins with program practices. This reinforces a key aspect of diversity education cited in the literature—its “adaptability” to sociocultural contexts (Brewster, Buckley, Cox, & Griep, 2002; Cross, 2004).

The image-based framework also differs in terms of variety. Sleeter and Grant (2007, 2009) commit to five approaches to diversity education although they also provide room for different iterations to emerge within these five. In contrast, thus far, the primary ITE programs in my study have generated three images. However I foresee possibilities for more interpretations through future research or analysis. Ultimately, our frameworks differ in their genesis, point of entry, view of pluralism, and the number of images/approaches.

In the following sections, I discuss the significance of my conceptual framework in relation to diversity education and teacher education literature. I begin with the three images—the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer—and show how they support findings in the literature on the considerable variation of diversity education (Ainscow, 2008; Gorski, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). In the next section, I contrast my approach with Sleeter and Grant's belief that ‘reconstructionist’ forms of diversity education are the most promising in terms of social action for social change. My study reveals that all three images of the diversity educator include social action for positive pluralism and equity. Consequently, images of the

---

94 Ghosh and Abdi (2013) suggest that diversity education is a trajectory rather than silos of practice. They add to the discussion a sense of evolution in which diversity education is proceeding along a developmental continuum of social inclusion. The continuum consists of five phases spanning assimilation, adaptation, accommodation, incorporation and the integration of individuals/groups. For these scholars, education policies and practices are working toward an ideal society—one that presents democratic pluralism as a viable, positive entity in which humans are interdependent.
diversity educator in ITE can prepare candidates to see political action and social change in many ways. In the third section, I demonstrate that multiple forms of diversity education can be engaged in a single program and that this approach is desirable in ITE. The concept of multiplicity extends existing understandings on how different approaches to diversity education occur in ITE in simultaneous and overlapping ways (Brown, 2004; DeLuca, 2013).

**Three Dominant Images of the Diversity Educator**

This section explores how the three images relate to diversity education discourse in the literature on teacher education. Each image connects to the existing literature on what is needed or presently occurring in diversity education in ITE. The finding that three dominant images emerged from my study supports arguments that different forms of diversity education are used in ITE (Ainscow, 2008; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Gorski, 2009) and in pluralist contexts (Banks, 2012; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). In spite of this recognition of variety, Gorski (2009) aptly states that “unfortunately, there exists very little empirical research examining how these [different forms] play out *in practice*” (p. 309).

Each image is founded on the values Rani and Glebe share on the positive treatment of pluralism and the need to address the negative treatment of diversity in schools and society. Each image includes educational practices that help candidates teach children and youth not only to “share spaces of schooling, but also to co-exist, peacefully and productively” in diverse contexts (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013, p. 44). In turn, each image represents a particular perspective on the role, capacities, and values of the diversity educator.

The affirmer sees diversity and social inclusion as fundamental to education. Consequently, the Rani and Glebe programs teach candidates to use diversity education to build students’ confidence, encourage positive relationships in the classroom, and ensure that students are validated. “Affirming” students in the classroom is similar to Gay’s (2010) concept of students as “funds of knowledge,” to Villegas and Lucas’ (2002) concept of “students as resources,” and to Cummins (2009) view of “affirming identity” that recommends seeing learners and communities as curriculum sources. However, given that affirmation is seen as fundamental for all educators rather than as an approach to diversity education, it can be said that the Rani and Glebe programs construct images of the diversity educator that are distinct in ITE.
The conscious practitioner achieves social inclusion by being open to exploring and accepting social differences. Diversity education is taught by presenting the experiences of others, engaging in self-study, and examining social issues. In relation to ITE, Banks and colleagues (2005) recommend that:

Activities or experiences that place students face to face with their entering beliefs and assumptions both about themselves and others, and about learning, schooling, and intelligence, are essential as novice teachers prepare to teach students who are often different from themselves, in schools that are also different from the ones they attended in a society that is changing with rapid intensity. (p. 266)

Grant and Gibson (2011) also see consciousness as fundamental to teacher education. The purpose, they maintain, is not to “instill objective knowledge, but to cultivate particular ‘habits of mind.’” They describe this as “enabling teachers to assimilate cultural knowledge, knowledge of the social context, content knowledge, and pedagogical tools in an analysis and the improvement of practice” (p. 31). The writings of these scholars suggest that the image of the conscious practitioner is a viable and increasingly recognized approach to diversity education in ITE.

As social reformers, candidates learn to foster inclusion by teaching social issues and developing a sense of agency. This image aligns with forms of teacher education that prepare candidates to be change agents (Gambhir, 2008a; Merryfield, 1997), social justice educators (Gorksi, 2014; Cochran-Smith, 1991), and social activists (Finn & Finn, 2007). It calls for political forms of diversity education to be an active part of ITE. For example, the Ontario programs in my study focused on “anti-discriminatory education” and the Delhi programs focused on “equality and social justice” both in official school curricula and in the classroom. This approach was often the most difficult to engage because it raises controversial issues, challenges systemic practices, and is based on a moral responsibility to address inequities (Gay, 2010; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; Wane, 2003). The vision statements at Glebe and Rani not only justify social reform in terms of systemic transformation and responsibility, but also suggest that these changes are officially endorsed in education policy.

Although Rani and Glebe share core images of the diversity educator, they construct and develop aspects of these images differently. For instance, they differ in their development of self-awareness in ITE. At Rani, strategies that focus on the affective aspects of the affirmer tend to be
concentrated in the early years of the program. The teacher educators build candidates’ skills for compassion and respect through the *Self-development Workshops*. At Glebe, candidates are encouraged to practice compassion and empathy as ‘homework’ rather than as part of course activities. They are taught affective skills via the ethical standards of the profession and school board policies for safe schools.

Learning opportunities related to the image of the social reformer also differed greatly between the two sites. I argue that underlying this difference are two views of how social reform occurs. The Rani candidates are taught to practice social reform not only by making changes to the learning environment and to curriculum content, but also by challenging beliefs in their own social circles (e.g., the treatment of women at home). Rani sees systemic reform as occurring in many spaces. At Glebe, the candidates engage in social reform by taking part in school activities such as charity events and by addressing social issues as part of officially supported curriculum reform. Unlike Rani, the Glebe activities centre reform within ITE and schools, and do not extend it to other spheres of life such as traditions, family, friendships, or religion.

The local school context also contributes to the differences in program approach. Teacher educators at Rani believe that emotional sensitivity development is a missing aspect of the elementary and secondary school curriculum in India. To redress this, it is taught as part of the ITE curriculum at Rani and is also a key aspect of its teacher learning model. The teacher educators see it as a skill that can be learned over the course of the program. In contrast, Glebe teacher educators do not prioritize emotional sensitivity in the ITE curriculum in the same way. They did not comment on if they attribute this lack of priority to the Ontario education system. However, their surprise at the lack of sensitivity of some candidates in the program was palpable. It seems that candidates are expected to enter the program with affective sensibilities already in place from prior schooling and life experiences.

The differences between the two programs can also be explained by the timeframe of a 10-month program versus a 4-year program. Rani’s cohort sizes, its system of learning in year-based groups (batches) for the duration of the program, and the consistency of having many of the same instructors year after year undoubtedly foster a different type of ITE learning environment. The 10-month program at Glebe is able to introduce candidates to a range of content and instructors, but this is interspersed with a significant amount of time in teaching
placements. The fact that teacher educators are not always able to see candidates on a weekly basis leads to discontinuity in course activities. The candidates are also learning, for the most part, in classes of 70—a noticeably different dynamic than Rani’s more intimate class size of 20–30 candidates.

In summary, the three images offer ways of conceptualizing diversity education in ITE programs, reflecting but also building distinct images from those existing in the literature. They are examples of how diversity education can vary due to regional context, local schools, and educational policy. The programs at the secondary sites share the same images but develop and prioritize them differently. Thus, to draw on Zeichner (2011), the image-based framework emphasizes the local, institutional, and sociocultural dimensions of diversity education.

Social Action As Part of Every Image

Many scholars argue that social action in diversity education is the most progressive, needed, and ideal approach in pluralist contexts (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Kumashiro, 2000; Nieto, 2008). At the same time, social action is associated with social reconstructionist forms of diversity education and not others. For instance, Sleeter and Grant (2009) address social action as part of only one of their five approaches, social justice education. This narrow view limits our potential to see social action as occurring in many ways in ITE programs. The three images in my framework extend our understanding of social action as a viable part of many forms of diversity education.

Social action is most often defined as individual or collective acts that target social change in the larger society. These acts are political and in doing so not only represent it as core attribute of social action, but also define various kinds of political work. Banks’ (2008) model of approaches to diversity education posits that social action “enables students to identify, analyze, and clarify important social problems and make decisions to take reflective actions to help resolve the issues or problems” (p. 208). Sleeter and Grant (2009) see social action as linked to “viewing the school as a laboratory or training ground for preparing a socially active citizenry” (p. 201). Priestley, Miller, Priestley and Edwards (2012) argue that social action is key to developing a sense of agency as a diversity educator; that is, “learning to act counter to societal constraints as well as with social possibilities” (p. 197). I read this as social action occurring within existing structures rather than solely outside of them. Thus, image-based actions can also
be seen as occurring both in macro political ways (outside of school) and micro political ways (within schools or through individual action).

My findings show that social action is central to the programs at Rani and Glebe. Candidates at both sites are taught to be socially active educators. In policy documents, candidates are seen as “a new cadre of teachers,” “change agents,” “community members,” “aware educators,” “actors of social justice,” and respecters of “all learners in the classroom” (Sahara, 2001; Stanton, 2009). They are reminded in their courses that teachers have social and political agency because they operate from a position of power in the classroom and are able to engage in social change. They are taught to become aware of themselves as empowered to make choices in their practice and to see inclusion in education as a sociopolitical cause.

Each of the three images includes a conception of how social action can be engaged at both the micro and macro level. For example, the affirmer creates respectful learning environments, the conscious practitioner pursues self-reflection and lifelong learning, and the social reformer challenges systemic practices by teaching about social issues in schools. These practices also extend the landscape for how diversity education in ITE is understood as political work occurring.

In terms of the affirmer image, candidates learn that they can engage marginalized youth in the classroom, which is itself a political act. Traditionally excluded voices become included in the classroom, students learn to see each other as valued members of the community, and teacher educators establish a learning environment that is different from what these students (such as girls and child labourers in India) experience outside of school. Rani and Glebe participants comment on how in schools this environment is different than what a colleague may offer students. Thus, creating the classroom as a space in which safety and inclusivity are priorities is a form of political action.

Conscious practitioners are offered opportunities in ITE to explore self and society. This commitment to exploration is the crux of their social and political action. Candidates are taught to learn about social issues, become mindful of their personal choices in the world, and be aware of their impact on others. The very act of seeking out new knowledge and making the decision to think differently is a way of engaging one's political power (Freire, 1994; Giroux & McLaren, 1987). Rani candidates, for example, are encouraged to act and think differently than some of
their home expectations. The focus on ‘self and other’ captures the social aspect of social action; it leads to social change because candidates are disposed to seeing the world through a diversity and inclusion lens. This disposition influences teachers' beliefs. These beliefs, in turn, are core to how teachers engage their practice in classrooms (DiAngelo & Sensöy, 2009; Huerta & Flemmer, 2005; Sharma et al., 2006).

The social reformer seeks to restructure the system by changing the curriculum and addressing controversial social issues with students. The decision to revise and add content in line with new curriculum policies is in itself a political act. At Glebe, the candidates are encouraged to coalesce and organize activities around social issues. In all three images, teacher educators make sociopolitical action part of their curriculum and intended outcomes for diversity education.

Pedagogical activities also nurture social action. At Rani, social action develops relationships with others that are nurturing and community-based. At Glebe, the focus is on recognizing and addressing the poor representation of some communities in the existing curriculum. In terms of the conscious practitioner, teacher educators at Rani push candidates to see the world through a critical lens and to address conflict by learning to see from different perspectives. At Glebe, the activities encourage candidates to see social inequities as relevant to the Ontario context and their classrooms. In terms of the social reformer, pedagogical activities at Rani focus on teaching the new curriculum and integrating rights and justice issues into the content. Glebe activities focus on building candidate awareness of the curriculum as a social issue and that more critical education opportunities need to be included.

At the same time, the administrators, teacher educators, and candidates in my study identified some of the challenges of teaching social action in ITE. At Glebe, the School and Society educator struggled to reconcile the program's social reform expectations with his own beliefs on how change occurs. He saw the focus on social issues and social reform as a negative view of diversity that encouraged divisions in society. Teacher candidate Nisha, on the other hand, felt the program did not do enough to develop candidates' critical and political orientation. Allie, her peer, believed the social reformer’s practice of social action was not realistic for “novice teachers.” In her view, social action was more for the experienced teacher.
To a certain extent, Rani participants also struggled with suggested forms of the expectations to take social and political action such as challenging practices of their associate teachers. They, too, experienced challenges due to a lack of skill development. The senior candidates struggled to continue with social action in the face of the realities of child labour, child prostitution, corporal punishment, and an exam-based education system. They entered into placements hopeful about making a difference, but quickly realized the need to be pragmatic. External influences on the classroom such as poverty, community bias, discrimination, and lack of support were not within their ability to address as candidates. In both contexts, as reported by participants and in the literature (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Kelly, 2012), candidates are not always supported in these confrontational or critical actions, even though these actions are advocated by curriculum innovations and ITE faculty.

In summary, the images extend our understanding of social action as political even if, at first glance, the ‘act’ itself is associated with less critical forms of diversity education. The social actions associated with each image also suggest that what is deemed political in diversity education in ITE may need to be seen in more nuanced ways as occurring in the individual, in the classroom, and in society. In the two regions of my study, these actions are powerful tools for changing not only the education system, but the experiences of children and teachers.

**Multiplicity of Images**

As evident in the literature and in this study, diversity education in ITE is shaped by sociocultural, professional, policy, program, and pedagogical forces (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Gay, 2002; Zeichner, 2011). Indeed, the case studies of Rani and Glebe show that the diversity of students in the school system, the expectations of teachers in the classroom, professional standards, and available resources are just some of the forces at play in diversity education. In addition, as DeLuca’s (2012) study of diversity-focused admissions in ITE and Schmidt’s (2004) study of instructors’ views of English Language Learners make clear, teacher educators themselves hold a range of beliefs. Looking across the findings from Rani and Glebe reveals that multiple images of the diversity educator are present in the programs. By 'multiple,' I refer to the threading of different views of diversity education through the aims, content, pedagogy, and participant experiences of a program. This co-existence is mirrored by candidates Miriam (Glebe), Evin (Thomson), and Clea (Baldwin) in their comments that teacher educators address
diversity education “in their own ways” and “as they see best.” Candidates therefore learn in an environment where more than one image is valued and where they also have opportunities to develop in more than one image.

My findings show that all three images of the diversity educator—affirmer, conscious practitioner, and social reformer—can occur at the same time in a program. Figure 8.1 illustrates this concept by showing the simultaneity of these images in the context of an ITE program. The figure does not attach any priority to images within a program, nor is the order or position of the three circles significant. However, it allows for other iterations that depict relationships among the images. Adjusting the spacing between the circles or overlapping them captures the dynamic way an image-based program can occur.

Figure 2. Framework of multiple images of the diversity educator in an ITE program.

The simultaneity of these images is revealed by program and teacher educator practice. A document such as Glebe’s policy on diversity priorities or Rani’s statement of program aims advocate the image of the social reformer. A teacher educator presents pedagogy in a way that supports a particular image, such as John’s “affirming” view of community in his Physical and Health Education course or Vidya’s focus on social reform in her Gender course. Teacher educators or candidates accept responsibility for diversity, but also reject the values of a
particular image. For example, Glebe candidate Samantha and Rani candidate Kavleen reflect the image of the conscious practitioner when they comment on their personal growth in understanding diversity. However, they also reflect the image of the social reformer when they express discomfort about engaging the new curriculum in their own communities or teaching placements. In this instance, they are not pursuing the image but rather reacting to it. These examples suggest that more than one option exists for the diversity educator.

At the same time, an emerging finding from the data is that teacher educators can communicate more than one image in their classroom practices. For example, at Glebe, Paula prioritized the social reformer in her Social Science course by having candidates produce social justice lessons, teaching about the oppression of particular communities, and introducing candidates to social justice resources. However, she also asked the candidates to increase their awareness of social issues and gave a lecture at the retreat about at-risk communities in education, thereby reinforcing the image of the conscious practitioner. In addition, she modeled attributes of the affirmer by using an introduction letter activity in which candidates tell her about themselves.

These examples also raise questions about the relationship between the three images. Sleeter and Grant's (2009) framework suggests a cumulative dimension in which social justice education is built on several aspects of other approaches. In contrast, the images in this study do not present in the same cumulative way. One does not master the affirmer before becoming a conscious practitioner. Nor is it necessarily the case that affirming a candidate's identity is part of the practice of the social reformer in teaching controversial content about the candidate's community. The images seem to develop as distinct, but also overlapping and simultaneous approaches to diversity education. For instance, at Rani, Neeraj’s use of the ‘devil’s advocate’ in the classroom raised candidates’ consciousness about how to seek out new information and question assumptions, while at the same time demonstrating a teaching strategy they could use in their own classrooms as social reformers. Pedagogical activities in support of diversity education can therefore be read as having multiple purposes. Not all the activities I observed in my study overlapped, but there was evidence in both sites that some activities could be interpreted as serving the development of more than one image.
In looking across the images and their evident complexity in ITE, I would argue that no one image dominates the overall Rani or Glebe program. The teacher educators may present one image more directly through their practice than another. Similarly, policy statements may promote one image more strongly than another. Candidates’ or teacher educators’ experiences also have the power to diminish the representation of an image in program practice. Further, this study did not set out to identify the nuances of how images simultaneously occur and the relationships between them. Rather the concept of multiplicities is partially emergent, acting as a catalyst for discussions on new directions of diversity education in ITE.

In conclusion, the images of the diversity educator invoked at Rani and Glebe extend our understandings of diversity education in the literature and ITE. They suggest multiple possibilities for the diversity educator in a particular context. By placing social action as core to each image, the diversity educator is also engaging his or her potential for social change. In addition, challenges to particular images, activities, and types of social action suggest program tensions based on different perceptions of what is doable, most needed, and appropriate in each region. In the end, an image-based framework is a powerful tool for understanding and improving diversity education in ITE.

Implications of the Study

The results of this study suggest several avenues for improving the design of diversity education in ITE. I begin with the possibilities and key issues that arise from an image-based approach to ITE. I also identify ways that ITE can address some of the challenges emerging from program activities.

Applying an image-based view of diversity education to ITE can benefit programs in seven ways. First, as a conceptual tool, images open up possibilities for examining what is occurring in ITE. Teacher educators and candidates learn that there are many pathways to becoming a diversity educator. Each of these holds merit in a democratic society working toward equity and the positive treatment of pluralism. As an analytic tool, an image-based framework enables programs to identify the values circulating in the discourse, curriculum, and experiences in ITE. By responding to questions of who candidates are learning to be or become, a program can assess its practices of diversity education.
Second, social action is part of each image. This means the commitment and ability to act can be more carefully developed and included in program activities. Programs can begin by asking not only what practices of social action are valued but how they are taught in ITE. As suggested by the way the Rani program connects course work to practicum projects and field placements, learning opportunities can include social action both inside and outside the ITE classroom. This allows candidates to explore forms of action they feel most comfortable with, but also to see other forms as viable and possible directions for their own personal growth. I believe that ITE programs should intentionally offer opportunities for candidates to observe and practise different approaches to diversity education. Images of the diversity educator can become part of discussions in the ITE classroom on what is needed by administrators, teacher educators, candidates, and children for social change.

Third, the principles that guided this study can also be part of how programs are designed as “Knowing Teacher Candidates.” The images of the diversity educator I present here were derived from ITE discourse, but primarily from the beliefs of the participants in each program, especially candidates. There is great value in hearing the voices of candidates as “learners,” seeing candidates as “knowledgeable”, but also in seeing candidates as “co-creators” of the diversity education experience in ITE. If applied, a program would have recent ITE graduates at the design table. It would begin the coursework from candidates’ views and experiences of diversity, social inclusion, diversity education, and social action. These practices are in line with social constructivist views of teacher learning that are popular in Canada and becoming more prominent in India.

Fourth, the case studies and cross-case analysis offer insights into ITE pedagogical practice. The teacher educators at both sites provide powerful examples of diversity education practice as well as options for ITE activities. Rani and Glebe’s multidisciplinary approach requires teacher educators to engage with diversity education. At Rani, team teaching opportunities and on-site participation in field activities enabled faculty to learn how to meet this requirement. At Glebe, professional development workshops were offered for coordinators and could be extended to all faculty. Rani’s community engagement activities and both programs' use of experiential activities (e.g., Lynn’s speech simulation activity) are powerful learning opportunities in ITE. Experiential activities seem to help candidates learn concepts, but also model strategies they can use in their own classrooms.
Fifth, ITE programs operate within a context; thus, sociocultural forces outside the program are also at play inside. This means that Rani and Glebe are not immune to conflict, discrimination, bias, deficit thinking, fear, and missed opportunities for change within their own microcosms. The challenges identified in the programs are real concerns. Alongside their promising ITE practices, programs can make these challenges part of the dialogue about ways to improve diversity education in ITE.

In terms of challenges, the study also suggests that ITE programs need to consider if they are presenting selective views of diversity. If so, teacher educators can take actions such as: changing whose voices are represented in their syllabus; examining with candidates whose voice are present; asking candidates to bring in content; beginning with candidates’ own histories; and introducing communities not in the cohort.

The need for affective development and safe learning spaces was a prominent challenge at both sites. Candidates are part of a learning community and need to learn how their actions either affirm or hinder community. As the case studies show, the teacher educators engaged candidates in community-building activities, self-development workshops, community rules, courageous conversations, group assignments, and a cohort retreat. These activities improve candidates’ affective skills, as well as develop accountability for their own learning environment.

In addition, the study implies that teacher educators must be willing to tackle difficult issues in order to help candidates build awareness as diversity educators. Some Glebe candidates saw ‘conflict’ as an opportunity to gain new perspectives. In other cases, the challenge was a lack of support. At Rani, Vidya saw that candidates needed space and emotional support to address the social issues they witnessed in their practicums.

In both India and Canada, the programs offer examples of teacher educators trying to disrupt candidates’ understandings of society and education. The Glebe teacher educators discuss examples of racial and religious discrimination with their students. The Rani teacher educators push candidates through questioning, probing, and discussion. Critical dialogue and questioning, as Bickmore (2005) observes, can “in turn, provoke the desire and the need for further knowledge building. Such discomforting moral and political questioning is at least as important in teacher education as it is in elementary and secondary classrooms” (p. 6). She also points out
that these activities require a substantial amount of time and a deep engagement by all involved in order to be effective. This space and time must be factored into ITE lessons.

Sixth, an important implication of the study for ITE pedagogy is ensuring that choice and decision making are part of the curriculum. Offering candidates choices in the learning process helps to offset the perception of 'indoctrination' by ITE educators and policy makers. Choice allows candidates to direct their learning and put their own agency and empowerment at the centre.

Seventh, comparative international researchers can use images as a vehicle for exploring diversity education in ITE. Not only do the images reflect actual practices of a program, but the process of generating images gives space for variances in teacher learning models, professional standards, and society to emerge. There is no question that Delhi and Ontario are operating in unique educational contexts, yet the shared spaces for discussions of diversity education in ITE are evident when considering that they are both working towards values of diversity, social inclusion, and social change.

The findings also suggest that ITE programs in Eastern and Western democratic pluralist countries can hold broadly shared values for diversity education such as curricular reform, respect for all learners in the classroom, and expectations of teachers as agents of educational change. All six programs in Delhi and Ontario were trying to work toward a common purpose of achieving greater social cohesion through their next generation of teachers. The implications are that programs need to both document their practices, but also share strategies on how to prepare teachers to be and become diversity educators.

In summary, the implications of my study range from program design to global discourse on diversity education. As a conceptual and analytic tool, an image-based framework of diversity education can measure how program values resonate with what is transpiring in practice. Both the programs and the participant accounts also offer insight into how to engage diversity education in ITE in meaningful ways for the novice practitioner.
Limitations of the Study

This study is unique in that it draws on a range of stakeholder perspectives from multiple sites to understand how diversity education is approached in ITE. However, there are limitations to what can be reported and claimed from the research.

One limitation is the breadth and depth of inquiry into diversity education at the six institutions. At the primary sites, I visited one version of the program at each site. Concentrating on one cohort or college allowed me to examine the experiences of candidates and educators in depth at one location. However, I was unable to see how the findings from these cohorts compared to other cohorts in the same program. At the secondary sites, I interviewed a few faculty and candidates who were engaged in the overall enterprise of ITE. They represented a small number keenly interested in sharing their stories; however, their insights and voices cannot speak for the programs as a whole rather than a specific cohort. The study was also limited to the classes I observed during my field visits. Although these observations provided a strong sense of the dispositions of the educators and some of the activities used in the programs, they only represented a particular point in the teacher educators' practice.

In the interest of keeping the study manageable, significant partners in ITE such as associate teachers and local school districts were left out of the design. A future version of this study would benefit from including the voices of school-based practitioners and district administrators. It would also benefit from the addition of more data on admissions, assignments, assessment, and school–university partnerships.

The challenges of comparative work and cross-case analysis also proved to be formidable. My conceptual approach to the study allowed for many interpretations of diversity education to be investigated. My aim was to provide rich descriptive cases of diversity education pedagogy in ITE across two regions. The study offers a sample of what can be gleaned from the Indian and Canadian cases. However I recognize that regional experiences of ITE and diversity education differ from program to program. Inquiring into why each program chose particular forms of diversity education over others was beyond the scope of this study. I had to monitor myself to ensure that my claims remained rooted in what the data demonstrated. The conclusions are embedded in the realities of each program’s public commitments, teacher educator pedagogies, and candidate experiences.
Another limitation of this study is the cursory integration of the secondary sites into the final reporting. The data from these sites provided regional context for the comparison of the primary sites. However, presenting rich and thick descriptions of the primary cases meant abbreviating attention to the findings at the secondary sites. A more complete and nuanced discussion of their approaches to diversity education is a project for future work.

This study is a snapshot of ITE programs at a particular time. Since my data collection, the programs have undergone changes in staffing, curriculum, and structure. As teacher educators move, other instructors take up the responsibility and bring their own understandings of how diversity education should be done in ITE. In Ontario, the 10-month program is being phased out and replaced by a 2-year program. Nevertheless, the findings are timely because they speak to the need for ITE programs to consider many aspects of their diversity education programming. These include their intentions for candidates and schools, how curriculum is taught and supported, and the experiences of teacher educators and candidates. If diversity education is a quest for social change, then ITE should not fear change as part of its own improvement.

Suggestions for Future Research

Several possibilities exist for elaborating this study. A natural progression would be to gain a more comprehensive picture of images in a particular site and develop a better understanding of the image-based framework. The first option would be to focus on a single case. I would research images of the diversity educator in a particular institution to learn more about how they function simultaneously in programs and in teacher educator practice. I would examine how the images are developed in practicum placements and connected to program structure. I would choose two or three teacher educators in order to explore their beliefs about the images, determine if multiple images are present in their practice, and observe how the images interact.

To gain more examples of how diversity education operates in a program, I would expand the study sample to recent graduates, associate teachers, and community partners. Adding graduates would also enable me to see how they connect images of the diversity educator to their own teaching practice. A related approach would be a longitudinal study of graduates in their first, third, and fifth year of teaching to see how they use the images in their own practice of
diversity education. As Beck and Kosnik (2014) point out, staggered observations of practice account for the learning curve of the novice educator.

I would also study the breadth of diversity education practices in a program. In the first phase, I would increase the number of cohorts. The findings in this study posit that diversity education pedagogy is context based and that it can be taken up differently in different cohorts. I would like to study more deeply how images and pedagogical activities occur. In the second phase, I would expand the number of programs and consider using surveys as well as interviews. The surveys would enable me to canvass a larger segment of the teacher educator and candidate population on their experiences of diversity education.

Future research could also focus more deeply on the issues raised in the current study. Many of the teacher educators drew on their life experiences to explain how they take up diversity. Doing life history studies of diversity educators in ITE would reveal how their practices and choices were shaped over time. In view of the challenges to diversity education, a study of who is included and excluded in the content and practice would be a meaningful contribution to improving representation in ITE programs. This could be taken up as a review of course texts in an ITE cohort or a subject area. In another form, documenting the experiences of the marginalized in teacher education could help identify ways for ITE to be more inclusive.

At the international level, the opportunities are numerous. This study focused on elementary teacher education and could be extended to secondary education as well. In India, campaigns are calling for the universalization of secondary education. The issues and imperatives of diversity education that elementary teachers face will most certainly manifest themselves at the secondary level as well. In both India and Canada, regional interpretations of teacher education and different pathways to becoming a teacher may reveal other forms of diversity education. In India, the non-formal sector has long been grappling with how to serve the needs of marginalized learners. Documenting these programs could prove an important source of learning in higher education. To date, the literature on cross-case comparisons is rare. The chance to learn how pluralism manifests and is valued around the world is a lesson that transcends borders. As internationalization becomes increasingly significant, the importance of diversity education for the inclusion of difference will continue to take on new meanings.
Concluding Remarks

The findings from my research contribute to scholarly and professional literature on international constructions of diversity education in ITE. The research shows that ITE program approaches to diversity education in Canada and India are influenced by national priorities, stakeholder beliefs, and the demographic imperatives of the public education system. It also shows that the programs are preparing teachers for particular professional identities or images of the diversity educator. These images—the affirmer, the conscious practitioner, and the social reformer—all address social change in education and encompass distinct views of diversity, inclusion, diversity education, and social action. Although ITE programs nurture multiple images, the choices made by programs and teacher educators impact which of these images are fostered most explicitly. The experiences of the participants also show that the programs encounter challenges in facilitating the three images. Candidates and teacher educators feel that ITE struggles to represent many social identities, effectively promote awareness, and/or provide opportunities to practice social reform. Ultimately, this research can help to explain how approaches to diversity education manifest conceptually and pedagogically in ITE programs. It offers a comparative international perspective on how ITE is responding to the call to prepare teachers and their students for the realities of living and working in pluralist societies.
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Appendix A  
Information Letter for Institution Participation

Dear Director, Dean or Principal of Teacher Education:

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting the cooperation of your institution in my study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education in institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:
1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi)
3. content and pedagogy (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors)
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am currently looking for Indian/Canadian teacher education programs that are interested in being either primary or secondary institutions in this study. A two level case study approach enables me to consult with a number of actors in programs in each country on their perceptions of diversity education. The data for the primary institutions will be collected via individual interviews with 1-2 administrators, 8 teacher educators, and 8 candidates in the programs. In addition, I will seek to collect program documents (e.g., course syllabi) and conduct observations of the teacher educators’ courses. Each interview will last 60 minutes and be conducted at a time that is convenient for participants. The timeline for data collection at primary institution is a 5-week period between September and December XXXX and a 3-week period between January and May XXXX.

The data for the secondary institutions will be collected via focus groups of teacher candidates and teacher educators. Each focus group involves 6 participants and will last no longer than 120 minutes. The timeline for data collection of secondary institutions is 1-week between the months of January and May XXXX.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and the institution will be given a pseudonym. *No one beyond myself and my supervisor Dr. Dennis Thiessen will be told of your institution’s involvement in the study. To help protect your institutions’ anonymity, a pseudonym will be assigned to it in all reports. In addition, all participants in this study will be asked to sign individual consent forms and choose a pseudonym. Participants will also be asked to read their transcripts after the interviews. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research project room. Findings from this study will not be published until the end of the academic year.

Documenting and reflecting on practices in an institution, enables teacher education programs to better understand how issues of diversity are addressed in their context as well as generate new directions and insights. Diversity education and better preparing future teachers is a national and local priority in both Canada and India. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. If you decide to have your institution participate as either a primary or
secondary institution in this study please contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or at my contact number (416)-XXX-XXXX. I would be happy to provide additional information.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and the participants may withdraw at any time they choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached via e-mail or telephone.

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and
Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University
of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix B

Information Letter and Consent Form for Administrators

[OISE/UT LETTERHEAD]

Dear Administrator (name and title):

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled *Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers* and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting your co-operation as a voluntary participant in my thesis study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:

1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components and their connections to diversity education (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi);
3. content and pedagogy in this area (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors);
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am seeking an administrator to volunteer for an individual interview. The interview will last no longer than 60 minutes and take place in the Fall/First term/semester. The interview will focus on your views and experiences with diversity education as an administrator working in a teacher education institution. The interview will be audiotaped. In the event, that there is need for further clarification in any parts of your interview or the program, I may contact you in a later term/semester to ask if you are open to a brief follow-up interview. The follow-up interview will also last no longer than 60 minutes.

In addition to the interview, I will also be asking you to assist me by recommending a list of 20 or more teacher educators. The teacher educators needed for this study are individuals who teach diversity education courses in your program or have been involved in diversity education-related initiatives.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose a pseudonym. *No one will be told of your involvement in the study.* To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read the transcript of the interview. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research office. Only my thesis supervisor, Dr. Dennis Thiessen, and myself will have access to your data. Although I will make every effort to protect your anonymity, it is important to note that individuals familiar with this study and your institution may be able to identify you as a participant because of your leadership role in your teacher education program.

If you decide to participate in this study please read through the attached consent form and contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or the telephone at 416-XXX-XXXX. One-on-one interaction with a researcher can act as a catalyst in the reflective growth process. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. In addition, you will be presented with a book upon the completion of your involvement with the project.
In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
ADMINISTRATOR CONSENT FORM

I, _________________________, agree to take part in Mira Gambhir’s doctoral research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This is a comparative international study of India and Canada and the study is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers.

I understand that my participation would involve one individual interview with the possibility of a second interview.

I understand that the interviews will take about 60 minutes, will be audiotaped, and will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in the interview. I understand that my employer will not be informed of who agrees to participate in the study and who does not, and neither decision will have any consequences for my future employment. *I understand that only the researcher will know that I am a participant and that I will be asked to select a pseudonym. To help protect my anonymity, I will be asked to read transcripts generated by the project that contain information related to my interview. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me.*

I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that only the principal investigator and her supervisor will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study will be presented at conferences and included in a range of publications.

I understand that a possible benefit of this study is the reflective growth process. I will also be given a book upon the completion of my involvement with the project. If requested, I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be sent to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________
Date_____________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator please contact Mira Gambhir at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca If you have any complaints or concerns about how you have been treated as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics, ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274,
252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix C
Administrator Interview Schedule: Primary Institutions

Background

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role as an administrator in teacher education? (age, gender, education, number of years as teacher educator, past teaching experiences, priorities and interests in education)

2. Can you tell me about the teacher education program: the history, the components, the admissions process, and the student and faculty complement?

3. What types of teaching environments or schools does your program prepare candidates to work in?

4. What does your program consider to be the essential characteristics of a good teacher in terms of serving students in today’s school system?

The Conceptualization of Diversity Education

5. Can you tell me about the diversity in your region/community/context?

6. How can one address/bridge individual and group differences that one finds in today’s classrooms, schools, and the local community?

7. What kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes do you think that teachers should have for working with children from different backgrounds, beliefs, and heritages?

8. How do issues of access, equity and equality in education impact how teachers respond to diversity? What are the priorities in teacher education with regards to access initiatives, equity initiatives, and equality initiatives?

9. How does your teacher education program prepare teachers for the differences they may encounter in their classrooms and the education system? For example, how does your program deal with difference education in areas like religion, language, culture, gender, sexuality, and so on?

10. How would you define diversity education in your institution and your context? Are there other terms which are more commonly used?

11. What are the major beliefs and values that shape your program’s approach to diversity education for beginning teachers? What are the major influences (readings, philosophies, current events) or beliefs that shape your program’s approach to diversity education for beginning teachers?

Program Structure and Components

12. How is the program organized (types of course required- elective, in college vs. field components, etc.)

13. What policies, resources, structures, partnerships and curriculum do you have in place to support diversity education? When were the aforementioned diversity education policies, structures, partnership and curriculum introduced to the program and why? If this has not been a focus of your institution, please explain why this hasn’t been.
Content and Pedagogy

14. What types of content (topics, resources) do you cover in your program with respect to diversity issues and diversity education?

15. Which teaching strategies or classroom activities does your program use to help teachers learn how to create safe and inclusive classrooms?

16. What are the greatest challenges that your program, teacher educators, and candidates face in including this type of learning in the curriculum?

Comparative Diversity Education in Teacher Education

17. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and others in India? In what ways is your program distinct to others in India and South Asia?

18. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and teacher education in countries like Canada?
Appendix D

Information Letter and Consent Form for Teacher Educators:
Primary Institutions

[OISE/UT LETTERHEAD]

Dear Teacher Educators

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting your co-operation as a voluntary participant in my thesis study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:
1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components and their connections to diversity education (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi);
3. content and pedagogy in this area (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors);
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am seeking 8 teacher educators to volunteer to participate in this study over the academic year. I am hoping that you will be interested in being one of the 8 teacher educator participants. Your involvement would include interviews, classroom observations, and the provision of documents (e.g., course syllabi or content) to help me understand how diversity education and issues of diversity are undertaken in your program. Over the course of the academic year, I would conduct a total of 5 interviews with you - an initial interview, 2 pre-observation and 2 post-observation interviews. Each interview will last no longer than 60 minutes and will be audiotaped.

In addition to interviews, your participation would include 6 classroom observations of courses that you teach. These observations would be divided over the year and help me better understand how issues of diversity and diversity education unfold in the classroom. Three observations would take place in the Fall/First term/semester and another three would take place in the Winter/Second term/semester. As a researcher, I will simply observe your classes. In the event that the class is not in English, I may audiotape the class and ask for the assistance of a translator to ensure that I understand the events of the class fully. I will also be asking all teacher educators to assist me by providing a class list(s) of your teacher candidates. These candidates may be potential participants in this study.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose a pseudonym. *No one will be told of your involvement in the study.* To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read the transcript of the interview. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research office. Only my thesis supervisor, Dr. Dennis Thiessen, and myself will have access to your data.
If you decide to participate in this study please read through the attached consent form and contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or via telephone at 416-646-6806. One-on-one interaction with a researcher can act as a catalyst in the reflective growth process. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. In addition, you will be presented with a book upon the completion of your involvement with the project.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
OISE/UT LETTERHEAD

TEACHER EDUCATOR CONSENT FORM

I, ______________________, agree to take part in Mira Gambhir’s doctoral research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This is a comparative international study of India and Canada and the study is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers.

I understand that my participation would involve one initial individual interview, as well as two pre-observation and two post-observation interviews over the course of the academic year. Each interview will last no longer than 60 minutes and will be audiotaped.

In addition to interviews, my participation includes 6 classroom observations of courses that I teach. I understand that an observation is the duration of one class. The interviews and observations will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in the interviews or observations. I understand that my employer will not be informed of who agrees to participate in the study and who does not, and neither decision will have any consequences for my future employment. * I understand that only the researcher will know that I am a participant and that I will be asked to select a pseudonym. To help protect my anonymity, I will be asked to read transcripts generated by the project that contain information related to my interview. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that only the principal investigator and her supervisor will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study will be presented at conferences and included in a range of publications.

I understand that a possible benefit of this study is the reflective growth process. I will also be given a book upon the completion of my involvement with the project. I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be sent to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________
Date_____________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator please contact Mira Gambhir at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@utoronto.ca. If you have any complaints or concerns about how you have been treated as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics, ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix E
Teacher Educator Interview Schedule #1:
Primary Institutions

Background

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role as a teacher educator in teacher education? (age, education, specializations, number of years as teacher educator, past teaching experiences, priorities and interests in education)

2. Can you tell me about the classes you teach and your student population?

3. What do you consider to be the most challenging aspects of teaching in today’s schools?

The Conceptualization of Diversity Education

4. Can you tell me about the diversity in your region/community/context?

5. How can one address/bridge individual and group differences that one finds in today’s classrooms, schools, and the local community?

6. What kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes do you think that teachers should have for working with children from different backgrounds, beliefs, and heritages?

7. How do issues of access, equity and equality in education impact how teachers respond to diversity? What are the priorities in teacher education with regards to access initiatives, equity initiatives, and equality initiatives?

8. How does your teacher education program prepare teachers for the differences they may encounter in their classrooms and the education system? For example, how does your program deal with difference education in areas like religion, language, culture, gender, sexuality, and so on?

9. How would you define diversity education in your institution and your context? Are there other terms which are more commonly used?

10. What are the major influences (readings, philosophies, current events) or beliefs that shape your approach to diversity education for beginning teachers?

Program Structure and Components

11. How is the program organized (types of course required- elective, in college vs. field components, etc.)

12. What policies, resources, structures, partnerships and curriculum do you have in place to support diversity education? When did you first learn about the aforementioned diversity education policies, structures, partnership and curriculum introduced to the program?

13. What types of teaching experiences do candidates have over the course of the program? How are these placements selected for teacher candidates?
Appendix F

Teacher Educator Interview Schedule #2:

Pre-Observation: Primary Institutions

Background

1. What are the major influences, beliefs, and values that shape your approach to diversity education for beginning teachers? Are there any prominent individuals, personal experiences, or doctrines that guide these beliefs and values?

2. Please tell me about the course(s) you have taught in the past. What were students’ reactions and experiences within these courses?

Content, Pedagogy and Experiences

3. What types of content (topics, resources) do you cover in your program with respect to diversity issues and diversity education?

4. What teaching strategies do you use to help teachers learn about diversity, the community building skills, and that will help them create safe and inclusive classrooms?

5. What are the greatest challenges that your program, teacher educators, and candidates face in including this type of learning in the curriculum?

6. What kinds of materials do you use to teach candidates about diversity? In the courses you teach, what type of information do you see as most important for candidates to get from the course in relation to diversity and diversity education?

7. What kinds of assignments do candidates do to help them learn about relevant issues in this area? Please tell me about the assignment, the expectations, and students’ submissions.

8. Can you describe to me in detail a lesson you have taught or will teach in that focuses on diversity education or diversity issues?

Observations (Interview Schedule for Phase 2 begins here)

9. Please tell me about the lessons I am going to see? What is/are the goals of the lesson(s)?

10. Where is/are the lesson(s) positioned in the curriculum? What have candidates learned prior to this?

11. Please tell me about the planning process and how you selected materials for the lesson(s)?

12. What sections of the lesson relate most to diversity education?

13. What do you anticipate the student response will be and what type of engagement they will have in the lesson?
Appendix G
Observation Protocol: Primary Institutions

Name of Instructor:
Date:
Location
Lesson Topic:
Duration
Materials:
Lesson Objectives:

Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Observations- content, teaching strategies and discussions</th>
<th>To discuss at the post-observation with the Teacher Educator</th>
<th>Teacher Candidate Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
Teacher Educator Interview Schedule #3:
Post-Observation: Primary Institutions

1. Please tell me about how the lesson went and what you were able to achieve?
2. Is there anything you had wanted to teach or present that you were unable to?
3. How do you feel students responded to the information? Was there anything that was notable or interesting that arose?
4. What were some of the most successful aspects of the lesson?
5. In the future, what aspects would you change or revise? What would you like to stop, start and continue?

Comparative Diversity Education in Teacher Education

14. In what ways is your approach to teaching about diversity and/or diversity education similar or different to other teacher educators in your institution?
15. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and others in India? In what ways is your program distinct to others in India and South Asia?
16. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and teacher education in countries like Canada?
Appendix I

Information Letter and Consent Form for Teacher Candidates:
Primary Institutions

Dear Teacher Educators

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting your co-operation as a voluntary participant in my thesis study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:
1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components and their connections to diversity education (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi);
3. content and pedagogy in this area (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors);
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am seeking 8 teacher candidates to volunteer to participate in this study over the academic year. I am hoping that you will be interested in being one of the 8 teacher candidate participants. Your involvement would include interviews, classroom observations, and the provision of documents (e.g., copies of assignments) to help me understand how diversity education and issues of diversity are undertaken in your program. Over the course of the academic year, I would conduct a total of 2 interviews with you - an initial interview will take place in the Fall/First term semester and another interview would take place in the Winter/Second term/semester. Each interview will last no longer than 60 minutes and will be audiotaped.

In addition to interviews, I will conduct classroom observations of courses that you may be involved in. These observations would be divided over the year and help me better understand how issues of diversity and diversity education unfold in the classroom. All observations will take place with the consent of your teacher educator, although he or she will not be aware of your participation in this study. Three observations of courses would take place in the Fall/First term semester and another three would take place in the Winter/Second term/semester. As a researcher, I will simply observe the classes. In the event that the class is not in English, I may audiotape the class and ask for the assistance of a translator to ensure that I understand the events of the class fully.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose a pseudonym. *No one will be told of your involvement in the study. To help protect your anonymity,* you will be asked to read the transcript of the interview. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research office. Only my thesis supervisor, Dr. Dennis Thiessen, and myself will have access to your data.
If you decide to participate in this study please read through the attached consent form and contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or via telephone at 416-646-6806. One-on-one interaction with a researcher can act as a catalyst in the reflective growth process. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. In addition, you will be presented with a book upon the completion of your involvement with the project.

In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM

I, _________________________, agree to take part in Mira Gambhir’s doctoral research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This is a comparative international study of India and Canada and the study is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers.

I understand that my participation would involve two interviews over the course of the academic year. Each interview will last no longer than 60 minutes and will be audiotaped. The interviews will occur at a time and place that is convenient for me.

In addition to interviews, my participation may include classroom observations of courses that I attend. I understand that an observation is the duration of one class. The researcher will get consent from the instructor before observing the course. The teacher educator will not know that I am a participant in the study.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in the interviews or observations. I understand that only the researcher will know that I am a participant and that I will be asked to select a pseudonym. To help protect my anonymity, I will be asked to read transcripts generated by the project that contain information related to my interview. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that the findings of this study will be presented at conferences and included in a range of publications.

I understand that a possible benefit of this study is the reflective growth process. I will also be given a book upon the completion of my involvement with the project. I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be sent to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________
Date_____________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator please contact Mira Gambhir at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e- mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca If you have any complaints or concerns about how you have been treated as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics, ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix J

Teacher Candidate Interview Schedule #1:

Primary Institutions

Background

1. Could you please tell me about yourself (age, education, specializations, interests in teaching)? What brought you to the field of education?

2. Can you tell me about your program, your application process to the program, and your classes?

3. What do you consider to be the most challenging aspects of teaching in today’s schools?

4. What do you consider to be the essential characteristics of a good teacher in terms of serving students in today’s school system?

The Conceptualization of Diversity Education

5. Can you tell me about the diversity in your region/community/context?

6. How can one address/bridge individual and group differences that one finds in today’s classrooms, schools, and the local community?

7. How do issues of access, equity and equality in education impact how teachers respond to diversity? What are the priorities in your program with regards to access initiatives, equity initiatives, and equality initiatives?

8. How does your program prepare you for the differences you may encounter in the classrooms and the education system? For example, how does your program deal with difference education in areas like religion, language, culture, gender, sexuality, and so on?

9. How would you define diversity education in your institution and your context? Are there other terms which are more commonly used?
Program Structure and Components

10. How is the program organized (types of course required- elective, in college vs. field components, etc.)

11. Can you tell me about the courses you take?

12. What kinds of schools have you visited or taught in since you began the program?

Content and Pedagogy

13. What kinds of materials are you given or have access to about diversity? What type of information do you see as most important for teacher candidates (you) to have?

14. What teaching strategies that you use to help teachers learn about diversity, the community, building skills that will help them create safe and inclusive classrooms?

15. What kinds of assignments or class activities help you learn most about relevant issues in this area? Please tell me in detail about one assignment that stands out in your mind.

16. What are your experiences in the college/school with relation to diverse student populations? Please tell me in detail about one experience that stands out in your mind.
Appendix K
Teacher Candidate Interview Schedule #2:
Primary Institutions

1. Please tell me about what has happened in your program and your life as a teacher candidate since we last met?

2. Can you tell me if there have been any changes in the program or new experiences you would like to share about learning about diversity?

3. Since we met last, have you identified any more challenges for meeting the needs of today’s schools?

4. Since we last met, have you identified any more strategies for how to address/bridge individual and group differences in today’s classrooms, schools, and the local community? What experiences in your program and life shaped your understanding of this?

5. What kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes do you think that teachers should have for working with children from different backgrounds, beliefs, and heritages? What experiences in your program and life shaped your understanding of this?

6. What kinds of diversity education related materials have you been given or accessed since we last met?

7. What kinds of teaching strategies have you learned to create inclusive classrooms?

8. What kinds of assignments or class activities help you learn most about relevant issues in this area? Please tell me in detail about one that has made an impact.

9. What are your experiences in the classroom with relation to diverse student populations? Please tell me in detail about one that has made an impact.

Comparative Diversity Education in Teacher Education

10. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and others in India? In what ways is your program distinct to others in India and South Asia?

11. What are the similarities and differences in diversity education between your program and teacher education in countries like Canada?
Appendix L

Information Letter and Consent Form for Teacher Educators:
Secondary Institution

[OISE/UT LETTERHEAD]

Dear Teacher Educators

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting your co-operation as a voluntary participant in my thesis study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:
1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components and their connections to diversity education (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi);
3. content and pedagogy in this area (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors);
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am seeking 6 teacher educators to volunteer to participate in a focus group session. I am hoping that you will be interested in being one of the 6 teacher educator participants. Your involvement would be to attend a focus group session scheduled on [date, time, location] or be part of an individual interview. Your insights would help me better understand how issues of diversity (gender, religious, linguistic, and so on) are addressed in teacher education. I will also better understand teacher educators’ experiences in initial teacher education programs in Canada. Each focus will last no longer than 120 minutes and will be audiotaped. Light refreshments and snacks will be provided. If you choose an individual interview, it will be no longer than 60 minutes in length and scheduled at your convenience.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose a pseudonym. *No one will be told of your involvement in the study. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read the transcript of the focus group. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research office. Only my thesis supervisor, Dr. Dennis Thiessen, and myself will have access to your data.

If you decide to participate in this study please read through the attached consent form and contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or via telephone at 416-XXX-XXXX. Interaction with a researcher can act as a catalyst in the reflective growth process. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. In addition, you will be presented with a book upon the completion of your involvement with the project.
In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and
Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University
of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
TEACHER EDUCATOR CONSENT FORM

I, _________________________, agree to take part in Mira Gambhir’s doctoral research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This is a comparative international study of India and Canada and the study is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers.

I understand that my participation would involve participation in one focus group session or one individual interview. The focus group session will last no longer than 120 minutes and if I choose the interview it will be no longer than 60 minutes. All sessions will be audiotaped.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in the interviews or observations. I understand that my employer will not be informed of who agrees to participate in the study and who does not, and neither decision will have any consequences for my future employment. *I understand that only the researcher will know that I am a participant and that I will be asked to select a pseudonym. To help protect my anonymity, I will be asked to read transcripts generated by the project that contain information related to my interview. This will allow me the opportunity to edit out any information that I feel is too sensitive or that I feel would serve to identify me. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that only the principal investigator and her supervisor will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study will be presented at conferences and included in a range of publications.

I understand that a possible benefit of this study is the reflective growth process. I will also be given a book upon the completion of my involvement with the project. I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be sent to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature_________________________
Date_____________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator please contact Mira Gambhir at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca If you have any complaints or concerns about how you have been treated as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics, ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix M
Teacher Educator Focus Group/Interview Schedule:
Secondary Institution

1. Thank you for attending this session. Can you please fill out the attached page before you leave which asks you for some broad background information?

Pseudonym:
Seat (seats will be labeled with a number):
Information you would like to share about your background (e.g., age, gender, heritage, language(s)):
Number of Years as a Teacher Educator:
Areas/Subjects of Specialization:
Division of Teacher Education (Elementary, Secondary):
Please define Diversity Education
Please identify if there are other terms which may be more commonly used in your context:

2. Can you please say aloud your seat number and your areas of specialization in teacher education?
   *This is to help with transcription purposes.*

3. What kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes do you think that teachers should have for working with children from different backgrounds, beliefs, and heritages?

4. How do issues of access, equity and equality in education impact how teachers respond to diversity?
   What are the priorities in teacher education with regards to access initiatives, equity initiatives, and equality initiatives?

5. How does your teacher education program prepare teachers for the differences they may encounter in their classrooms and the education system? For example, how does your program deal with difference education in areas like religion, language, culture, gender, sexuality, and so on?

6. What are the major influences (readings, philosophies, current events) or beliefs that shape your approach to diversity education for beginning teachers?

7. What kinds of materials and resources do you use to teach candidates about diversity? What type of information do you see as most important?

8. What kinds of teaching strategies do you use to help teachers learn about diversity, the community, building skills that will help them create safe and inclusive classrooms?

9. Additional questions: I will also ask questions based on themes that have emerged about diversity education in teacher education programs from the first phase of the study (i.e., from the two principal sites).
Appendix N
Information Letter and Consent Form for Teacher Candidates:
Secondary Institutions

Dear Teacher Candidates

My name is Mira Gambhir and I am a doctoral candidate from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a qualitative research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This study is a comparative study of initial teacher education programs in India and Canada. It is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers and funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Shastri-Indo Canadian Academic Award. I am requesting your co-operation as a voluntary participant in my thesis study, which I hope will lead to the reconceptualization of initial teacher education and help to shape program policy in this area. Defined broadly, diversity education encompasses the content, pedagogy, resources and attitudes that foster inclusion. Fostering inclusion means the commitment to act on values of equity, entitlement, community, participation and respect for others. This is of particular importance at a time when we are faced with growing demands from the public to be accountable for the preparation of new teachers in an ever more complex and diverse world.

In order to better understand how diversity education is conceptualized, implemented, and experienced in teacher education programs, I will be generating case studies of teacher education institutions’ over a one-year period. The elements that I will most consider and study in relation to diversity education in teacher education include:
1. administrators, teacher educators, and teacher candidates understandings of diversity education;
2. program structure and components and their connections to diversity education (e.g., the design of programs, course syllabi);
3. content and pedagogy in this area (the curriculum choices and teaching strategies used by instructors);
4. learning experiences (administrators, teacher educators and teacher candidates experiences in the program)

I am seeking 6 teacher candidates to volunteer to participate in a focus group session. I am hoping that you will be interested in being 1 of the 6 teacher candidate participants. Your involvement would be to attend a focus group session scheduled on [date, time, location] or be part of an individual interview. Your insights would help me better understand how issues of diversity (gender, religious, linguistic, and so on) are addressed in teacher education. I will also better understand teacher educators’ experiences in initial teacher education programs in Canada. Each focus will last no longer than 120 minutes and will be audiotaped. Light refreshments and snacks will be provided. If you choose an individual interview, it will be no longer than 60 minutes in length and scheduled at your convenience.

All data generated during this study will remain confidential and you will be asked to choose a pseudonym. *No one will be told of your involvement in the study.* To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read the transcript of the focus group. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. All data will be stored in either a password-protected area of a restricted-access computer or in a locked cabinet, both housed in a locked research office. Only my thesis supervisor, Dr. Dennis Thiessen, and myself will have access to your data.

If you decide to participate in this study please read through the attached consent form and contact me directly via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca or via telephone at 416-XXX-XXXX. Interaction with a researcher can act as a catalyst in the reflective growth process. A study of this nature will also be of benefit to those concerned with improving educational equality, equity, and access in Indian and Canadian schools. In addition, you will be presented with a book upon the completion of your involvement with the project.
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In closing, allow me to reiterate that you are under no obligation to agree to participate in this research. However, if you choose to do so, you will be free to raise questions or concerns with me at any time throughout the study and you may withdraw at any time if you choose.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me or my thesis supervisor with any concerns you may have. I can be reached at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor, Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM

I, ________________________, agree to take part in Mira Gambhir’s doctoral research study on how beginning teachers are prepared for the diversity they will encounter in local schools and the world. This is a comparative international study of India and Canada and the study is entitled Indian and Canadian Perspectives on Diversity Education for Beginning Teachers.

I understand that my participation would involve participation in one focus group session or one individual interview. The focus group session will last no longer than 120 minutes and if I choose the interview it will be no longer than 60 minutes. All sessions will be audiotaped.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in the interviews or observations. *I understand that only the researcher will know that I am a participant and that I will be asked to select a pseudonym. To help protect your anonymity, you will be asked to read the transcript of the focus group. This will allow you the opportunity to edit out any information that you feel is too sensitive or that you feel would serve to identify you. I understand that I may refuse to answer any questions, to stop the interview at any time and/or withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my specific answers and comments will be kept confidential. I understand that my name will not be identified in any report or presentation that may arise from the study. I understand that only the principal investigator and her supervisor will have access to the information collected during the study. I understand that the findings of this study will be presented at conferences and included in a range of publications.

I understand that a possible benefit of this study is the reflective growth process. I will also be given a book upon the completion of my involvement with the project. I understand that a summary of the findings of the study will be sent to me.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature__________________________
Date__________________

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the principal investigator please contact Mira Gambhir at 416-XXX-XXXX or via e-mail at mgambhir@oise.utoronto.ca If you have any complaints or concerns about how you have been treated as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics, ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

Mira Gambhir

Mira Gambhir
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
10th Floor, Room 10-274, 252 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Doctoral Supervisor
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Professor, Department of Curriculum Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto, Canada.
252 Bloor Street West, 10th Floor,
Phone Number: (416)-XXX-XXXX
e-mail: dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix O
Teacher Candidate Focus Group/Interview Schedule:
Secondary Institution

1. Thank you for attending this session. Can you please fill out the attached page before you leave which asks you for some broad background information?

Pseudonym:
Seat (seats will be labeled with a number):
Information you would like to share about your background (e.g., age, gender, heritage, language(s)):
Year of Teacher Education Program:
Areas/Subjects of Specialization:
Division of Teacher Education (Elementary, Secondary):
Please define Diversity Education
Please identify if there are other terms which may be more commonly used in your context:

2. Can you please say aloud your seat number and your areas of specialization in teacher education? *This is to help with transcription purposes.*

3. What do you consider to be the most challenging aspects of teaching in today’s schools?

4. What kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes do you think that teachers should have for working with children from different backgrounds, beliefs, and heritages?

5. How does your teacher education program prepare teachers for the individual and group differences they may encounter in their classrooms and the education system? For example, how does your program deal with difference education in areas like religion, language, culture, gender, sexuality, socioeconomic and so on?

6. Are there any teaching strategies/information that you use have learned in your teacher education program that will help you address diversity or build skills you can use as a teacher?

7. What types of content (topic, resources) do you cover in your program with respect to diversity education?

8. What kinds of assignments or class activities help you learn most about diversity education related issues? Please tell me in detail about one that has made an impact.

9. Additional questions: I will also ask questions based on themes that have emerged about diversity education in teacher education programs from the first phase of the study (i.e., from the two principal sites).
# Appendix P

## Overview of Data Reported as Part of Doctoral Dissertation

### INDIA SITES

**Table P1**

*Sahara University’s Rani College: Administrator and Teacher Educator Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indu</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Interview 95 Part 1</td>
<td>November 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Part 2</td>
<td>December 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Part 3</td>
<td>March 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmi</td>
<td>Teacher Educator/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2 Part 1</td>
<td>December 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2 Part 2</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 196</td>
<td>December 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>December 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>December 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeraj</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1 Part 1</td>
<td>November 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1 Part 2</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>December 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>November 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>November 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>November 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 4</td>
<td>March 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayatri</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1 Part 1</td>
<td>November 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1 Part 2</td>
<td>December 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>November 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>November 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>December 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopa</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>December 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation A1</td>
<td>November 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation A2</td>
<td>December 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation A3</td>
<td>December 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation B1</td>
<td>November 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation B2</td>
<td>December 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation B3</td>
<td>December 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 Interview refers to Individual Semi Structured Interview in the English language unless specified

96 Data includes corresponding field notes, observation notes, handouts, course readings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sadhaka</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>November 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>December 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 4</td>
<td>March 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 5</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 6</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandana (withdrawn)</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>November 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Did not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>November 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>November 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>December 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observations</td>
<td>Not permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table P2
*Saara University’s Rani College: Teacher Candidate Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janvi</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neha</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarti</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavleen</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priya</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Interview 1 – Hindi</td>
<td>December 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2 – Hindi</td>
<td>March 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajani</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>December 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meenal</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>March 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table P3
*Secondary Site: River Institute Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 1 (Naveen)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 2 (Ashok)</td>
<td>Interview – Hindi/English</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 3 (Himan)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 4 (Simi)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 5 (Bhavani)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 6 (Mona)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 1 (Sanjay)</td>
<td>Focus Group - Hindi</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 2 (Vishal)</td>
<td>Focus Group - Hindi</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 3 (Shilpa)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 4 (Geeti)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 5 (Manisha)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 6 (Shanti)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 7 (Veena)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 8 (Sumita)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table P4**  
*Secondary Site: Forefathers University Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>March 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 1 (Singa)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 2 (Ali)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 3 (Farahnaz)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 4 (Fariq)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 1 (Aban)</td>
<td>Pair Interview</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 2 (Zakir)</td>
<td>Pair Interview</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 3 (Jalila)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 4 (Sudeshna)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 5 (Tarik)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 6 (Henna)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 7 (Dev)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 8 (Vanni)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>March 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CANADA SITES

### Table P5

*Stanton University’s Glebe Cohort: Administrator and Teacher Educator Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Interview Part 1</td>
<td>May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Part 2</td>
<td>August 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Teacher Educator/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>February 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>January 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>January 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>January 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 4</td>
<td>February 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 5</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>January 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>May 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>February 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>February 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>April 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>January 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>January 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>February 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>January 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>April 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>January 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>January 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>January 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>January 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1 Group 1</td>
<td>January 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2 Group 2</td>
<td>January 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3 Group 1</td>
<td>February 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 4 Group 2</td>
<td>February 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>January 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>January 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2</td>
<td>February 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 3</td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1 and Interview 2 Part 1</td>
<td>February 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1 Group 1</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 2 Group 2</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2 Part 2</td>
<td>February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>January 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Observation 1</td>
<td>February 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table P6  
*Stanton University’s Glebe Cohort: Teacher Candidate Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>February 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>April 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>April 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisha</td>
<td>Interview 1 and 2</td>
<td>April 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table P7  
*Secondary Site: Thomson University Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 1</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>May 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Charles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 2</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>January 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Clea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 3</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>December 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jamie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 4</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>November 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jesse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 5</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 1</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>February 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ambika)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 2</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Josie)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 3</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>January 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scott)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 4</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vida)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 5</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>February 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shona)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table P8

**Secondary Site: Baldwin University Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 1  (Rachel)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 2  (Vincent)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>February 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 3  (Evin)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 4  (Ruth)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>February 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 1  (Wayne)</td>
<td>Pair Interview</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 2  (Jenn)</td>
<td>Pair Interview</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 3  (Sage)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 4  (Heather)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>January 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 5  (John)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate 6  (DJ)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>March 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Q

### Diversity Education Focused-Courses in the B.El.Ed. Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Practicum Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary India</td>
<td>Candidates develop an understanding of contemporary Indian realities through a study of key historical, political, socio-cultural, and economic issues. Major contemporary concerns in education, childhood, reservation policy, environment, and development are examined within inter-disciplinary frameworks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performing and Fine Arts</td>
<td>....This practicum provides and opportunity to discover inherent links between dramatics and education....It does not necessarily mean playing drama in classrooms or in schools, but to use the techniques of drama and orientations of a performer for enhancing teaching-learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Craft Participatory Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Language</td>
<td>This course aims to develop a deep understanding of language as a subject and as metalanguage. The course also equips students to tap the multilingual character of the Indian classroom as a rich source for teaching language as well as for developing analytical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquia Introduction to the Program</td>
<td>....The course aims to generate creativity among students, and for them to experience the learning process as a whole. Both in terms of generating fun as well as in creating an emotional outlet....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Practicum Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Social Sciences</td>
<td>The aim of this course is to make students familiar with the concept and nature of social science and the inter-linkages between different branches of social science. It explores What the social scientist does, the relationships and interactions of people in groups and the importance of perspective in understanding social phenomenon are some of the issues which will be dealt with in this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities that focus on performing and exploring children’s literature, storytelling, drama, music, organizing teaching and learning resource centres, seminar presentations of school experiences. The candidates learn about children, the Indian education system, and conduct an afternoon of teaching activities in a slum school and an elite school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition and Learning</td>
<td>This course offers an indepth study of processes of cognition and learning and their socio-cultural contexts. The course also deals with significant features of different theoretical approaches to the study of cognition and their educational implications.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observing Children</td>
<td>This practicum provides opportunities for undertaking systematic observations of children in various naturalistic and semi-structured settings. Through specific assignments, students come in contact with children, construct scientific ways to understand them, while also getting a chance to test universal development concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Relations and Communication</td>
<td>This course attempts to develop the conceptual bases for exploring and understanding student’s own self and the dynamics of identity formation. It further seeks to develop in students a capacity to reflect on education as a relational process, requiring communication skills, social sensitivity and receptivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-development Workshops</td>
<td>The workshops aim to focus on personal development and complement the learning of the theory course on Human Relations and Communications. The workshops are essentially meant to cover broad areas of awareness of: one’s own strengths and limitations, developing sensitivity, open mindedness and positive attitudes, the ability to communicate and relate with children and adults and developing ones own personal aim and vision as a teacher and as a person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Theory Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>This course aims to promote an understanding of language characteristics of learners, language usage, socio-cultural aspects of language learning, language as a process and the functional use of language across the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquia Storytelling</td>
<td>Students learn how to evaluate children’s literature, hone storytelling skills and build resources for storytelling like a display board or a collection of multicultural fables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td><strong>Theory Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td><strong>Practicum Courses</strong></td>
<td>These two practicum courses are complementary. Teacher trainees explore curricular, pedagogic, and classroom organization issues. They are expected to reflect on official documents, observe teaching-learning practices and measure of discipline in the classroom as also to critically analyze their relevance to the contemporary concerns of education. The practicum courses would also include conceptualizing alternatives in pedagogy and evaluation within real classroom contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td><strong>Theory Course</strong></td>
<td>Basic Concepts in Education This course attempts to introduce students to certain basic ideas in educational theory. It provides philosophical and sociological frameworks with which assumptions about human nature, knowledge and learning are examined. While exploring the societal context of education, students also learn to distinguish between formal knowledge and experiential knowledge.</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td><strong>School Planning and Management</strong></td>
<td>司校计划 and Material Development and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td><strong>Theory Course</strong></td>
<td>School Planning and Management This course attempts to expose students to the current education scenario in India, to familiarize them with school as a system and its relationship with other institutions and to create consciousness among students about the possible role they can play to change the situation.</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td><strong>Practicum Course</strong></td>
<td>School Internship This practicum offers an intense and focused school experience. Students function as a regular teacher gets to translate her knowledge base, pedagogic theory, understanding of children and her repertoire of skills into reflective classroom practice. The school benefits from this alliance in terms of witnessing possibilities of unconventional pedagogies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td><strong>Theory Course</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum Studies This course offers a critical analysis of considerations in curriculum design including the role of socio-cultural and ideological factors; developing varied perspectives of curriculum organization and the enquiry and insights into processes of curriculum transaction and evaluation.</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td><strong>Practicum Course</strong></td>
<td>Colloquia Creating a Resource Centre In keeping with the true spirit of partnership between the colleges and the schools, the intern gives a part of herself to the school in terms of a rich resource of teaching learning ideas, activities, and materials with the aim to lay seeds of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention.</td>
<td>innovation in schools and set in motion a process of thinking, discovering and doing amongst their school faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>