

COLOR-BLIND AND COLOR-CONSCIOUS RACIAL IDEOLOGIES AMONG
WHITE TEACHERS IN URBAN, SUBURBAN, AND RURAL AREAS

A Dissertation
Submitted to
Temple University Graduate Board

in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
OF EDUCATION

by
Ross Whiting
May 2016

Examining Committee Members:

Maia Bloomfield Cucchiara, Policy, Organizational, and Leadership Studies
Michael W. Smith, Teaching and Learning
Will J. Jordan, Policy, Organizational, and Leadership Studies
Wanda Brooks, External Member, Teaching and Learning

ABSTRACT

This study examined the differences in teacher racial ideology among white teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. This study advances the scholarship on the ideological frames used by teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas through an examination of the differences in teachers' discourse and racial ideology. Using contact theory, this study employed interviews to examine teachers' discourse related to racial inequality in education to determine whether there were similarities in teacher discourse within and across urban, suburban, and rural areas with differing racial compositions. Interviews were conducted with 42 teachers in urban, suburban, and rural school districts during the 2014-2015 school year.

There were three major findings in this study. First, four original frames of color-conscious racial ideology were present in data across urban, suburban, and rural areas. Second, teachers across all areas employ the systemic responsibility frame to talk about the achievement gap, and the cultural racism frame to talk about increased violence in urban areas, revealing that teachers frame some topics similarly across areas of differing racial composition. Third, analysis of teacher racial ideologies using the eight frames of color-conscious and color-blind racial ideology reveal that teachers within Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia employ specific frames within each area to talk about racial inequality in education. Further, teachers in Lincoln City and Gresham framed racial inequality in education more consistently using color-conscious frames than teachers in Arcadia, indicating that contact with outgroup members also shapes teacher racial ideology.

DEDICATION

To the students at Edward W. Bok Technical High School who deserve more than they got.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I want to thank my parents, Kent and Jill, and brothers, Ryan and Evan for always giving me the freedom and support to pursue my goals. I want to acknowledge O. David Deitz who gave me my first opportunity to teach at 14 years old, and showed me that every student can learn. Thank you to Sheryl Monkeliën and J. Rick Lucero who taught me to care for students and always give them my best.

Thank you to Wanda Brooks for serving on my dissertation committee, and to Michael Smith whose thoughtful criticism shaped my interview protocol and pushed my thinking on discourse. Talking about risk and resilience with Will Jordan led me to this topic; I am appreciative for his guidance. I would not be defending my dissertation without Maia Cucchiara. Maia's criticism, advice, and support made me a better researcher and educator. Thank you.

Finally, and most importantly, I want to thank my wife, Ashley, and my son, Finnley for the sacrifices they made that led to this work's completion. I would not be where I am without your love and support. Thank you is not enough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Context.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Invisible Racism.....	5
Perpetuation of Racist Discourse	5
Theoretical Framework.....	7
Ideology	7
Racial Ideology	8
Discourse and Racial Ideology	9
Contact Theory.....	10
Purpose.....	11
Research Questions.....	12
Key Definitions.....	12
Significance.....	13
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16

Racial Ideology	16
Teacher Racial Ideology – Color-Blind Ideology.....	26
Teacher Racial Ideology – Color-Conscious Ideology.....	32
Racial Ideology and Educational Experiences.....	33
Contact Theory.....	37
3. METHODS	41
Overview.....	41
Qualitative Research	41
Semi-Structured Interview	42
Research Sites	43
Urban – Recruitment and Site.....	44
Lincoln City	45
Suburban – Recruitment and Site	47
Gresham	48
Rural – Recruitment and Site.....	50
Arcadia.....	51
Interview Protocol.....	53
Questions Used in Similar Research.....	55
Data Analysis	56
Initial Coding	56
Code Families – Color-Conscious Frames	58
Populating Code Families	63
Codes Not Found in Code Families	67

Ethical Issues and Role of the Researcher	67
Limitations	68
4. RESULTS – TEACHER DISCOURSE	71
Color-Blind Frames	71
Abstract Liberalism.....	71
Naturalization.....	76
Cultural Racism	79
Minimization of Race	85
Color-Conscious Frames.....	90
Social Liberalism	91
Constructivism	98
Systemic Responsibility.....	101
Acknowledgement of Race.....	108
Conclusion	112
5. RESULTS – TEACHER RACIAL IDEOLOGY	114
Color-Blind Group	115
Transitional Group	119
Color-Conscious Group	122
Ideological Groups in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia	126
Urban Teacher Racial Ideology – Lincoln City.....	127
Ideological Commonalities among Lincoln City Teachers	128
Racial Ideology in Lincoln City.....	131
Suburban Teacher Racial Ideology - Gresham	134

Ideological Commonalities among Gresham Teachers	135
Racial Ideology in Gresham.....	142
Rural Teacher Racial Ideology - Arcadia	146
Ideological Commonalities among Arcadia Teachers	147
Racial Ideology in Arcadia	151
Critical Self-Reflection	153
Conclusion	155
6. CONCLUSION.....	157
Theoretical Implications: Color-Conscious Frames	158
Teacher Discourse Across Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia	160
Racial Ideology and Contact Theory	161
Directions for Future Research	165
Conclusion	168
REFERENCES CITED.....	170
APPENDICIES	
A. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	175
B. CODE LIST.....	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table

3.1 Lincoln City Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages	46
3.2 Gresham Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages.....	50
3.3. Arcadia Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages.....	53
5.1 Lincoln City Teacher Ideological Groups.....	127
5.2 Gresham Teacher Ideological Groups	135
5.3 Arcadia Teacher Ideological Groups	146

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Educational opportunities in the United States often break down along racial lines. Students of color consistently receive fewer educational resources than their white¹ counterparts, jeopardizing the American Dream for millions of people. Disparate educational opportunities are perpetuated in part through racialized discourse, which values the traits of some while devaluing others. This research suggests that white teachers in three specific urban, suburban, and rural areas perceive and conceptualize race differently, views that then negatively affect the experiences of students in their schools (Dee, 2005; Diamond et al, 2004; Morris, 2005). These views on race may then contribute to the educational disparity in the wider educational sphere as students learn about what and who is valued in our society. Findings of this study indicate that teachers use similar discourse to talk about racial inequality across all areas, and that teacher racial ideologies in urban, suburban, and rural areas differ as the racial demographics of the communities shift. This research details white teachers' racial ideologies in urban, suburban, and rural areas to better understand how the discourse that perpetuates inequality is propagated in different areas.

Context

The election of President Barack Obama has changed the way Americans view race and racial inequality (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). For many people of color, Obama's election signaled a new era; proof that the United States is indeed making racial progress.

¹ I chose not to capitalize the words "white" and "black" in recognition that these words represent a fluid social construction that are applied differently depending on who is reading them and who they are applied to.

For many whites, Obama's election signaled the end of racism in the United States, proof that the color of one's skin no longer affects one's life chances. Obama ushered in this new era of color-blindness himself: "There's not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America; there's the United States of America" (Obama, 2004). While the nation celebrated our new, apparently racism-free country, people of color continue to experience discrimination in law enforcement (Antonovics & Knight, 2009), healthcare (Smedley, Stith, & Nelson, 2009), in the workplace (Stainback, & Tomaskovic-Devey, 2009), acquiring housing (Turner, 2008), and in credit and consumer markets (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). Obama's presidential victory affected discussions around race in the United States in two ways: it created the perception that our nation was moving towards racial equality while simultaneously making it taboo to discuss the insidious ways racism continues to affect people of color in these United States.

The problem of racism in the United States is covert and complex. Whites' belief in the meritocracy of the United States has caused covert forms of racism to become the norm. In his influential work on racial ideology in the 21st century, Bonilla-Silva (2013) writes about color-blind racial ideology, which is characterized by denial by the dominant group that race has anything to do with inequality in society. Instead, individuals who have formed a color-blind racial ideology report that "we're all equal now," and you have to "work hard to get ahead," while institutional racism continues to provide opportunities for whites while denying them to people of color. This new, color-blind racism maintains and strengthens the invisibility of race and racism, limiting one's ability to see privilege and the marginalization of minorities (Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, and Campbell, 2005). We have moved on from the days of racial epithets and cross-burnings, instead

employing the use of coded language and unequal resource distribution to marginalize people of color. The discourse has shifted; overt forms of racism are no longer acceptable, yet hidden forms of racism continue to limit opportunities for people of color through the legal institutions, in healthcare, and, perhaps most importantly, in our educational systems.

Racism persists in our schools. White flight, vouchers, school choice, tracking, advanced, honors and gifted programs, teacher and school placements, teacher perceptions and expectations, and compensatory programs can serve as catalysts for the withdrawal of resources from poor and minority schools (Ladson-Billings and Tate, 1995; Farkas, 2003b). As a nation, we have said that all should have access to the American dream, yet we consistently allocate resources in a way that systematically advantages one racial group at the expense of others. Several authors have studied how racially based educational inequality has been institutionally perpetuated through the legal system in rural California (Prins, 2007), through curricular tracking (Weiss, 2001), and the transfer of skilled staff from a school where the majority of the students were minorities to a largely white school (Taylor and Clark, 2009). Race is also clearly related to patterned and persistent achievement gaps, yet community-based discussions about how race affects educational outcomes continues to be taboo (Castagno, 2008).

We have elected the first person of color as President of the United States, yet the structures that perpetuate racially based inequality in our society are as strong as ever. Racial ideologies, including color-blind racial ideology, are a part of what perpetuates this paradoxical state. Ideologies are taught to us through discourse, which we then pass on to future generations through conscious and unconscious means. Studying the

character of contemporary racial ideology is essential to understand why the “Land of Opportunity” is, in reality, the “Land of Unequal Opportunity.

Statement of the Problem

All ideologies are acquired. They are passed down through unconscious and conscious actions and discourses that help people conceptualize who and what is valued in our society. Authors have studied Americans’ racial ideology among college-students and everyday Americans (Bonilla-Silva, 2013), and working-class Americans (Lamont, 2003). In addition, a few researchers have studied teacher racial ideology using small groups of teachers from urban schools. Stoll (2014) studied how teachers use color-blind frames to talk about race and educational inequality. Ullucci studied the development of color-conscious racial ideology among urban teachers (Ullucci, 2010; Ullucci, 2011). Color-consciousness is an ideology that has developed to counterbalance color-blindness. It is characterized by recognition of institutional and historical racism, the understanding race is socially constructed, and that racial systems of power can affect the life experiences of individuals. We know that many Americans ascribe to color-blind racial ideology (Bonilla-Silva, 2013), and further, that these ideologies help maintain educational inequity (Castagno, 2008). However, we do not know whether teachers, a particularly important group in this regard, share these racial ideologies across areas of differing racial composition, or whether they adopt color-conscious ideology. Further, there is evidence that individuals’ racial prejudices vary in urban, suburban, and rural residents based on their exposure to people of other race (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). This study provides a detailed description of the discourse used by teachers to talk about race

and racism, and describes the racial ideologies of teachers in areas that are racially homogenous and racially diverse.

Invisible Racism

Racism no longer takes the form of easily identifiable actions by the dominant group; new racism is omnipresent, pernicious, is frequently unchallenged, and is embedded in our institutions and systems (Cross, 2005). Language and dominant ideologies perpetuate power for some while limiting power for others. Dominant members of society continue to cling to the notion of meritocracy in the United States while maintaining institutionalized structures that perpetuate dominance for whites and oppress people of color. The belief in meritocracy, coupled with post-Obama, color-blind racial ideology allow the dominant group to weave a narrative that racism is not a problem while maintaining the structures that ensure their dominance (Bonilla-Silva, 2013).

Perpetuation of Racist Discourse

Color-blind racial ideologies undoubtedly negatively affect student schooling experiences (Dee, 2005; Diamond, Randolph, & Spillane; Lewis, 2001; Morris 2005), but pinpointing the structures that reinforce color-blind racial ideology is difficult. Who teaches us what is “normal” and what is “other?” Several authors have studied the racial ideology of Americans, but two are central to the conversation of racial ideology because of the comprehensive nature of their studies. Lamont (2003) sought to determine how working-class Americans establish moral boundaries, finding that moral boundaries were often drawn along racial lines. More recently, Bonilla-Silva (2013) studied the racial ideologies of college students and people living in the Detroit area, finding that a large

majority of whites ascribe to what he terms color-blind racial ideology. Both authors highlight the ways color-blind discourse maintains power for the individuals who are using it, and removes power from those in the minority. However, Bonilla-Silva's research was designed to uncover the racial ideologies of everyday Americans, while Lamont's study focused instead on how working-class Americans draw moral boundaries. The results of Lamont's study highlight the salience of race in the lives of Americans despite the fact that uncovering the racial ideologies of Americans was not the main goal of her study.

We trust teachers to provide a high-quality education to all children. We believe that teachers should hold their personal biases and preferences in check while educating future generations; unfortunately, this is not always the case. Though educators are frequently exposed to social-justice related coursework, teachers continue to hold biases against students of color based on their upbringing and community (Picower, 2009). This study documents teachers' background contact with people of other race, and takes community racial demographics in to account to better understand how racial ideology changes based on exposure to people of other races. Several studies have linked teachers' negative views of students of color with negative student experiences. (Picower, 2009; Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, and Campbell, 2005; Dee, 2005). Documenting issues related to race and equity is essential identifying our nation's educational strengths and opportunities (Farkas, 2003a). This research describes the ways in which teacher racial ideology differs among teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas, and identifies opportunities for the development of color-conscious racial ideologies.

Teachers play a vital role in the development of our nation's children. The majority of teachers bring an advanced knowledge of their content area and educational practices with them in to their classrooms. They also bring conscious and unconscious beliefs about the world and its people. These beliefs are then communicated to students in a variety of ways, and include beliefs about race. While Lamont (2003) reports that individuals who have graduated from high school and hold college degrees are more likely to report anti-racist ideologies, we know little about how teachers in particular understand race, especially with respect to students' educational opportunities. A comprehensive analysis of teachers' racial ideologies is presented below to help us better understand the ways in which teachers use or reject dominant racial discourse.

Theoretical Framework

Ideology

The term ideology originated in the 18th century when Destutt de Tracy proposed a science of ideas called *idéologie*, which would not survive to the 21st century. Marx resurrected the term, altering it to include issues of power and domination. Marx (2000) believed that ideology was created when the elite and powerful fail to realize their views of reality support their positions of power. Further, these ideologies and behaviors invert reality to make the world appear how those in power would like, and are more or less accepted by others as "natural." The popular definition of "ideology" has a negative connotation. Ideology is used as a pejorative; "Ours is the Truth, Theirs is the Ideology" (Van Dijk, 1998, p.2). While the popular notion of ideology is largely negative, scholars have developed theoretical constructions of the term that are decidedly more nuanced.

Van Dijk (1998) describes modern ideology as a “system of ideas,” often related to group interests, conflicts, or struggles, that may be used to legitimate or oppose power and dominance, or symbolize societal problems. Ideologies may involve social collectivities like classes or racial groups, and may also include institutions, organizations, and other social structures. They function to serve the symbolic interests of a group, and are “the basis of social representations shared by members of a group” (Van Dijk, 1998, p.8); power and dominance play a central role in ideology, shaping how group ideas are formed and maintained. Ideologies allow groups of people to organize a plethora of social beliefs about the way things are, good or bad, wrong or right, and help them make decisions to act accordingly. People form ideologies about a variety of concepts; religion, gender, political systems, and race are common topics around which ideologies are formed.

Racial Ideology

Racial ideologies are an important part of how we interact with the dynamics of race and racism in our society; they highlight the ways that race operates throughout our lives, not just in conscious or explicit thoughts about others (Lewis, 2004). Often, these ideologies are influenced by positions of power and authority to construct discourses that are often emotionally and academically harmful to the racial other (Solomona, et al. 2005). Bonilla-Silva (2003) describes racial ideology as a set of racially based frameworks used by individuals to explain and justify or challenge the racial status quo. Issues of power and dominance are central to racial ideology; actors expressing dominant racial ideology seek to maintain the status quo, while ideologies formed by subordinate actors may use racial ideology to challenge the dominant ideology.

Bonilla-Silva (2003) reports that racial ideology helps people structure their lives in five ways: First, it helps structure the racial order, providing arguments to account for racial inequality. Second, racial ideology provides basic rules for racial actors, as well as guidelines to make decisions about who is “other,” and who is “same.” Third, racial ideology provides individuals with a basic script for interacting with others of their own race and those of “other” races. Fourth, racial ideology is systemic and/or global; all social actors are affected by racial ideology, whether they realize it or not. Last, the dominant racial ideology normalizes racial inequality by portraying the interests of the dominant race as universal and by subjecting all others to their social and moral authority. Issues of power and dominance are central to racial ideology; racial ideologies are designed to maintain the racial status quo, or are formed in opposition to the dominant racial ideology. Ideologies of any sort must be communicated to be considered ideologies. Discourse is central to the communication and maintenance of racial ideologies.

Discourse and Racial Ideology

Ideologies could not be formed or spread without discourse. Van Dijk (1984) defines discourse as a communicative event, including conversational interaction, written text, and associated gestures, facework, images, and other semiotic or multimedia dimension of signification. Discourse is communication; it not just cognitive, but social and ever-changing (Van Dijk, 1983). Discourse is central to the spread of ideologies:

Language use, text, talk and communication (together subsumed here under the overall term of ‘discourse’) are needed and used by group members to learn, acquire, change, confirm, articulate, as well as to persuasively convey ideologies to other ingroup members, to inculcate them to novices, defend them against (on conceal them from) outgroup

members, or to propagate them among those who are (as yet) the infidels (Van Dijk, 1998, p.6).

Discourse is intimately related to power. When discourse occurs between majority and minority groups, it may be discriminatory, and involve a set of strategies that aim at the exercise of dominance (Van Dijk, 1993). It is central in the formulation of ideologies, and in socially reproducing those ideologies, including racial ideologies. There are two major models of discourse in the reproduction of racial ideology: discourse between majority and minority group members that serves to reify power structures, and discourse among majority group members about minorities or ethnic relations that shape and legitimate ideological beliefs (Van Dijk, 1993). Discourse can be used to challenge dominant racial ideology, but most often is used to legitimate the dominant racial ideology and oppress those in the minority. Discourse surrounding racial ideology is flexible (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). It changes based on need, and allows the user of dominant racial ideology to choose discourse that maintain their power while hiding behind the concepts of “shared values and morals.”

For the sake of clarity, it is necessary to define how the terms “ideology,” and “discourse” will be used throughout this writing. Ideologies, including racial ideologies, are a system of values and beliefs about what is “normal,” and what is “other” that serve to reinforce or challenge societal power structures (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Discourse is communicative event, including but not limited to speech, text, symbolism, and media, through with ideologies are expressed (Van Dijk, 1998). Ideologies and discourse are symbiotically related. If we want to look at how ideologies are created and reproduced, one needs to look no further than the discursive manifestations of ideology in communicative events.

Contact Theory

Intergroup contact theory states that repeated, voluntary, positive contact with people of “other” group reduces prejudice towards individuals in those groups.

Thousands of peer-reviewed articles have been published on contact theory since Allport (1954) introduced the idea that contact with other groups reduces prejudice towards other groups. A recent meta-analysis of those articles revealed that there is overwhelming evidence that intergroup contact contributes to meaningful reductions of prejudice across a plethora of groups and contexts (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Research on intergroup contact indicate that voluntary, repeated, positive interaction with people of other races reduces prejudice towards those groups. My research seeks to establish a link between school and community racial composition and racial ideology, extending the idea that reduced prejudice may affect teacher racial ideology.

Teachers in racially diverse urban and suburban areas are more likely to have repeated, positive, voluntary contact with people of color living in their communities than teachers in homogenously white rural areas as a result of the racial compositions of those areas. Contact theory suggests that teachers in urban and suburban areas would be less prejudiced towards people of color than white teachers in rural areas. However, contact theory does not explore how reduced prejudice might affect racial ideology. This research establishes a link between school and community racial composition and racial ideology. This research establishes that teachers in racially diverse urban and suburban areas more often and consistently used color-conscious frames to talk about racial educational inequality, while teachers in the rural area more often used color-blind frames to talk about the same issues.

Purpose

This research describes the racial ideologies of teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas by examining their discourse surrounding race. Contact theory suggests that individuals who more frequently interact with individuals outside of their own racial group have more favorable views of outgroup members (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). This research finds that white teacher racial ideology varies in communities that are both racially diverse and racially homogenous.

Research Questions

In this study, I explore and define teacher racial ideology in order to better understand the following questions:

- In what ways does racial ideology manifest in discourse on racial inequality in education by white urban, suburban, and rural teachers across all grade levels?
- To extent do white teachers' racial ideologies differ in urban, suburban, and rural areas across all grade levels?

Key Definitions

- Discourse – A communicative event, including conversational interaction, written text, and associated gestures, facework, images, and other semiotic or multimedia that is socially significant (Van Dijk, 1994)
- Ideology – a system of ideas related to group interests, conflicts, or struggles that may be used to legitimate power or oppose power and dominance, or symbolize societal problems (Van Dijk, 1998).

- Racial Ideology – Racially based frameworks used by actors to define and legitimize (dominant race) or challenge (subordinate race or races) the racial status quo (Bonilla-Silva, 2003).
- Race – A categorical label ascribed on the basis of physical characteristics and linked to stereotypical beliefs about behavior (Fredrickson, 2002)
- Race Related Issues – issues including definitions of race and racism. Issues including but not limited to “natural” differences and stereotypes, definitions and examples of discrimination, causes and attributions of institutional racism, views on white privilege, views on segregation, and onus for racial change.

Significance

While the study of people’s conceptualizations of race and discrimination is not new, this study’s focus on teacher racial ideology in urban, suburban, and rural areas is the first to detail the racial ideologies of teachers across geographic areas. Several authors have called for a study addressing racial ideology in different populations (Bonilla-Silva, 2013; Lamont, 2003). Others assert that if we are to address racial discrimination by teachers and staff, it must first be better documented (Farkas, 2003a). A few researchers have recently studied teacher racial ideology. Stoll (2014) used Bonilla-Silva’s (2013) four frames of color-blind racism to discuss how teachers of various races in an urban areas talk about racial educational inequality. Two studies by Ullucci (2010; 2011) discuss how color-consciousness develops among white teachers in an urban area. This research fills a gap in literature in three ways. First, it identifies four frames of color-consciousness consistently used by teachers to frame racially-based educational inequality. These four frames of color-consciousness are positioned at the

opposite end of the ideological spectrum from Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blind racial ideology. Second, it shows that teacher discourse on racial inequality in education within frames of racial ideology remain consistent across urban, suburban, and rural areas. Finally, frames of color-blind and color-conscious ideology are used to identify the ways ideology varies in urban, suburban, and rural areas

Bonilla-Silva (2013) identified four frames of color-blind racism whites use to justify racial inequality in education. Those four frames, abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of race, and discussed in detail in the sections below. Analysis of teacher interviews revealed that there are also four opposing frames of color-conscious racial ideology that whites use to reject notions of color-blindness. Those four frames, social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, and acknowledgement of race, are used by teachers to frame topics related to racial inequality. These frames can be used to identify color-conscious ideology among people in a variety of settings.

This study also identifies several topics where discourse was consistent across teacher responses in urban, suburban, and rural areas within the frames of color-blind and color-conscious racial ideology. Teachers across geographic areas framed some topics related to race in similar ways. Analysis of data reveal that teachers across all sites use similar language to discuss race and education.

Bonilla-Silva (2013) states that "Researchers also need to turn the analytical lenses on *white* segregation and isolation from minorities and begin documenting how this isolation affects whites' views, emotions, and cognitions about themselves and about minorities" (p. 268). The urban, suburban, and rural areas studied have vastly different

racial demographics. Results indicate that teachers in racially diverse urban and suburban areas hold more progressive racial ideologies than those in homogenously white rural areas, as intergroup contact theory would suggest (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). This study establishes a link between teacher racial ideology and community racial composition, and details the ways in which these ideologies change based on the community in which they are located.

Data collected have been useful in identifying how teacher racial ideology changes across areas of different racial composition. Farkas (2003a) suggests that if we are to root out possible discrimination by school personnel, we must first better document the existence of any such discrimination. While this research identifies that teachers used color-conscious frames to talk about race across geographic areas, there is still much work to do to thwart the perpetuation of color-blind discourse that maintains racial inequality.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study of teachers' racial ideologies draws from and contributes to a large body of research on racial ideology and student outcomes. Here I focus on four central topics. First, I will discuss studies of racial ideology in the U.S., focusing particularly on how scholars have attempted to understand individuals' conceptions of race in the U.S. Second, I look at several studies that also detail teacher racial ideology. Third, I will examine studies on the relationship between teachers' racial attitudes and student outcomes. Finally, I highlight a meta-analysis from the literature on intergroup contact theory which may help explain why the racial ideologies of teachers may be different based on the racial compositions of their communities.

Racial Ideology

In the past decade, research on racial ideology has highlighted the discourse that legitimizes whites as "normal," and people of color as "other." Research on racial ideology continues to indicate that color-blind racial ideology remains the dominant racial ideology in the United States. Studies reviewed here detail the various methods researchers have used to identify racial ideology in a variety of settings.

In two studies with differing populations, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2013) examines the language people use in talking about race and existing patterns of racial inequality. The first study features a convenience sample of 41 college students from a large Midwestern university. These 41 students come from varying backgrounds: 24 women and 17 men; 31 were upper-middle class, while 10 were working class. While this

population represented a convenience sample, the bias in the sample was in the direction of more racial tolerance as young, college educated whites are more likely to hold more progressive racial ideologies than other segments of the white population. The second study, dubbed the “Detroit Area Study,” looks at 84 randomly selected interviews with race-matched interviewers. 66 whites and 17 blacks were interviewed on their racial ideology in participants’ homes. Interviews for both studies included participants’ background information; socialization in schools; employment; romantic life; views on minorities, including race, racism and stereotypes; government intervention; reverse discrimination; job discrimination; and crime.

In these studies, Bonilla-Silva (2013) found that color-blind racial ideology is the dominant racial ideology among whites in the United States. Bonilla-Silva identified four frames used by whites to justify color-blind racism: abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and the minimization of race. Each of these themes is supported by respondent answers, and couched in extant literature. These frames are an essential part of color-blind discourse, preventing whites from seeing the historical context of racism in the United States while simultaneously denying privileges to people of color who are affected by color-blind discourse.

These four frames of color-blind racism were crucial in the analysis of data for this research project. Data related to the four frames of color-blind racism as identified by Bonilla-Silva (2013) were placed in code-families based on these frames of color-blind racism which were identified in the data. The population of these code families is discussed in-depth in the next chapter. Comprehensive descriptions of the four frames of color-blind racism are discussed below.

The first frame, abstract liberalism, uses ideas associated with political liberalism (like meritocracy) and economic liberalism (choice, individualism) in an abstract way to describe racial matters (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). This theme is used to appear reasonable and moral, using stories like “things are equal now,” and “people should not get more just because of their race” to oppose affirmative action programs. This claim allows whites to ignore the historical and systemic nature of racial inequality while reaffirming disproportionate representation in good jobs, schools, and universities. Respondents claimed that everyone should be given “equal opportunity,” which at best would serve to maintain current levels of white privilege, and at worst establish further grounds for exacerbated racial inequality.

People who use the frame abstract liberalism use choice and meritocracy to deny the existence of systemic racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). People in Bonilla-Silva’s study used three themes related to abstract liberalism. First, they used the idea of meritocracy to explain the racial status quo. People who used this theme within abstract liberalism embraced market choices for hiring decisions, or reject affirmative action policies by claiming they are racist. Bonilla-Silva quotes Jim, a computer software salesperson, on affirmative action:

I think it’s unfair top to bottom on everybody and the whole process. It often, you know, discrimination itself is a bad word, right? But you discriminate every day. You wanna buy a beer at the store and there are six kinds of beers you can get, from Natural Light to Sam Adams, right, and you look at the price and you look at the kind of beer, and you...*it’s a choice* (p. 81).

Jim used the idea of choice to explain discrimination. Jim explains away discrimination as bias, and implies that the choice relative in the decision to hire, or not hire an

individual is a race-neutral one. People who use the frame abstract liberalism rely on the ideas of individualism, choice, and meritocracy to explain away racial inequality.

Bonilla-Silva's (2013) second theme, naturalization, is used by respondents to describe racism as a natural occurrence. Whites claimed that segregation was natural because people of all backgrounds gravitate towards likeness. These claims suggest that segregation is biologically driven, which normalizes the act of segregation. When respondents were told that whites may be responsible too, they frequently used the concept "that's the way it is" to frame racial inequality as natural. By framing racism and segregation as natural occurrences, whites can place the blame for inequality on naturally occurring, biologically driven acts.

Participants in Bonilla-Silva's (2013) study rely heavily on the frame naturalization to explain segregation. Sara, a student in Bonilla-Silva's study, uses naturalization to talk about black self-segregation.

Hmm, I don't really think it's a segregation. I mean, I think people you know, spend time with people that they are like, not necessarily in color, but you know, their ideas and values, and you know, maybe their class has something to do with what they're used to. But I don't really think it's a segregation...It's just that the people that I do hang out with are just the people that I'm with all the time (p. 85).

Sara also said about residential segregation, "Maybe, like I said before, if people like to be with people that they're similar with and it means, you know-well, I don't think it has anything to do with color..." (p.85). Sara repeatedly downplays the idea that segregation is racial, instead implying that shared values and ideas cause people to move closer to each other. Sara fails to recognize the stereotypes she broadly applies to whites and people of color, and instead says that people simply gravitate towards people they are like. Sarah's description of segregation as natural ignores her personal privilege, and the

historical and institutional inequities that exacerbate racial segregation in the United States.

While Bonilla-Silva's (2013) second frame relies on biology as an excuse for racism, the third frame, cultural racism, relies on culturally-based arguments to describe people of colors' lack of progress in society. White respondents frequently said that they worked hard to get where they are, inadvertently implying that all minorities have to do to overcome adversity is work harder. Whites argued that minorities' lack of success was due to lack of effort, loose family ties, and a dearth of quality values. This theme amounts to "blaming the victim," and ignores the institutional effects of racism in employment, housing, and education.

The frame cultural racism is used by whites in Bonilla-Silva's (2013) study to explain the cause of the achievement gap. Ann, a student in Bonilla-Silva's study, uses cultural racism to frame her answer about why the racial achievement gap exists.

Um, I guess I would have to say primarily family structure. Maybe it's not [being] able to support the child and, you know, in school and really encourage. It might be that it's a single-parent family and it's necessary [for them] to get out and get a job, you know, a full time job and work a part-time job and still try to go to school... (p.89).

Ann's arguments seem to be without blame; she explains away educational inequality as the understandable result of parents who are struggling and low-income situations.

However, as Ann is addressing the racial achievement gap, she is also implying that families of color are unable to support their children in school, thereby characterizing parents of color as inadequate. Ann places the onus for change on individual families, rather than on systems of power in their community that limit opportunities. People who frame statements using cultural racism downplay the responsibility of systems for racial

inequality, emphasize individual choices, and characterize people of color as lacking morals and values.

Minimization of race was is the final theme of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). Whites frequently said “it’s better now than before,” to justify the racial status quo. Many whites accuse blacks of being hypersensitive to race, and using it as an excuse. Whites and blacks in the Detroit Area Survey (DAS) survey both agreed that discrimination is a problem in America; however, whites did not feel that discrimination was important in explaining blacks’ collective social standing. Additionally, white respondents of the DAS survey believe that discrimination has all but disappeared, while black respondents indicated that racism was still alive and well. Whites can deny the existence of systemic racism by denying its existence.

People in Bonilla-Silva’s (2013) study minimized the role of race indirectly and directly. Indirect minimization of race involved participants who avoided saying inequality was the result of racially-based systems. Someone who indirectly minimized race would use the excuse of qualifications and credentials to explain why a black person was not hired over a white person. Direct minimization of race involved denying that racism exists. When asked if she saw any discrimination against minorities in general, Joann said,

I don’t think it was as bad as it was. It probably needs improvement. What [society] needs is a knowledgeable crew and I think that is the truth there. I think that the work will have to be done up continually until we’re all one big happy family [Interviewer: do you foresee that happening?] It wouldn’t surprise me. My great-granddaughter might marry a black, I don’t know, *I have no idea!* (p.92).

Joann downplays the idea of racism directly, saying that racial inequality is less prevalent in modern times than it was in the past. She also indirectly minimizes race, instead

saying that what is needed is leadership who is generally knowledgeable, omitting mention of race. The frame minimization of race is used to justify the racial status quo, instead characterizing racism as something that existed in the past, or downplay the role of race in modern systems of inequality.

According to Bonilla-Silva (2013), these themes make the discourse of individuals ascribing to color-blind racial ideology appear non-racist while placing the blame for inequality on things that, on the surface, appear race neutral. A key tenet of color-blind racism within these themes is that it allows room for exception. Sayings like “not *all* blacks are lazy” allowed the proponent of color-blind racism to frame minorities as ignorant, or lazy while allowing that there will be a few exceptions to this rule. The semantic rules of color-blind racism seem on the surface to be race neutral, but upon analysis serve to preserve the users’ mythological nonracialism, and resist challenges to the racial status quo (Bonilla-Silva, 2013).

For this study, I use Bonilla-Silva’s four frames of color-blind racism to create code-families to analyze teachers’ racial ideology. These frames were used to answer both research questions related to this study, analyze discourse to identify major themes within these frames, and aide in the identification of teacher racial ideology in individual teachers. The use of these frames is discussed at length in chapters four and five.

Bonilla-Silva’s (2013) studies used interview protocols that were focused on the concept of race. In contrast, Lamont’s (2003) interview protocol focuses on moral and ethical boundaries, never touching on the concept of race, yet themes of moral boundaries based on race were central in her data. She reports that “White Americans value individualism, self-reliance, a work ethic, obedience, and discipline, and they believe that

blacks violate these values” (Lamont, 2003, p. 71). By placing the blame on work ethic, they can say that they are not motivated by a dislike of blacks, but by a concern for American values. While Lamont does not label what she found color-blind racial ideology, the language used by whites to perpetuate racist discourse is nearly indistinguishable from the language used by people who exhibit color-blind racial ideology in Bonilla-Silva’s (2013) study.

Lamont (2003) conducted interviews with 150 lower-middle class men, 30 blue collar workers in four groups: white and black American workers, French white workers, and North African immigrant workers, and 15 white-collar managers in both the U.S. and France. While Lamont’s study examines both French and American workers, findings presented here will focus on the data and analysis related to American workers’ views. Altogether, 75 working-class, and lower white-collar Americans were interviewed in 1992 and 1993. The people interviewed include plumbers, electricians, truck drivers, postal workers, plant workers, painters, bank clerks, and white-collar workers with minimal managerial responsibilities. The interview protocol was designed to elicit information on the mental maps of American workers; to identify which social categories they perceive as violating moral norms, and describe why they see social categories in that way. Although Lamont’s intent was to explore the moral norms of working class Americans, she finds that the rhetoric of race and racism was a salient and relevant topic in many of the interviews. Lamont explores how blue-collar workers use what she calls symbolic racism to make racially based arguments that they feel are good and fair while avoiding feelings of responsibility for the disadvantaged.

Lamont (2003) reports that white workers often racialized questions that were originally not meant to discuss race. When asked about their likes and dislikes, many whites criticize blacks for not stressing their own values, which include the disciplined self. In turn, blacks emphasize the caring self when evaluating whites who they described as domineering and egotistical. White workers frequently use moral standards to evaluate blacks, describing blacks as lazy and irresponsible while framing themselves as hard-working. Blacks were also frequently framed as dependent, as white workers frequently cite taxes taken from their own paychecks as a sign of dependence. Whites complain about the laziness of black people who are hired to satisfy quota requirements for federal government contracts. Whites in Lamont's study engage in a symbolic fight to keep the racial groups separated in an effort to maintain their own social status while denigrating the status of black workers. Lamont (2003) details how whites view racial difference:

My white respondents explain racial difference by a mix of natural historical, psychological, and cultural arguments. Several suggest that laziness is part of the "nature" of blacks of comes from a culture that is so deeply ingrained and rooted in history that it is not easily changed and is passed on from one generation to the next in an almost unalterable manner (p. 67).

Lamont (2003) touches on some of the ways that whites use natural, cultural, and personal differences to explain away racism, tenets of color-blind racism that are elaborated on by Bonilla-Silva (2013). Whites can explain away these criteria for evaluating others by saying that they are criteria they apply to everyone. By applying what they feel are universal criteria of evaluation to everyone, whites are able to make racially based arguments that they feel are fair while holding up their own whiteness as the norm.

Symbolic racism as explored by Lamont (2003) includes many of the tenets found in color-blind racism. Symbolic racism relies on personal responsibility as an argument for lack of blacks' success, and frames black inequality as based on cultural and natural differences. Whites in Lamont's study frequently cite special privileges associated with affirmative action, believing that they can only count on themselves to get ahead in life. Lamont's research found that moral boundaries often ran parallel to racial boundaries, citing the superiority of their own morality and a dearth of morality in the racial other. While Lamont did not set out to study race, the salience of race in her work highlights the importance of race in how working class individuals structure their lives.

Lewis (2004) wrote a theoretical paper that discusses white racial ideology and group structure using a synthesis of extant literature on white racial ideology and hegemony. Published in *Sociological Theory*, Lewis' paper enumerates the ways in which whites form a group identity while not recognizing themselves as a racial group. Lewis reports that whites frequently do not see themselves as racial actors, instead comparing all others against their own experiences. Lewis also discusses the ways in which color-blind racial ideology gains hegemony. Ideology gains hegemony when it does more than help people make sense of their lives; it also naturalizes the status quo. Today, the ideological idea of color-blindness has gained hegemony. "In naturalizing and legitimating the present state of things, ideologies tend to support certain interests and subvert others" (Lewis, 2004, p.632). Color-blind racial ideology became the hegemonic ideology for whites because it successfully maintained opportunities for whites while appearing on the surface to be race neutral. Color-blind racial ideology limits institutional opportunities for people of color by ignoring the historical implications of racial injustice, and pointing to

affirmative action and the election of a black President as signals of progress. Lewis highlights the power structures that make color-blind racial ideology a useful ideology in the maintenance of power.

Teacher Racial Ideology - Color-Blind Ideology

There are several studies that examine teachers' color-blind racial ideologies in various ways. Several researchers studied the ways that whiteness is legitimized in the classroom (Castagno, 2008; Picower, 2009; Segall and Garrett, 2013, Solomona et al., 2005), while another used Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blind racial ideology to design a study that examined color-blindness among urban teachers in North Chicago (Stoll, 2014). Finally, Ullucci's (2010; 2011) studies examine color-consciousness among teachers in urban areas.

Stoll (2014) uses Bonilla-Silva's four frames of color-blind racism to theoretically structure her study, and to code data from interviews and observations of 18 teachers from the same geographic area in North Chicago. Two interviews were conducted with each participant, and each participant was observed teaching at least once. The semi-structured interview asked about teachers' attitudes toward educational policy in general and race-based policies specifically. Teachers of various races were interviewed for this study. Stoll found that teachers most often used the frames minimization of race, cultural racism, and abstract liberalism to frame topics related to education policy in general, and race-based policy specifically. She also found that teachers defined a color-conscious teacher as someone who has no preconceptions about race, who does not treat students favorably or unfavorably based on their race, celebrates racial diversity, and consciously works to create an environment for their students that is not bound by race. Teachers'

definitions of color-consciousness were consistent with Stoll's definition of color-blindness.

Stoll's (2014) research employs the same color-blind frames for understanding teachers' conceptions of race that were used in this study. However, this study also relies on four color-conscious frames to discuss the racial ideologies of teachers, and also includes teachers from both racially diverse and homogenous schools. This research will build on the work of Stoll by identifying teacher racial ideology varies based on the racial composition of the communities in which one lives, and by describing frames of color-consciousness reinforced by strong data.

There is some evidence that teachers enter the profession with a negative view of students of color and their families as dangerous, and responsible for their own educational debts (Picower, 2009). Picower studied eight white, pre-service teachers in their twenties enrolled in a course on multicultural education in their last semester of a teaching program in New York City. The course is intended to help teachers examine their own racial identities, privileges, racial biases, and help teachers better understand their role in urban schools. Participants were interviewed about how they see themselves, their students, and their role in the classroom. Data were analyzed using grounded theory, identifying themes present in the data without theoretical structure.

Picower (2009) finds that childhood conceptions shaped teacher beliefs about students, forming deficit constructions about urban students and families before entering urban classrooms. The color-blind ideological construction by white, pre-service teachers in Picower's study explains how whites use stories and stereotypes to perpetuate their own beliefs about people of color while legitimizing their own whiteness as the

norm. Picower also lists several of the ideological tools frequently used by participants to justify their color-blind hegemonic understandings. Themes included “now that things are equal,” “it’s personal, not political,” “out of my control,” “just be nice,” “I can’t relate,” “I just want to help them,” and “I would kiss a minority.” These themes were overwhelmingly color-blind in nature, supporting the narrative that everyone is now equal. While white pre-service teachers were enrolled in a course designed to question their hegemonic understandings of race, many of them were resistant to critical racial concepts that framed racial inequality historically. Participants deflected blame for racial inequality through statements like “I never owned a slave,” or “stop trying to make me feel guilty.” These pre-service teachers were able to resist stories that countered their own, thereby legitimizing their whiteness while perpetuating the racial status quo. Perhaps most importantly, Picower (2009) found that “White teachers are often entering the profession with a lifetime of hegemonic reinforcement to see students of color and their communities as dangerous and at fault for the educational challenges they face” (p. 211), showing that racial ideology is often deeply embedded in white teachers’ hegemonic understandings.

Silences by white teachers also contribute to the discourse of color-blindness. Castagno (2008) studied the ways in which silence on topics related to race served to maintain and legitimize whiteness. Castagno describes “colormuteness,” or the intentional silencing of racialized language in the classroom. In her ethnographic study of racialized silencing in two schools, Castagno identifies 35 separate examples of teachers’ silencing of race related language within classrooms, and only five contradictory examples. Indeed, discussions relating to race have become taboo, which in turn makes the words

that are taboo more powerful as they have been purposefully targeted for removal from the classroom. Castagno describes the inherent paradox in color-blind thinking:

“Allegiance to color-blindness, equality, and meritocracy means that race can’t possibly matter—and if race and racism existed and held some significance in students’ lives, then either our schools are not really color-blind, equal, and meritocratic, or teachers aren’t” (Castagno, 2008, p.324).

Segall and Garrett (2013) explore five white social studies teachers’ talk about race following a viewing of a documentary film related to hurricane Katrina. Discourse analysis was used to identifying the ways that white teachers talked about, or avoided discussions around race. This study was part of a larger, year-long qualitative study at a mid-western university. Active interviews were conducted with each participant after viewing the documentary. Segall and Garrett focused on commonalities among participants’ responses, taking a group centered approach to data analysis. They find that teachers have a tendency to involve color-blindness in discussions about blacks, or ignore race altogether by refusing to see or explain racism. They also directly avoid the topic of race, saying that race had nothing to do with the injustices witnessed in the documentary. Teachers prefer to avoid race. However, when they had to admit that it existed they immediately rendered it irrelevant to events shown in the film. Segall and Garrett report that teachers’ reluctance to talk about issues related to race is not simply an indicator of a lack of knowledge about race, but a desire to actively ignore race. Teachers in this study actively used language tools available to take color-blind positions about the film, using the language tools available to them to reify their color-blindness.

Solomona et al. (2005) interviewed 200 prospective teachers enrolled in a college in Canada to better understand how whites understand and legitimize white privilege. They found that whites used narratives to deny that white privilege exists by attributing their success to their individual efforts. Further, whites often blamed their lack of knowledge of race and racism on the communities in which they were raised, saying that it was not an issue because of their community's racial makeup. Whites often legitimized their views (or lack of views) on race by saying that they don't see race, they just see people. Solomona (2005) et al. report that this "...serves to reinforce the theorized invisibility of race and racism, thereby limiting one's ability to interrogate notions of privilege and its corollary, the deprivileging of minoritized social groups" (p.150). By asserting that people are people regardless of race, the prospective teachers in this study used color-blindness as a way to reinforce the idea that individual effort is indeed the factor that limited minorities, while in turn legitimizing their own whiteness.

Solomona et al. (2005) also highlighted three themes they believed contributed to whites' legitimation of color-blind discourse: Ideological incongruence, the negation of white capital, and liberal notions of individualism and meritocracy. Ideological incongruence includes when an individual's ideological belief sets are incompatible. For example, many white participants recognized that minoritized people receive fewer educational opportunities than whites, yet they opposed programs aimed at addressing this disparity, couching their incongruence in the language of reverse discrimination. Ideological incongruence is certainly an example of color-blind thinking as it removes race as a factor in societal benefits. The negation of white capital also serves to deemphasize race and white privilege. Whites in this study clearly believed that their

successes were due to individual efforts, and further, clearly believe that minorities are the ones who are being privileged at the expense of whites. Many participants also cited the pervasiveness of multicultural education as a counterbalance to white privilege. Efforts by to verbally downplay capital received covertly by whites and emphasize multiculturalism maintain the narrative of color-blindness by pointing to multiculturalism and individual effort as a true measure of success. Further, participants' notions of individual and meritocracy prevented them from understanding the historical context of systemic racism: "There is a clear sense that if people work hard enough they will overcome the myriad obstacles [associated with racism]" (Solomona, et al. 2005, p. 160). By focusing on meritocracy, participants are able to ignore systemic racism and place blame for racial inequality on the individual. In turn, placing the blame on the individual legitimizes color-blind discourse as whites believe that effort is the only variable separating opportunities for all.

Several authors have highlighted the ways in which whites avoid discussions about race and racial inequality. Bonilla-Silva (2013) asserts that the election of Barack Obama has made it more difficult to discuss topics related to race as whites can cite his election as evidence of racial equality. Further, the discourse of color-blindness employs silence as a tool to sustain the racial status quo. White teachers are able to choose to be silent on topics of race in an effort to reduce the importance of race and legitimize the discourse of color-blindness, (Castagno, 2008). Teachers also employ tactics to steer their students away from discussions of race in their classrooms in an attempt to silence their students (Thompson, 2005). The concept of racism is taboo because the discourse

surrounding dominant racial ideologies is precarious; it is in the best interest of dominant racial actors to remain silent about racism so their words cannot be examined in detail.

Teacher Racial Ideology - Color-Conscious Ideology

Kerri Ullucci (2010) examined how schools of education impact students' abilities to be successful in urban schools. Interviews were conducted with six elementary school teachers who were considered by professionals of color in their school to be examples of race-conscious white teachers. Ullucci positions race-consciousness at the opposite end of the ideological spectrum from color-blindness. Ullucci reports that race consciousness occurs along three dimensions – teachers understand that racism impacts schools, acknowledge and draw on the racial and cultural backgrounds of their students, and understand the value of culturally relevant pedagogies. Ullucci also finds that “personal experiences also helped to break down negative assumptions about these (urban) schools” (Ullucci, 2010, p.151). All of the teachers in this study spent some time in urban schools, which was seen as foundational to their development of race consciousness, and helped them visualize teaching in urban schools.

Ullucci (2011) also studied how three race conscious white teachers conceptualize multiculturalism using six semi-structured interviews that lasted between one and two-and-a-half hours. She writes that all three of these teachers grew up in multiracial neighborhoods, went to diverse schools, and had friends of other races growing up. Three important themes were identified related to color-consciousness among these three teachers: shared life experiences with people of color, the value and understanding of how equity did (and did not) function in their community, and lessons that came from

personal struggles. Teachers saw the challenges students of color faced in their neighborhoods, and understood that equity and fairness were not equally distributed.

Stoll's (2014) research draws on work by Bonilla-Silva to understand how teachers of various races frame issues related to race in an urban areas, research that closely aligns with the goals of this research. My research builds on this work, examining how teacher racial ideology manifests in areas of different racial composition among white teachers, and expanding on Bonilla-Silva's (2013) frames of color-blindness to include four additional frames of color-consciousness. In addition, research by Solomona et al. (2005) closely relates to my own research as it studied the racial ideology of pre-service teachers in Canada. My study will build on this research in two ways: First, I will examine how active teachers conceptualize race and race related issues, and second, I will be studying whether the racial composition of communities affects the racial ideology of teachers in these communities. Picower (2009) found that teachers brought their beliefs about race with them in to the classroom, but did not examine whether beliefs changed based on the racial composition of the community. Research by Ullucci (2010; 2011) on color-consciousness on white teachers was limited to teachers in urban areas. This research expands the study of color-consciousness across school districts with varying racial compositions, and employs clearly defined frames of color-consciousness to detail teacher racial ideology across the color-blind, color-conscious spectrum.

Racial Ideology and Educational Experiences

Teachers' attitudes about race affect student educational experiences. As students learn overt curriculum in schools, the actions of their teachers and staff establish

sets of rules and norms which students acquire throughout their educational careers. The acquisition of racial ideology through discourse is passive; students are often not consciously aware that they are acquiring information related to race. Included below are four examples of how teachers' racial discourse affected student attitudes and experiences within a variety of settings and populations.

Dee (2005) focused on whether assignment to a demographically similar teacher has an effect on teachers' subjective evaluations of student behavior and performance. Dee used NELS data from 1988 to determine whether same teacher demographics played a role in student-teacher interactions. Dee reports that teachers who did not share students' racial/ethnic designation increased the students' chances of being seen as inattentive by 33% and the odds of rarely completing homework by 22%. Results also indicate that among students with low socioeconomic status the odds of being seen negatively by a teacher of another race increase 35-57% compared to students who are the same race as the teacher, but are insignificant among students with a higher socioeconomic status.

Teachers in Dee's (2005) study held significantly more negative opinions of their students when the students were of a different race or ethnicity. Many white teachers' attitudes about race regarding students of a different race are overwhelmingly negative, which were reflected in the results of Dee's (2005) study. Teacher perceptions of race are inextricably linked to teacher perceptions of student performance before teachers set foot in a classroom, and negatively affect student educational experiences.

There are several studies linking teacher perceptions of race to negative student experiences. Diamond, Randolph, and Spillane (2004) conducted a six month

ethnographic study in five urban elementary schools examining how concentrations of African American students in an urban elementary school is paired with a leveling of teacher expectations and a reduction in teachers' sense of responsibility for student learning. Data from participant observation and semi-structured interviews were analyzed to identify instances where teachers and administrators expressed beliefs about students. These instances were coded as assets, deficits, or neutral. Data suggest that race and social class of schools is associated with staff's general beliefs about students. Data indicates that teachers held more deficit oriented beliefs about students when the majority of students were African American and low-income. Teachers and administrators hold higher expectations for students when the majority of students were white or Chinese, or when a higher percentage of students came from middle class families. Data also reveal that when student deficits were emphasized, teachers believed that students' lack of motivation, families, and limited skills stunted teachers' ability to educate. This results in either benefits or harm to students depending on the population being taught: "The everyday choices that teachers and administrators make will either contribute to continued inequity or help promote long overdue social transformation" (Diamond, et al., 2004, p. 95). Teachers and administrators in Diamonds' study frame students as having assets or deficits based on student race, which results in negative student educational experiences for many students of color, and reaffirmed white students as preferable.

Racial messages are also transmitted in largely homogenous schools. Lewis (2001) studied the racial messages students receive from adults in a mostly white suburban school. This ethnography examined explicit curriculum in the school and also

the multiple lessons about race, racial difference, racial sameness, and racial equity that were offered in both covert and overt ways. Lewis finds that “race” and “multiculturalism” seemed to be code words for “black,” which are implicitly understood as not being particularly relevant to this school due to the low number of students of color. School staff emphasize color-blindness while there was evidence that color, in this case blackness, carried a negative meaning. Teachers and staff repeatedly ignore issues of race, and demonstrate that they believe that people of color, and particularly blacks, were distinct, other, and undesirable. Teachers and administrators ignored an incident at the school where a student used the “N” word, and turned a blind eye to white students calling students of color “brown boy,” and “black boy.” Teachers and administrators repeatedly emphasize that “people are people,” and further that they should not be judged by the color of their skin. However, through their actions and inaction, they reified whiteness as normal and dominant, and repeatedly ostracized students of color. These messages created an environment that, on the surface, appeared equitable, but in actuality taught that being black was undesirable, and somehow less, which negatively affected the educational experiences of students of color.

White students were also negatively affected by perceptions of student race in Morris’ (2005) two-year ethnographic study of white students in a predominantly black school in a large city in Texas. Morris conducted semi-structured interviews with teachers and administrators, talked with teachers, tutored students, and conducted a survey examining how teachers’ viewed white students in this setting. The teaching population of the school was two-thirds African American, and one-third white; there were few Asian American and Latino/a teachers. Data indicate that both black and white

teachers tended to see themselves as helping disadvantaged kids, but white teachers viewed this role as more of a missionary role, and black teachers tended to think of themselves combating racism. White teachers also denied that race played a role in shaping social processes in the school while focusing more negative attention on white students than their African American peers. Morris also finds that white teachers perceived white students were poor or “trashy;” conversely, black teachers felt that their white students came from middle class background. For many black teachers, the whiteness of white students represented high social status, and reacted positively to them. These teacher perceptions of students related to race influence teacher-student relationships, which negatively affects student educational experiences.

Educators are constantly transmitting information to their students through discursive practices. In these studies, teacher racial attitudes were expressed in discourse that devalued students of color and privileged white students. Teachers’ individual attitudes about race are certainly expressed to students through discursive communications, and collectively as schools reinforce their perceptions of race through action or inaction. Teacher’s racial beliefs affect student experiences. This research will provide comprehensive view of teachers’ racial ideology in a variety of areas. Examining teacher racial ideology is essential in understanding whether teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas provide disparate educational opportunities based on their beliefs about race.

Contact Theory

Intergroup contact theory originated when Robin Williams, a sociologist at Cornell, was asked to report on what was known about group relations (Pettigrew, Tropp,

Wagner, & Christ, 2011). Williams' (1947) report stressed that many variables influence contact's effects on prejudice. Several studies focused on prejudice in New York City followed Williams' work. In 1954, Allport introduced *The Nature of Prejudice*, a volume that is said to have guided research on intergroup contact theory during the past five decades (Pettigrew, et al., 2011). Over the past five decades, over 1,000 peer-reviewed articles focused on intergroup contact theory as developed by Allport in 1954. Providing a comprehensive literature review based on those 1,000 articles would be challenging, and is outside the scope of this project. Instead, this section will focus on a recent meta-analysis of the literature on intergroup contact theory to provide a comprehensive picture of the findings in the literature.

Recently, Thomas Pettigrew and Linda Tropp have been especially active in the literature on intergroup contact theory. In 2006, Pettigrew and Tropp published *A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory*, which provides a comprehensive account of the results of the literature on intergroup contact theory. Literature was selected from the pool of over 1,000 articles on intergroup contact using the three criteria: First, only empirical studies in which intergroup contact was the independent variable and intergroup prejudice is the dependent variable were selected. Second, research that involves contact between members of specific groups was included to ensure intergroup contact was the focus as opposed to interpersonal outcomes. Third, the research reports some degree of direct intergroup interaction which must be directly observed by researchers, reported by participants, or occur in concentrated, long-term settings where intergroup contact is unavoidable (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Based on these selection criteria, 515 studies were selected for review.

A random effects model was used for analysis of all studies as it allows findings to be generalized to other intergroup contact studies not included in this model. 16 separate variables were rated and recorded for analysis, including the date of publication, type of study (e.g. experimental, survey), type of control group used, participant characteristics (e.g. age, sex, race, geographical area), and contact situation and setting. Two independent judges rated all variables, achieving kappas above .80 for all variables.

Results reveal an “inverse association between intergroup contact and prejudice for all studies, samples, and tests for both fixed effects analyses and random effects analyses” (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p. 757). The inverse relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice was significant, indicating that the more intergroup contact an individual experienced, the less likely they were to be prejudiced towards that group. Further, “...meta-analytic results provide substantial evidence that intergroup contact can contribute meaningfully to reductions in prejudice across a broad range of groups and contexts” (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p.766). Individuals who experience intergroup contact are also able to generalize beyond participants in the immediate contact situation, and may be broader than past studies have indicated. Importantly, these findings also indicate that intergroup contact may be useful in reducing prejudice in a variety of intergroup contact situations.

The results of Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis indicate that repeated, positive, voluntary contact with people of other groups reduces prejudice for those individuals. However, there is also evidence that ingroup members perceive outgroup members negatively if contact is negative or involuntary. Goyette, Farrie, and Freely (2012) report that whites in a suburban area outside of Philadelphia perceived that the

quality of their schools fell when the number of students of color increased in their schools over a period of four to five years despite the actual conditions or school demographics remaining constant. Goyette et al. assert that white families may leave areas where the percentage of students of color are increasing, which contributes to school and neighborhood segregation. Goyette et al.'s work highlights the opposite end of the contact literature, showing that when contact with outgroup members is involuntary or negative, prejudice increases.

The racial compositions of the urban and suburban areas to be studied are generally diverse. However, the former consists largely of people of color of varying ethnicities, and the latter has a roughly 80/20 split between whites and people of color. In addition, the racial compositions of both my urban and suburban sites have remained nearly constant for the last 15 years, which may make teachers in those schools less likely to perceive a decline in school quality as was found in Goyette, Farrie, and Freely's (2012) study. The rural area to be studied is nearly 100% white, which drastically reduces the amount of contact between individuals of "other" race and ethnicity. Teachers who teach in a more diverse areas are more likely to use discourse that reflects reduced prejudice that is not as prevalent in the largely homogenous white rural community.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Overview

This research builds on work by Bonilla-Silva (2013) to describe the racial ideology of Americans in an effort to understand teachers' conceptualization of race and race related issues. I conducted semi-structured interviews with 42 teachers total, 15 urban teachers, 13 suburban teachers, and 14 rural teachers. Data were coded and analyzed in ATLAS.ti in a three step process. First, data was openly coded using codes related to race and racism. Second, personal narratives were developed for each participant to aid in ideological categorization. Third, codes were placed in to code families based on Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blind racial ideology and four new frames of color-consciousness that were found in the data and are discussed below. Code families were then used to place teachers in to color-blind, transitional, and color-conscious groups in order to compare racial ideologies across urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Qualitative Research

This qualitative, theoretically driven research seeks to describe the racial ideology of teachers in urban, suburban, and rural school districts using semi-structured interviews with teachers teaching various subjects and grade levels across those school districts. I chose this approach because interview-based studies are ideal for uncovering and

examining how people think and talk about race (Bonilla Silva, 2013; Lamont, 2003; Stoll, 2014; Ullucci 2011, Ullucci, 2010).

Semi-Structured Interview

I chose semi-structured interviews over structured interviews as they provide a framework from which I can analyze data from similar questions while allowing the flexibility to elicit more information from respondents if necessary. Semi-structured interviews are characterized by a small number of prepared interviewer questions followed by further questions to follow-up the interviewee's response to the original question (Wengraf, 2001). Semi-structured interviews also allow me to change the sequence of question forms in order to follow up answers given and stories told by interviewees (Kvale, 2007). All interviews were conducted in a quiet place that was familiar to participants, as this practice has been shown to put participants in a good frame of mind (Wengraf, 2001). Occasionally, notes were taken during interviews. Pertinent notes about teacher actions are provided with the quotes.

Researchers who have studied racial ideology have used semi-structured interviews successfully on several occasions, and emphasize its importance in studying racial ideology:

The analysis of the interview data also sheds light on the methodological importance of using this kind of data for examining racial ideology. Had I relied on my [DAS] survey results to analyze whites' racial views, it would have been difficult...I could not have extracted from the survey data the stylistic and narrative elements of color-blindness (Bonilla Silva, 2013, p. 306).

Stoll (2014) used semi-structured interviews to identify the frames used by teachers of various races to talk about racial inequality in education in urban areas. Lamont (2003) used semi-structured interviews to elicit responses from participants that guided her

towards a greater understanding of how workers established moral boundaries between groups of people. Kvale (2007) reports that more spontaneous interviews elicit more spontaneous answers, while more structured interviews elicit structured answers. The semi-structured nature of the interview allowed me to delve in to topics of interest, or ask for participants to elaborate on a particular topic. I was able to memorize the interview protocol after three interviews, which allowed me to move fluidly and naturally from topic to topic, or switch the order of items if a participant brought up a subject before that subject came up on the interview protocol. This made for more comfortable and conversational interviews.

Research Sites

I chose to examine urban, suburban, and rural sites in the North-Eastern United States to study the difference in teacher racial ideology in areas of differing racial composition. Contact theory was integral in my decision to choose these sites. A meta-analysis of all literature related to contact theory revealed that there is "...substantial evidence that intergroup contact can contribute meaningful to reductions in prejudice across a broad range of groups and contexts" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p.766). Further research suggests that when people of differing race frequently come in contact with each other there is reduced prejudice regardless of the race of individuals in each group (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). I hypothesized that there may be a difference in teachers' racial ideology based on their contact with people outside of their race, and thus have decided to interview teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas.

School districts were chosen based on their designation as urban, suburban, or rural school districts in the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) database. The NCES designates these sites based on the population density of the area in which they are located, but there are racial trends within the public schools within each area. The public schools in the urban area and rural area are overwhelmingly homogenous; the former consisting of students of color, and the latter consisting of white students. The suburban school's population is nearly one-fifth students of color, and four-fifths white students, a racial ratio that is reflected in the surrounding community.

For this study, research sites were chosen based on their population density indicated on the NCES, the racial composition of the communities in which they are located, and whether the researcher is likely to gain access to these sites. School demographics were taken from the state's educational website, and are for school year 2012-2013. Site characteristics are broken down below for Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia below.

Urban – Recruitment and Site

Beginning in August of 2014 I made phone calls to the principals of schools located in Lincoln City, a city of more than 500,000 people in the Northeastern United States. Lincoln City School District (LCSD) has more than 100 public, middle, and high schools serving more than 50,000 students. Lincoln City is considered a Large City by the National Center for Education Statistics as it has more than 200,000 people living within the city limits (NCES, 2015). I began by contacting five high school and seven elementary school principals in public schools in LCSD. I exchanged phone calls and e-mails with several of these principals over the ensuing two months. The principals of

two schools, West Lincoln City High School (WLHS) and W. E. B. Du Bois Elementary School (Du Bois Elementary) said that I could recruit and interview teachers in their schools provided I could attain permission from the LCSD department of curriculum and evaluation. Normally, a rigorous review process is used to vet research to be conducted in LCSD schools. However, after a brief conversation with an administrator at the office of curriculum and evaluation, it was determined that I could conduct interviews with teachers in LCSD schools provided it was on the teachers' own preparatory or lunch period, or after school. I was confident that the principals of WLHS and Du Bois Elementary would allow me to conduct interviews during teachers' own time.

Lincoln City

Lincoln City is a large urban area that has many of the amenities common in large cities. Concert halls, museums, art galleries, sports stadiums, and ample public transportation are all part of the urban landscape. However, these urban amenities gradually diminish as you move away from the city center towards areas of concentrated poverty. Du Bois and WLHS are only five blocks apart, and serve the same families and neighbors. Du Bois is one block off of an arterial street that runs through West Lincoln City. Murals adorn the outside of Du Bois; two basketball courts and a playground sit within eight-foot-tall chain-link fences. Gates to these areas are locked. There is a corner store directly across the street from Du Bois I went in to my first day that sells Chinese food, small snacks, and cigarettes. All of the merchandise in this store are presented in pictures displayed outside of thick bullet proof glass that encases both the shop-keeper and goods. This is the only store visible from Du Bois' front steps.

Du Bois Elementary educates approximately 550 students and serves students in kindergarten to 8th grade. 91% of students at Du Bois are black, about 3.5% are Latino/Latina, 1% of students are white, and 3.5% of students are some other race. 100% of the students at Du Bois are considered economically disadvantaged; Du Bois Elementary provides free breakfast and lunch for all of its students. NCES reports that there are 14 students for every teacher in the school. However, class sizes are capped at 32 students. Du Bois Elementary is considered a Title I school, and receives additional funds from the federal government to support the educational goals of low-income students. The Lincoln City School District spends about \$11,900 per student on instruction, student and staff support, administration, operations, and food services.

There are approximately 500 students enrolled at WLHS. 92.5% of students are black, 5.5% are Latino/Latina, 1% are white, and another 1% are some other race. 100% of the students at WLHS are considered economically disadvantaged, and receive free breakfast and lunch. There are about 16 students for every teacher in the school. WLHS is also considered a Title I school, and receives additional funding to support low-income students' educational goals. A table of Lincoln City teachers and their subjects is included below:

Table 3.1

Lincoln City Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages

Name	Subject/Grade	Age	Name	Subject/Grade	Age
Ruth Wise	Elem. 2nd	27	Maureen Banks	Elem. 2nd	41
Marcia Perry	Elem. 2nd	54	Crystal Elliot	6-8 Learning Support	34
Olive Coleman	6-8 General Science	27	Troy Kelley	HS Economics	56
Rex Simon	HS Theater	65	Toni Murphy	HS English	42
Johanna Ellis	HS Health Sciences	54	Jacquelyn Alex	HS Health Sciences	55
Angelo Baker	HS Math	59	Terry Tyler	Math	63
Ginger Strickland	Social Studies	57	Derick Williams	Social Studies	48
Pat Dunn	Social Studies	52			

Suburban – Recruitment and Site

From September 2014 to March 2015 I made hundreds of phone calls and sent e-mails to administrators of 15 suburban school districts located just outside of Lincoln City and other major urban cities. My recruitment of these schools was based on them having at least 15% of their student population be students of color, and be designated a suburban area by the National Center for Educational Statistics. From September to December of 2014 I focused on nine school districts located outside of Lincoln City; from December 2014 to March 2015 I began contacting administrators of five schools located outside of another large city in the Northeastern U.S.. Very few of my phone calls and e-mails were returned. Two districts returned calls to say they were not interested in participating, several other districts directed me to different administrators, telling me that they were unable to approve this type of research in their schools by themselves.

In late February of 2015 a colleague e-mailed me saying that she had heard that I was having trouble recruiting a suburban site, and that she had a contact for me. She said that the Gresham School District (GSD), located 15 miles north of Lincoln City, had been amenable to having researchers in their schools in the past. She told me to contact Glenn Gilbert, a biology teacher at Gresham Middle School, who had connections with the GSD administration. The day after I contacted Mr. Gilbert in early March 2015, he took my proposal to the GSD school board for approval. The GSD school board approved the research in their schools as long as I got clearance from the director of curriculum, and could produce the requisite clearances to be present in a school. The day after the school board vote, I had a five minute phone call with the director of curriculum, who approved

the research without any reservations. She immediately sent an e-mail to the five principals of GSD schools, who were all willing to forward e-mails to their staffs. In mid-March of 2015 I began conducting interviews with teachers in the GSD.

Gresham

Located 15 miles north of Lincoln City, Gresham is characterized by new developments with clustered houses and older homes with sprawling yards. There are trail systems along the creek that runs near the town; several people were jogging on this path during my first trip to Gresham. There is a “downtown” area in Gresham with specialty shops including a soap shop, an artisanal cheese shop, several bakeries, French and Italian cafes, a brewery and restaurant, and several boutique-style clothing shops. As you move away from the “downtown” area, there are gas stations, fast-food and chain restaurants, and diners. Around the center of Gresham there are older, large houses with moderately sized yards. The number of housing developments increase as you move away from the town center, but houses generally remain large. Rarely there is a house on rolling farmland, or a cluster of trailers down a side road. Most of the people I met travel to one of the nearby urban centers for work, or work in a service industry in the town. I had not been to Gresham before conducting these interviews, and I have to say that I grew to like several of the quiet coffee shops and cafes in “downtown” Gresham.

Gresham School District (GSD) serves about 3,700 students. 80% of students in the district are white, 12% are black, 5% are Latino/Latina, and 3% are Asian/Pacific Islander. There are 13 students to each teacher in the GSD, and the district spends \$16,900 per student on instruction, student and staff support, administration, operations,

and food service. The Gresham area is considered a Large Suburb by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES 2015).

I visited and interviewed teachers at four of the GSD's five schools. The four schools in which I interviewed teachers are North Gresham Elementary (NGE), West Gresham Elementary (WGE), Gresham Middle School (GMS) and Gresham High School (GHS). No teachers responded to my recruitment e-mail at the fifth elementary school. Both North and West Gresham Elementary serve students in grades k-5. North Gresham Elementary is a sprawling, single-story brick building with large plate glass windows that sits about three miles to the north of the center of Gresham. The school is about 35 years old, but much of the interior has been recently renovated. Student work lined the halls, and students walked through the halls in orderly lines, talking quietly to each other. Teachers smiled and greeted me often, and several kids waved to me as they walked past. Of the approximately 300 students in this school, 94% are white, and 10% receive free or reduced lunch.

West Gresham Elementary is located just west of the center of Gresham. Of the approximately 400 students at WGE, 60% are white, 22% are Latino/Latina, 17% are black, and 1% are Asian/Pacific islander; 44% of the students at West Gresham Elementary receive free or reduced lunch. WGE is considered a Title I school, and receives additional funding to work towards the educational goals of their low-income students. Both Gresham Middle School (6-8) and Gresham High School (9-12) were built at the same time and are located in the same area just east of the center of Gresham. The student populations of GMS and GHS reflect the characteristics of the larger district.

I recruited teachers at these four schools using e-mails sent from their principals. Teachers then e-mailed me and we set up times during their prep, lunch, or after school. Teacher recruitment at GSD was difficult; during my initial recruitment I had eight teachers respond to my call for participants. I then e-mailed those participants and offered a \$10 gift card to a local bakery for every participant they could recruit for me. Five additional participants contacted me to be interviewed in May of 2015. By the end of May, I had interviewed three teachers at WGE, two teachers at NGE, four teachers at GMS, and four teachers at GHS, a total of 13 teachers. Those teachers and their subjects or grades taught are listed in the table below:

Table 3.2

Gresham Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages

Name	Subject/Grade	Age	Name	Subject/Grade	Age
Jennie Barker	Elem. 4 th	42	Alma McBride	Elem. Art	33
Devin Tucker	Elem. Art	42	Priscilla Fletcher	Elem. Special Ed.	32
Daisy Young	Elem. Literacy	34	Katherine Rice	MS Literacy	54
Howard Cross	MS Literacy	60	Lillian Thomas	MS English	64
Glenn Gilbert	MS Biology	65	Matthew Nichols	HS Chemistry	35
Brooke Snyder	HS Biology	40	Sally Bell	HS Earth Sciences	44
Sheryl Garrett	HS Physics	46			

Rural – Recruitment and Site

Recruiting a rural site was significantly more difficult than finding suburban or urban sites. Ultimately, I used personal connections to get the phone number of Penny Hudson, a principal at Arcadia Elementary School, and Janet Sharp, a physics teacher at Arcadia High School. After a brief conversation with Penny, she agreed to send an e-mail to her staff on my behalf, and provide a room to conduct interviews during the school day. Similarly, Janet agreed to help me recruit teachers if she could go through the interview process first to determine if it was something she would recommend to her

colleagues. After e-mailing with a few teachers at Arcadia Elementary who responded to my call for interviewees, a date to conduct interviews was set in late March of 2014.

Arcadia

I had been to Arcadia a few times while I was visiting friends in the surrounding area, and was generally familiar with the town. Arcadia sits next to a fairly well-used highway, and has an exit from that highway to its main street. As you head in to Arcadia, there are several used-car dealerships, a pizza shop, and several antique stores.

Downtown Arcadia has all of the accoutrements you would expect in a small town; a few fast food restaurants line the streets, a beer, liquor, and cigarette store, a bar and restaurant, a pharmacy, and a big-name grocery store are all along the main drag. If one were to travel a mile in any direction from downtown Arcadia they would encounter either rolling farmland used to grow mostly corn and soybeans, or densely wooded areas in which the people of Arcadia like to hunt. There is a nearby creek that has a reputation for some beautiful small-mouth bass and channel catfish; you can see people in canoes and kayaks fishing the creek on most evenings and weekends. From my experience, the people of Arcadia are friendly and quick to offer guidance on where to eat or head out for a hike. Most of the people I met outside of the schools work in some kind of contracting or construction, or worked at one of the few large factories that exist within a 20 mile radius.

Arcadia School District is comprised of four schools; East Arcadia Elementary, Arcadia Elementary, Arcadia Middle School, and Arcadia High School. The district educates approximately 2,500 students. 98% of the students are white. Less than 2% students in Arcadia School District would be considered students of color; about 1%

identify as black, .3% as Asian/Pacific Islander, and .2% as Hispanic. Approximately 29% of the district's students qualify for free or reduced price lunch. The student to teacher ratio is about 15 to 1, and the district spends \$11,200 per student on instruction, student and staff support, administration, general operations, and food services. The National Center for Education Statistics defines this area as a fringe rural area, a rural area less than or equal to five miles from an urbanized area.

When I arrived at Arcadia Elementary in March, 2015 to conduct my three scheduled interviews, Penny immediately gave me a list of teachers and when their prep periods were for the day, then directed me to freely walk around the school to introduce myself and recruit teachers. It quickly became clear that teachers were willing to donate their time; I recruited an additional six teachers to be interviewed that day. I conducted a total of nine interviews during my first day at Arcadia Elementary. The following day, I conducted an interview with Janet Sharp, who agreed to advocate for teachers in the high school on my behalf. Within two weeks, Janet provided me with the e-mails of six other teachers who she said would be willing to participate in my research. Ultimately I scheduled interviews with four of these teachers over two days in late April. I interviewed a total of 14 teachers at Arcadia Elementary and Arcadia High School; their names, grade or subject taught, and ages are in the table below:

Table 3.3

Arcadia Teachers: Names, Subjects and Grades, and Ages

Name	Subject/Grade	Age	Name	Subject/Grade	Age
Amelia Harris	Elem. 3 rd	40	Jody McCarthy	Elem. 3 rd	40
Kristina Myers	Elem. 2 nd	35	Gregory Wheeler	Elem. 5 th	48
Dianna Holt	Elem. 4 th	37	Rachel McKenzie	Elem 4 th	44
Katrina Massey	Elem. Computer	46	Oliver Lindsey	Elem. Orchestra	33
Susie Bridges	Elem. Special Ed.	62	Janet Sharp	HS Physics	56
Saul Carter	HS World History	53	Kristi French	HS Literature	25
Al Matthews	HS Physics	48	Casey Stevenson	HS Special Ed.	42

Interview Protocol

The interview protocol combines questions from the interview protocols used in both Bonilla-Silva's (2013) and Lamont's (2003) study while adding questions deemed pertinent to answering the questions posed by this research. All questions were compared to the researcher's research questions, and then written in colloquial language to elicit more authentic responses (Kvale, 2007; Wengraf, 2001). Colloquial question wording will be used as colloquial language has been shown to generate spontaneous and rich descriptions (Kvale, 2007). The interview protocol has 29 total questions broken in to four sections. An example of the interview protocol can be found in Appendix A.

Sections include:

A: Background Information – demographics, ethnic background, neighborhood and community description, school attendance and description.

B: Current Information – length of stay and socialization in current community, description of community, and marital status.

C: Overall Views on Race – definitions of race and racism, and “natural” differences.

D: Racism and Discrimination – definition and examples of discrimination, discrimination in education, cause of the racial achievement gap, affirmative action in education, race in teacher classroom and school, segregation, and closing the racial achievement gap.

As it turned out, participants' background information was not as pertinent as I imagined. Nearly all of the teachers I interviewed were from the area that they currently teach, or grew up in a similar area. However, collecting the participants' current information, including information on the community in which they teach and their marital status was integral in building a comprehensive picture of participants' racial ideology. Establishing the respondents' length of stay in the community in which they teach and descriptions of that community were indicative of individuals' feelings about that community and the people in it as people who have more exposure to differing groups of people are less likely to exhibit prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew, 1998). There were exceptions, which are noted. In this section of the interview, respondents are also asked about similarities and differences in culture with no reference to race as this has been shown to elicit responses related to race in past instances (Lamont, 2003). Participants rarely drew on race to answer questions inspired by Lamont, instead invoking personal responsibility or socially oriented thinking. These answers were useful in analyzing teacher racial ideology across areas.

Section C was designed to determine how respondents define race, and determine whether they feel there are racially based differences between individuals. In this section, respondents first answer questions about people they like and dislike. This section also asks respondents to define race, which is integral in establishing a narrative

for how the individual believes race contributes to larger social constructs like segregation and affirmative action.

The final section is designed to ask pointed questions about racism and modern discrimination. This section asks individuals to describe why inequality, segregation, and discrimination exist, and determine who is responsible for creating equity. These questions are the metaphorical meat and potatoes of this study; they have been shown to elicit responses related to color-blind ideology, and occasionally, antiracist ideology (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). These questions led to rich data. Questions in this section were used to establish a comprehensive picture of how teachers frame racial inequality in education.

Questions Used in Similar Research

Many of Bonilla-Silva's (2013) questions were used on the interview schedule for this study as they have been shown to elicit rich responses that can be used to create a holistic picture of an individual's racial ideology. By focusing on some established tenants of color-blind racism, including personal responsibility, segregation, and affirmative action, questions taken from Bonilla-Silva's study aims for the heart of color-blind racism while providing opportunities for antiracist responses from participants. Whether an individual ascribes to color-blind or color-conscious racial ideology is based on their discourse; the way the individual chooses to phrase their answer will reveal pieces of their racial ideology. Questions originally in Bonilla-Silva's study are indicated with a citation in the interview schedule located in Appendix A.

While the vast majority of Lamont's (2003) interview questions did not mention race explicitly, they often elicited responses that broke down along racial lines. The

interview protocol will use questions designed along these lines determine how much an individual considers race in when race is not the topic of the question. Questions on the community the respondent lives in, qualities of people they like and dislike and feelings of inferiority and superiority towards groups of people give respondents opportunities to discuss race without being prompted. Questions originally in Lamont's study are indicated with a citation in the interview schedule located in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

Initial Coding

Data consisted of 42 interviews with teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Interviews, which lasted between 25-75 minutes, were transcribed, then coded using open coding. Open codes were guided by themes of race established by Bonilla-Silva (2013), Lamont (2003), and Solomona et al. (2008). Responses were coded by question. For example, when teachers were asked about whether additional funding should be provided to urban school children who have extreme educational debts, three codes were present. Teachers who unequivocally said yes were coded as "AA.K-12 – Yes" (Affirmative Action in K-12 Schools), Teachers who said yes, but wanted systemic accountability for the money were coded as "AA.K-12 – Yes;\$ Accountability," and teachers who said that institutional racism is too ingrained in the educational system for money to make a difference in the lives of students whose educational debts are the greatest were coded "AA.K-12 – No – Institutional Racism." In addition to codes developed for each question, overarching themes were coded across all questions using the coding prefix "Theme." For example, if an interviewee's responses was coded "AA.K-12 – No – Institutional Racism," that response would also be coded with "Theme – Institutional

Racism.” Thematic codes were used across all questions to identify themes within individuals, and across teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. A complete list of codes and descriptions can be found in Appendix B.

In addition to coding, single-spaced, one to three-page personal narratives were written for each interviewee. Narratives followed questions in the interview protocol, including information on where the participant grew up, where they currently live, their marital status, the qualities they like and dislike in others, their feelings on the achievement gap and affirmative action in different educational settings, feelings about high rates of violence in urban schools, opinions on the role of race in the classroom and school system, feelings on segregation, and suggestions for closing the achievement gap.

Narratives were written in two sections. The first section provided quotes, and summarized teachers’ opinions on the topics presented in the interview protocol. The second part of the narrative included an analysis of the teachers’ racial ideology using quotes and summaries written in part one. At the conclusion of the narrative, a preliminary statement was written summarizing whether the person is mostly color-blind, color-conscious, or uses parts of both to frame their answers from the first section of the narrative. Personal narratives ultimately served two purposes: they detailed the complexity of each individual, providing quotes from their interviews as evidence, and they eventually served to validate code-families and racial ideology designations developed during subsequent rounds of coding.

In addition to validating coding structures using rigorous definitions of codes and code families, a small sample of codes were examined to determine interrater reliability. 12 responses to the question “There are up to 25x more incidents of violence against

teachers in urban areas than teachers in suburban and rural areas. Why do you think is the case?” were coded by a colleague who also studies racial ideology using codes I developed during open coding. I provided my colleague with 12 responses to the question on violence and a list of codes and code families and their definitions that were pertinent to that question. We had 87% agreement at the code level, and 100% agreement at the code-family level, indicating that while our codes may have differed on 13% of codes, those data we coded differently were members of the same code-family. 100% reliability at the code-family level is important as code-families were used to examine differences in teacher racial ideologies across all areas, and compare teacher racial ideologies within areas. The amount of data checked for interrater reliability was low, but 100% agreement at the code-family level indicates that the two-step vetting of codes using code-definitions and code-family definitions both increased validity and was highly effective.

Code-Families – Color-conscious Frames

After all interviews were coded using question-based codes and themes, code families were developed to aid in analysis. I grouped codes loosely across questions. As I compared codes from different questions, it became clear that there were similarities in responses across questions which the themes had not addressed. A colleague who also studies white racial ideology suggested re-reading Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s (2013) book to see if connections existed between his four frames of color-blind racism, and codes developed through my open-coding, question, and theme based coding process. I compared my grouping of codes to the frames used in Bonilla-Silva’s study, and found that there were similarities between my groups and frames of color-blindness as

developed by Bonilla-Silva. It was clear Bonilla-Silva's themes of color-blind racism were present in my data, so I made the decision to use the frames as developed by Bonilla-Silva to guide the creation of code families. Thus, abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism and minimization of race formed the code-families for codes related to color-blind racism.

Nearly all codes related to color-blindness could be placed within the four frames of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). However, there were groups of codes that could not be placed within the four frames of color-blindness, and were often in opposition to the frames of color-blind racism. These remaining codes related to institutional racism, the social construction of race, how individuals are affected by systems, and the recognition that race plays a role in society. As the remaining codes were grouped, data indicated that these groups were in opposition to Bonilla-Silva's frames of color-blind racism. I grouped the remaining codes, and identified four frames of color-consciousness that are related to Bonilla-Silva's four frames of color-blind racism. Those four frames, social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, and acknowledgment of racism, are related to the four frames of color-blind racism as developed by Bonilla-Silva. Bonilla-Silva's four frames of color-blind racism are defined in chapter two. I present below a brief definition of the color-conscious frames that were found in the data below.

Four Frames of Color-Consciousness. Color-conscious racial ideology beings with a response to abstract liberalism, which I am calling social liberalism. Social liberalism is the color-conscious response to Bonilla-Silva's (2013) description of abstract liberalism. Where abstract liberalism is characterized by ideas of meritocracy,

choice, and individualism used in abstract ways to describe racial matters, people who use the frame of social liberalism recognized that historical and institutional racism exist in our society, and further support programs to make social systems equitable.

Respondents who use social liberalism to frame statements directly or indirectly reference affirmative action. Social liberalism is characterized by two essential themes: the recognition of historical and/or systemic racism, and the recognition that these systems continue to affect the lives of people of color.

The second frame of color-conscious racial ideology in teachers' responses is constructivism. Constructivism is a response to Bonilla-Silva's (2013) color-blind racism frame naturalization. Where statements framed by naturalization describe racism as a natural occurrence, statements framed by constructivism acknowledge that race is socially constructed, and further that segregation and socioeconomic inequality is the result of social construction of race. People who frame race using constructivism place the blame of segregation and inequality on the negative social construction of race related to people of color.

Systemic responsibility is the third frame of color-consciousness found in teachers' responses. Systemic responsibility is related to Bonilla-Silva's (2013) third frame of color-blind racism, cultural racism. Statements framed by cultural racism rely on culturally-based arguments to explain the lack of success by people of color in American society. Cultural racism relies on personal responsibility, saying that blacks' lack of effort, loose family ties, and poor values is inherent and responsible for the racial economic gap. By contrast, statements framed by systemic responsibility acknowledge that systems of inequality affect the lives of people of color disproportionately,

acknowledge that systemic racism exists, and further that it affects the experiences and outcomes of people of color. People who use this frame explain the lack of success in American society by people of color by stating that community supports, social supports, and generational poverty are the main factors for an individuals' success. Teachers in this study made statements under the systemic responsibility frame that highlighted the role of systemic and generational poverty in urban areas, and recognized that systems like child care, community education, and community schools should be created to repay these debts.

The final frame of color-consciousness, acknowledgement of racism, is a response to the minimization of race, Bonilla-Silva's (2013) fourth frame of color-blind racism. People who framed statements using the minimization of race often acknowledged that discrimination was a problem in America. People who framed statements using the minimization of race indicated that race was no longer important in America, that privilege does not exist, and often cited examples of affirmative action as reverse racism. Acknowledgement of racism is the color-conscious response to the minimization of race, and is characterized by the recognition that racism exists, that one's race matters, and that beliefs about race affect peoples' experiences. Teachers who framed statements using the acknowledgement of racism often taught about racism in their classrooms in order to effect change, recognized that discrimination exists in society and in their communities, understood the importance in teacher diversity in their schools, and often stated that disparate scores between black and white students on standardized tests could be used to tell different stories about those students.

I want to take special care to explain the difference between social liberalism and systemic responsibility, two frames that are very closely related. Social liberalism as defined above is the recognition of systemic and historical racism, and acknowledges the role of these systems in describing current racial inequality. However, teachers who frame statements using tenets of systemic responsibility do not necessarily have to acknowledge that systemic racism exist, but will reference *systems* in responses related to dealing with educational inequality. Someone who uses the frame systemic responsibility may not use the social liberalism frame, or vice versa. For example, an interviewee could acknowledge that institutional and historical racism exist, but then would place the onus for change on the individual, thereby framing their statement first using social liberalism (color-consciousness), and then cultural racism (color-blindness). Similarly, someone may believe in meritocracy (color-blindness), but will name systemic changes that would mitigate the effects of systemic racism (color-consciousness), thereby first using frames of abstract liberalism, then systemic responsibility.

As we will see, the dissonance between frames of color-blindness and color-consciousness was nearly ubiquitous among participants in this study. Teachers' ideologies are complex; the eight frames of color-blindness and color-consciousness are employed to help describe the complexities of teachers. However, the categorization and analysis of teachers would not have been possible without first placing codes in to code-families. These code-families *are* the eight frames of color-blind and color-conscious racism. The process the development of code families is outlined below.

Populating Code Families

Code families consisted of the four frames of color-blind racism as described by Bonilla-Silva (2013), and four frames of color-conscious which were identified in the data. Codes developed during the initial coding process were then placed in one of these eight families using a two-step process. First, the description of the code was used to place the code in one of the eight code families. Next, all instances of the code were examined throughout all documents to ensure that the codes found within matched both the original definition of the code, and fit within the definition of one of the eight frames of color-blind or color-conscious racism. If a coded section of text within a code did not fit the within the definition of the code or code family, the section of text was either coded to better reflect the content, or, if it was the only instance of this type of text throughout all documents, removed altogether. The latter option was rarely used.

For example, the code family “cultural racism” includes the initial code “AGap – NegHomeLife.” Portions of text were coded with this code if the interviewee indicated that the achievement gap between students who are black and students who are white existed because the student’s home life was negative. Statements that fell in to this category included “...they (students) might not be eating the meals they need to eat...proper sleep, because mom’s partying,” “...to close that gap is hard because they need the – you need the home environment to (support the school environment,” and “...they don’t get enough encouragement from their parents to study.” All of these quotes imply that parents and families are personally responsible for the achievement gap as they describe families as lacking values or apathetic. This process of vetting individual quotes within codes shifted some quotes to new codes. Initial coding, then scrutinizing

individual codes to determine whether they fit within the code-family frame increased the likelihood that quotes were placed in appropriate codes and code families.

Quotes were analyzed to determine whether they fit in appropriate code and code families. Color-blind and color-conscious code families were each assigned a color – pink for color-blind, and purple for color-conscious. In this way, sections of teacher discourse could be analyzed to determine if teachers used multiple frames within sections, or whether their discourse was consistently framed by either color-blind or color-conscious ideology.

The first research question asked the ways which racial ideology manifested in discourse among white teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. In order to limit the scope of analysis, major discursive themes were identified within each of the eight frames of color-blind and color-conscious racial ideology. A theme was determined to be major if it was present across all geographic areas, remained consistent across ages and grades, and had more than three responses in each urban, suburban, and rural areas. Teacher discourse found within major themes and frames of racial ideology is discussed in detail in the next section.

The second research question required the analysis of teachers' interview questions in order to determine whether they were using majority color-blind or color-conscious frames, or a mixture of both to talk about racial inequality in education. Each teacher's coded interview was reviewed to determine how consistently teachers used different frames. A list of teachers was created. As teachers' interviews were reviewed, instances of framing were recorded on the list of teachers. Teachers who used a particular frame at least twice in their interview were said to have intentionally used that

particular frame. When teachers used a particular frame in responses to at least four questions, they were said to have consistently used this frame; the frame was marked in bold on the list of teachers. In this way, a list of teachers and the frames they consistently used was developed. For example, Rex Simon, a teacher at WLHS, used the color-blind frame cultural racism in response to questions on violence and the achievement gap. However, he more consistently used frames of systemic responsibility, social liberalism, acknowledgment of racism, and constructivism to discuss racial inequality in education. Rex more frequently and consistently used frames of color-consciousness to talk about racial inequality in education, which was corroborated two ways. First, personal narratives, written during initial coding, corroborated this method of analysis. Personal narratives were designed to tell a story about whether a person believed in systems of power related to race, or personal responsibility and meritocracy, and while they did not use the eight frames of racial ideology that became code families, always reflected the frames found in a teacher's list of frames. Further, the color-coding of color-blind frames as pink and color-conscious frames as purple made the contrast between these codes on the page of analysis obvious. Rex Simon's coding page was populated by nearly all purple codes; pink codes could be found within only two interview responses, indicating that the majority of frames used by Rex Simon were color-conscious.

Teachers were placed in to three groups in order to determine whether teacher racial ideology among teachers in urban, suburban and rural areas. I chose to place teachers in to groups rather than along a spectrum of teacher racial ideology to more easily make comparisons between teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas. I acknowledge that teachers could also be placed along an ideological spectrum, which

would have given a more nuanced view of teachers' individual ideologies across all areas. However, this research calls for comparisons between teachers in different areas, and grouping teachers in to clearly defined categories would make ideological differences across areas more obvious.

Teachers who consistently and overwhelmingly used color-blind or color-conscious frames were placed in color-blind or color-conscious groups. Teachers in these two groups may have used frames from the opposing ideology, but it was rare. A group called "transitional" was situated between color-blind and color-conscious groups. Teachers in the transitional category used frames from both color-blind and color-conscious ideologies, and did greatly favor one over the other. For example, a teacher could use the color-blind frames cultural racism and abstract liberalism to talk about the achievement gap, then use the color-conscious frames systemic responsibility and acknowledgement of race to talk about the reasons for increased violence in urban areas.

Using color-blind and color-conscious frames as code families allowed for the identification of themes in code families in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Breaking down teacher racial ideology in this way allowed me to see that *every* suburban teacher used the frame systemic responsibility in their interview, which was not consistent with teachers in rural or urban areas. Code families allowed for the identification of similar or absent themes within urban, suburban, and rural areas. An extensive review of teacher racial ideologies in urban, suburban, and rural areas and ideological commonalities within those areas is presented in chapter five.

Codes Not Found in Code Families

There were a few codes that were developed during initial coding that could not be grouped in to one of code families. These codes included teachers' descriptions of race, qualities teachers found positive or negative in others, codes related to feeling superior or inferior to others, and a variety of codes where the person said "I don't know" in response to a question. I examined these codes and their data in relationship to each other, and in relationship to other groups, and determined that they could not be placed either in a stand-alone group, or in to any of the code families discussed above. The intent of this research is to examine teacher racial discourse and describe racial ideology across areas of differing racial compositions. These codes were not related to teacher racial discourse or racial ideology, so I made the choice to omit these codes and their data from analysis related to this research.

Ethical Issues and Role of the Researcher

Privacy was the main concern when completing this research. All participant and site names have been changed and statistics related to school districts have been altered plus, or minus 5% to keep them anonymous. Participant names, subjects, and grades taught were also altered. All participant consent forms were kept in a locked cabinet with one key. Digital links between myself and participants were all password protected. Documents *never* linked participants and sites to their pseudonyms; once transcription was complete, all documents were renamed with the pseudonym and then links were digitally shredded. Information participants did not want included in the final project were omitted. When specific cities were mentioned, their designated pseudonym is used

(i.e. Gresham, Lincoln City, etc.), or they are given a generic designation like “large diverse town.”

My whiteness was a salient issue throughout the interview process. Castagno (2008) reflected on her experiences in the field: “I am sure that a number of teachers felt comfortable saying certain things to me because of our shared white identity” (p.317). My experiences were the same. Two teachers felt comfortable enough to use the vilest racial slur in the English language during their interviews, and another used the term “mulatto.” Only one teacher, Saul Carter, was openly hostile to my questions, and that only lasted for the first section of interview questions. Though I loathed what he had to say, I tried to encourage him to elaborate on his thoughts, and did not condemn him for his beliefs.

As a white antiracist, my racial ideology conflicts with the color-blind racial ideology predominantly found in white America. However, white teachers’ perceptions of my racial identity certainly made them feel more comfortable talking about race as they perceive me as an ally rather than an adversary. It is certainly the case that participants present “socially desirable” responses in an attempt to disguise their racial ideologies. Fortunately frames developed by researchers who have examined color-blind racial ideology have proven useful in revealing the underlying ideology in participants’ responses (Bonilla-Silva, 2013; Picower, 2009; Stoll, 2014).

Setting up discussions around the problem around color-blind racism has been difficult. My goal has been to avoid the narrative that I am “hunting for racists.” Throughout the study it was clear that all teachers wanted the best for their students, and were doing what they thought was right. No one wanted to appear racist. I came to think

of color-blind white teachers in the same way I approached teaching in Philadelphia; there are clear debts that are owed to students of color, and it was my goal to pay those educational debts with my time and dedication. Similarly, color-blind teachers are owed an ideological debt that, when paid, results in better schooling experiences for all students. Finally, themes found as a result of this research reflect larger, systemic issues, and not teachers at an individual level. For this reason, site and teacher anonymity is of the utmost importance.

Limitations

As a white teacher doing research in to white teacher racial ideology I have to recognize that my biases may unconsciously play a role as I code data. This was mitigated by the fact that I used a theoretically driven coding structure to develop code families based on Bonilla-Silva's (2013) research detailing the four frames of color-blind racism. In addition, though research on racial ideology has identified color-blind racism across the United States (Bonilla-Silva, 2013; Lamont, 2003), it was not assumed that teachers from rural areas were more color-blind, or teachers from urban areas were more color-conscious. While this ended up being the case, one of my most color-conscious teachers came from Arcadia, while the color-blind frame cultural racism was the norm in Lincoln City.

While the sample size was rather large when compared to other studies that examine teacher racial ideology, it cannot be said to be a representative sample. However, the depth of the data aids in theme and pattern recognition among participants in similar sites. In addition, data from this study may not reflect data that can be obtained

from charter or private schools whose missions include teaching antiracist discourse and social justice.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS - TEACHER DISCOURSE

I chose to analyze teacher discourse through the four frames of color-blind racial ideology as defined by Bonilla-Silva (2013), and the four frames of color-conscious racial ideology that I identified in the data. Also, rather than analyzing broadly within these frames, major discursive themes that emerged as a result of specific questions are taken from each frame and discussed through the presentation of data from urban, suburban, and rural teachers. In this way, I highlight the ways that teachers consistently framed different topics, and illustrate that discourse often remains consistent within and across all areas. I considered themes major when there were multiple statements on the theme from multiple teachers across all geographic areas. I used data from themes that I did not designate as major themes to analyze individual teachers' racial ideologies; results of this analysis are presented in the following chapter. Also, it is possible that teachers who use color-blind frames to talk about one topic may use color-conscious frames to talk about another. The complexities and differences in teacher racial ideologies are presented in the next chapter. This section will present the ways that teacher racial ideology manifests in discourse on specific topics across geographic areas through the eight frames of color-blind and color-conscious racial ideology.

Color-Blind Frames

Abstract Liberalism

Bonilla-Silva (2013) reports that people who employ frames of abstract liberalism focus on meritocracy, and economic liberalism including choice and individualism to talk

about race. People who rely on this frame often report that things are equal now, and that people may be conferred some kind of advantage based on their race. Abstract liberalism ignores historical and systemic racism, and instead that everyone should be given equal opportunity. Content in this frame is often less obviously racist, as participants use choice and fairness to negate race. In addition, this code often co-occurred with codes from the frame minimization of race as teachers downplayed the power and role of race in society.

Teachers mainly used abstract liberalism to frame two different issues. First, teachers invoked the abstract liberal idea of meritocracy when talking about whether a black teacher should be hired over a white teacher for diversity. Second, teachers also talked about choice and individualism when asked whether the government should desegregate through busing.

Teachers from all geographic areas talked about hiring based on qualifications instead of hiring for teacher diversity. Olive Coleman, a general science teacher at Du Bois Elementary, said she was a proponent of "...blind casting..." of teachers. Olive also implied that teachers who are black might be lower quality: "...I feel like you want the best, you can't look at skin color." Arcadia 2nd grade teacher Kristina Myers said she would have no problem hiring a black teacher over a white teacher if they were exactly equally qualified, "...it's when they hire someone with less qualifications," that she has a problem. Dianna Holt who teaches 4th grade with Kristina agreed, saying "I think that's wrong if they're only hiring them because they're trying to create a minority...I think it should go by qualification period." Her colleague, Janelle Ness, agreed. "I think the position should go to the best no matter what color you are. But that happens. Because

everyone has to have so many black people amongst their staff.” Other teachers claim that they had been discriminated against because of hiring practices. Du Bois Elementary teacher Marcia Perry says she applied to a school closer to her home, but they said “...I’m sorry you’re white?...I’m not kidding you! I went and they said, ‘no you’re white, you cannot get that job.’ You cannot get that job.” She undermines the practice of hiring for affirmative action, and ignores the historical teacher-hiring inequity by failing to recognize the value of teachers of color.

Teachers went out of their way to undermine the role of race and legitimize ideas of fairness. When asked if a black teacher should be hired over a white teacher for diversity if, in a vacuum if both teachers were exactly equally qualified, many teachers said to leave it to chance. Olive said “I would probably flip a coin because that’s the only fair way...” Jennie Barker, a 4th grade teacher at North Gresham Elementary it would be preferential treatment to hire a black teacher over a white teacher, and that it should be left to chance: “I think that’s preferential, yea. I think you gotta roll the dice or pick a card, flip a coin.” Howard Cross, a literacy teacher at Gresham Middle School, said, “I don’t know, I don’t know if that’s fair, you know what do you do at that point, do you flip a coin?” Fairness and qualifications were common themes when talking about teacher hiring. Education is a world of qualifications and certifications, things that teachers felt mattered when talking about teacher quality. Even when given the same candidate with two different races, teachers leaned on fairness, saying that flipping a coin was preferential to hiring a candidate based on their race.

While teachers leaned on the abstract liberal ideas of meritocracy and fairness to talk about race, they often used themes of choice to talk about desegregation. When

talking about busing to desegregate schools, teachers often emphasized that people should volunteer to go to diversify schools instead of being forced. Dianna Holt, a 4th grade teacher at Arcadia Elementary said “I don’t think the government should step in at any point, because they’re gonna take it as a negative and it could just cause more friction between different cultural backgrounds.” Dianna also thought people should be given the choice to go to private schools instead of their urban schools: “...there are probably a lot of private schools where they’re choosing to pay the extra money to get away the public schools, and I think that’s a great thing and if they can afford to do that, that’s wonderful.” Gresham 4th grade teacher Jennie Barker echoed the sentiment of choice, saying “You can’t tell people, oh you’re black you need to move here because we don’t have enough blacks here, like I said it’s a community, whatever’s in the community.” Teachers relied on choice to describe racial segregation to move away from arguments related to structural racial inequality.

Teachers were also worried about the distance students would have to travel if they were forced to desegregate by bus. Gresham Middle School English teacher Lillian Thomas talked about purposefully choosing where she lived for the schools.

...My husband and I deliberately bought a house where we thought was a good neighborhood and good schools to raise our children, so because of that effort we put in to it, I would be very upset if my child was taken from that and had to go a distance, and had to be there only because we had to even up the [percentages of races in a community].

When teachers supported busing students for diversity they only supported busing students in urban areas to suburban areas. Priscilla Fletcher of West Gresham Elementary said “...it’s not the schools, but if the community is not safe, I don’t necessarily want my child to go there. I would be more in favor of having busing them

[urban students] out to different school districts.” Arcadia Elementary teacher Janelle Ness would support busing programs, but only in cities like Lincoln City. While there is a large, racially and economically diverse town nearly 20 miles away, Janelle indicated that there were no opportunities for increased diversity in her school district. Janelle’s colleague Katrina Massey suggested that the cost to desegregation via busing would put undue costs on school districts. When asked whether students should be bused to Arcadia from a large diverse town nearby, Katrina said

...I never thought of that, seems like it would be more of a cost. You know, I mean, if they lived here, mmm I don’t know, I don’t know, if everyone gets along, then if they move, then it’s pretty much where you live, which school you go to, so I don’t know if that’s something that can be fixed.

Invoking the cost of desegregation, both in time and money, allows teachers from all areas to ignore the historical effects of inequality in different communities.

Teachers invoked personal choice to talk about whether their students should be bused to other schools for diversity. While teachers from Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia are represented in this section, it is important to note that these teachers all resided in nearly homogeneously white suburban areas. These teachers suggested that students from urban areas should be bused to the suburbs, but that their community could not bus students to other areas for more diversity, normalizing and legitimating the schools in their communities while denigrating schools with students of color by omission. Teachers who invoked choice in desegregation via bus also supported hiring teachers based solely on qualifications, ideas that fit within the color-blind frame of abstract liberalism. Teachers who employed abstract liberalism were also quick to talk about segregation as natural, a key idea in the color-blind frame of naturalization.

Naturalization

The frame naturalization is used to describe racism as a natural occurrence. For example, whites can claim that segregation is natural, saying that people gravitate towards likeness. This suggests that segregation itself is inherent; something that is biologically driven. Naturalization was nearly exclusively used to frame discussions about segregation, and also found during conversations related to why white teachers might make up more a disproportionate amount of the teaching population. This frame more directly ties race to biology, which implies that ones' life decisions may be driven by biology as opposed to culture, ethnicity, or preference. This frame also included very few obviously racist statements. Naturalization rarely co-occurred with codes in other code-families.

Teachers often deflected blame for segregation, using naturalization to frame their statements. Derick Williams at WLHS:

I don't know that it's [segregation] anybody's fault. I think that you know, generally speaking, people are going to gravitate towards people that are like them, so when you're choosing a place to put down your roots and you gotta raise your family in a community that mimics what your beliefs and values are and in a lot of cases that's going to cause, you know, um, segregation. But I don't know that it's state sponsored or even individual sponsored, I think people just gravitate towards their groups.

Du Bois Elementary teacher Crystal Elliot echoed this sentiment, saying that segregation is going to continue because "... We tend to be near people that are similar to ourselves."

Kristina Myers of Arcadia agreed: "I, I don't think it's really anybody's fault, I mean it's there there's no reason for it not being blended or mixed, I just think it's the way the, just where people live and how it is." Teachers often invoked the idea "this is how it is," to normalize segregation and shift blame from systemic racism to natural forces.

Other teachers blended the abstract liberal notion of choice in to their answers. Dianna Holt said about segregation "...I just think it's a matter of culturally where these people are choosing to live." Susie Bridges talked about why Arcadia has very few people of color: "It's where they choose to live is why - and this area just doesn't have a large...[population of people of color]." Both from Arcadia, Dianna and Susie both indicate that it is not their responsibility to desegregate; the onus is on people of color. They both ignore the systemic causes of racism while describing their nearly entirely white communities as natural and normal.

The majority of teachers who framed segregation using naturalization stuck to the idea that people can live where they like, and that segregation is a matter of fact, and that it is normal and acceptable. Gresham Middle School teacher Howard Cross said "Maybe it's [segregation] nobody's fault...people feel comfortable living around people who are like them I think..." Arcadia HS teacher Casey Stevenson echoed his sentiments:

I can't tell people where to live. I don't agree with, I don't agree with saying you can only go to that school, that's of course not legal, but, um, I do think that it's again a societal issue that they seem to be drawn to, drawn to where we feel comfortable, and whether that's an all-black community, all white community, all Latino community that's where we're at I think.

In addition to describing segregation as natural, Casey distances herself from the idea that whites could be responsible for segregation as "...they..." seem to be drawn together. Casey used the term "they" to indicate that it is people of color who self-segregate from whites, implying that the blame for segregation is on people of color, and that whites have no responsibility for segregation.

The frame of naturalization was most strongly used by teachers to talk about segregation, but teachers also occasionally used this frame to discuss why teachers might

be drawn to teach in a certain area. Ruth Wise from Lincoln City thought that teachers might want to teach in a school with majority white students: “maybe there’s something drawing them, that, you know, certain population...[white students]” Kristi French of Arcadia HS said she might encounter some challenges as a white teacher in an urban area:

...I would have a hard time as a white person just going with my family to an entirely black area. I would feel like, I wouldn’t be able to relate to a lot of things, and it’s not necessarily because I’m racist, it’s more like, I just feel like our cultures are slightly different.

Kristi first identified herself as white, and then identified areas with people who are black as areas with different cultures. She hedges throughout her statement, and moves away the topic of race, explicitly stating she is not racist while implying that black culture is different than white culture.

When asked why there might be more white teachers teaching in a given area, Casey Stevenson from Arcadia HS said “because that’s who lives there...” implying that white people tend to teach white students. Arcadia Elementary School teacher Rachel McKenzie echoed Casey’s statements, saying white teachers teach in white schools because “...it’s because our population is [majority white].” McKenzie and Casey implied that it is natural and normal for people to want to teach people of their own race. They accept segregation as natural and normal, and leave little wiggle room for arguments that challenge segregation as normal.

Teachers used the frame naturalization to talk about segregation as a biologically driven, natural occurrence. They also occasionally linked segregation to choice, saying that segregation occurs because people choose it. Teachers also used the frame of naturalization to talk about why there might be more white teachers, implying that whites

are more naturally suited for the teaching profession, and that whites are more likely to gravitate to schools with all-white student populations. In a few cases, teachers also implied that it is blacks who self-segregate, and that whites do not have a role in racial segregation.

In all cases where teachers used the frame naturalization, teachers spoke candidly and without apprehension. They believed that segregation was totally natural, and implied that white teachers are more likely to teach in white schools. Teachers who used this frame relied on normalization to explain the status quo. However, teachers who employed the next frame, cultural racism, made strongly negative statements about people of color, often in ways that downplayed the role of race in their statements.

Cultural Racism

This frame relies on culturally-based arguments to describe racial inequality in society (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). Whites use this frame to argue that people of color's lack of success is due to lack of effort, loose family ties, and a dearth of quality values. This theme blames people in traditionally marginalized groups for their own plight, emphasizing personal responsibility, and ignoring structural sources of racial inequality. By employing the cultural racism frame, whites can move away from saying that a race as a whole has negative qualities, instead blaming the "culture" of an area or group of people. The cultural racism frame included some of the strongest racist language of any of the color-blind frames as teachers linked sexual-promiscuity, inherent violence, and lack of education directly to people of color living in urban areas. Cultural racism rarely co-occurred with other code families.

Teachers often used the cultural racism frame to talk about disproportionate amounts of violence in urban areas, the cause of the achievement gap, and how the achievement gap can be closed. When talking about increased violence in urban areas, teachers often characterized students' home lives as lacking in values or inherently violent. Occasionally teachers directly described increased violence in urban areas as cultural. The statements that follow were elicited as a result of the following question: there are up to 25 times more incidents of violence against teachers in urban areas compared to suburban and rural areas - why might you think this is the case? 36 of 42 teachers used the cultural racism frame. Of those 36 teachers, 32 used the cultural racism frame made statements that indicated that increased violence in urban areas was related in some way to culture.

Direct references to violence as cultural were fairly common. Du Bois Elementary teacher Marcia Perry said she "...[Has] to go back to the culture..." when talking about increased violence in urban areas, while Toni Murphy from Lincoln City said "I guess each culture does have a way of dealing with, I guess with what I guess would be considered authority figures, you know here I think that like a little culturally..." Toni implied that her students are more likely to deal with authority figures violently than students in other schools, and ties this to race. Pat Dunn at WLHS said increased violence is a result of "...how they live, what they see at their home, in their neighborhood, is what you're seeing in schools...It's part of their culture." Pat then described how he feels like his students live and go to school in a "war zone," and that they live in a place that is "dangerous." He also marked urban students as "other," repeatedly excluding urban students from his group by saying "...how *they* live, what

they see (emphasis added).” When it comes to violence, Gresham teacher Jennie Barker said “...that’s their culture. They don’t talk things out, they yell at each other...In their neighborhoods, all they do is fight, nobody talks.” In addition to characterizing urban families as violent, she makes an added assertion that communication among urban families is dysfunctional.

Priscilla Fletcher of Gresham was more direct. She said that a lack of parenting is the cause of increased violence. She described an incident in Lincoln City where a man was shot for simply walking through a neighborhood: “Where was the person who’s responsible for making sure these kids were inside [their homes].” Gresham literacy specialist Daisy Young said that increased violence comes down to “...values...” She said “...violence is easy to come by when there’s less education at home...” then admitted “...that’s my assumption,” recognizing that she does not necessarily know whether adults at home are less educated, but that she is still ready to assert that her students’ parents are uneducated and therefore violent. Du Bois Elementary learning support teacher Crystal Elliot also thought that violence was a result of “...a lack of education,” and that “...it’s difficult to express yourself in the way you want to. Gresham teacher Brook Snyder agreed that “...there’s a lack of home and parental support in urban situations,” and that there are often “...no consequences for [kids’] actions.” In these cases, teachers make an argument that parents in urban areas lack the sense to keep their children under control, or are teaching their children that there are no consequences for their actions.

Some teachers directly blamed violent parents and neighborhoods. Du Bois Elementary teacher Olive Coleman said “I think it’s the neighborhood...some of these

parents have come up and said “well I told that kid, if someone says something to them, they should punch ‘em, they should not back down, she’s not gonna look like a wimp...” Others felt that single parent homes were responsible for increased violence. Lillian Thomas of Arcadia said that urban kids are “...coming from families that don’t have two parents, and that maybe one parent doesn’t have the time or resources to um, um, to ah, you know, teach their kids what’s right and wrong.” She then backtracked a bit on her previous statement, “...not that one group is more violent than anyone else, I can be pretty violent if someone gets me mad you know.” Lillian made generalizations about urban families being broken, but then tries to soften her statements by saying she can also be violent if pressed. Lillian’s colleague Glenn Gilbert also thought that “...our family structure, more single parents, more kids with single parents than we used to have back then (in the 60’s)” result in more violence in urban areas. While not as strong as Lillian’s statements, Glenn also implies that there are more dysfunctional urban families, and that the extent of dysfunction is greater among these families.

Teachers talked about urban families as uneducated, inherently violent, culturally deficient, lacking coping skills, poor communicators, and lacking the ability to maintain two-parent homes. Teachers who used the frame of cultural racism to talk about violence never mentioned suburban or rural areas directly. Instead, they placed negative attributes solely on people living in urban areas, normalizing the home values and attributes of suburban and rural homes by omission.

A number of teachers also evoked cultural racism when considering the achievement gap. Teachers who used the cultural racism frame to discuss the achievement gap talked about enrolling urban parents in parenting classes, parents having

kids too young, parents who are partying and doing drugs when they should be paying attention to their children, lack of parental interest in education, single parent homes, and uneducated parents. They focused on individual responsibility as a remedy for the achievement gap, rather than addressing systems of inequality.

Parenting classes came up as a theme among teachers who wanted to frame urban families as lacking education when talking about the achievement gap. Du Bois Elementary teacher Ruth Wise: “I just think more parenting classes. Parenting classes, and just teaching the parents to you know how to, you know, be there for their child, and how to help their child, and how to help their child, and what their child needs.” Arcadia Elementary teacher Susie Bridges also thought that closing the achievement gap is contingent on “...teaching families to be better, how to be a parent.” Susie also thought that parents of students of color place little value on education “...what holds them back the most is that education isn’t valued at home, and they come in so far behind and to close that gap is so hard because they need the, you need the home environment too...” When asked what can be done to close the achievement gap, Arcadia teacher Katrina Massey said that urban parents may not be interested in getting a good education for their kids “My guess would be more, maybe not color as much as, backgrounds, their home life. How interested their parents are in getting them educated, how helpful they are at home, but that can be in whites, families too.” While Katrina explicitly stated that her thoughts are not tied to race, the question is designed to elicit responses related to the racial achievement gap. She tried to untie race and achievement, attributes the racial achievement gap to how invested their parents are implying that black parents are less invested in their children, and then hedges her statement by saying that some white

families do the same thing, furthering herself from a racial argument. When talking about the achievement gap, Katrina believed parents should take some of the blame.

Gresham teacher Katherine Rice believed the achievement gap exists because of

...The culture that surrounds them, um, if they come from a very large family, sometimes they don't seem to get enough attention from parents, there's just too many, or if they come from a single parent home where the parent works, and, they just, they don't get enough encouragement from their parents to study, and enough, they don't understand how important it is.

Others echoed Katherine's sentiments that home life may be to blame. According to Gresham HS teacher Sally Bell the achievement gap exists "...because of the degradation of families, the loss of a family leader in the home, there seems to be more dysfunctional African American families that I deal with." Sally also thought students lack focus because they might be more interested in gaining status. In addition to the achievement gap being cultural, Sally thought that African American children, "...especially some of my boys...[are] more interested in the shoes they're wearing and the status they can gain within their peers just no real desire for academic focus, not a distractor like being poor, something else, a status gaining piece." Sally first described families of color as leaderless and dysfunctional, then said that her black male students are more interested in status than in education. She moves away from systemic factors "...like being poor," and places the blame for educational inequality on individual black men who she views as simultaneously uninterested in school and status-seeking.

Other teachers specifically reference young parents and single family homes. Du Bois Elementary teacher Marcia Perry said part of the problem is "...the kids who have 21 year old parents who have three kids, or four kids, that had them when they were 14."

Lillian Thomas of Arcadia agreed:

...how can learning to read and write be important when the mother's strung out on drugs, or she had her first baby at 15 or 16, and she was raped at an early age they come to school with too much baggage that that they, don't have, they're dealing with their parents' problems really.

Lillian's colleague Sally Bell also felt that the "...loss of a parent, mother or father..." can adversely affect outcomes for students of color. Arcadia HS teacher Al Mathews described "...a higher percentage of young black children who unfortunately grow up without a father in the home. When one parent does the parenting, it makes it very difficult to place a value on education." These statements paint black men and women as uncommitted, and imply that that lack of commitment extends to parents' educational aspirations to their children.

When parents talk about parents lacking education, or not investing in their children's education, or being sexually promiscuous at a young age, they are accusing black parents of these things, and holding up white parents as the norm. Further, some teachers believe that a divestment in education by black families is cultural, implying that it would have nothing to do with what many teachers in this study have to say about black families. Teachers were familiar with the racial achievement gap. They were also quick to characterize black families and students in negative ways, framing the achievement gap using themes found in the color-blind frame cultural racism.

Minimization of Race

The fourth frame of color-blind racism, minimization of race, was also used by teachers to talk about race and education. Bonilla-Silva (2013) reports that this frame is used by whites to minimize the role of race in creating and perpetuating social inequality. Whites minimized race in order to say that race does not matter anymore, and to accuse blacks of being hypersensitive to race. By denying that race has a role in social standing

today whites are able to deny the existence of systemic racism. The frame minimization of race is less obviously racist, and produced statements that deliberately moved away from discussions of race. Minimization of race frequently co-occurred with codes in the code-family abstract liberalism as teachers relied on meritocracy and preference to move away from discussions on race.

White teachers often minimized race when talking about teacher hiring and standardized testing. Occasionally teachers minimized race when talking about whether they were obligated to talk about race in their classroom, were asked to define race, or when talking about the achievement gap. Most teachers in this study used minimization of race to talk about two issues: teacher hiring and standardized testing. Teachers who minimized race when talking about teacher hiring also frequently employed frames of abstract liberalism at the same time. Teachers minimized race by failing to recognize the existence of institutional racism in teacher hiring. Teachers who minimized race often drew on the idea of chance – flipping a coin – to talk about teacher hiring, implying that race has no value.

White teachers were often incensed at the suggestion that a black teacher might be more valuable to have in a class than a white teacher. Derrick Williams complained about administrators who openly admitted to wanting more black teachers in WLHS:

...I've heard principals come straight out and say we need more teachers that look like our student body, and I don't know I necessarily ascribe to that because, again, I've been successful in[x number of] years here and I'm not African American, I think the kids respect me, and I respect the kids, and generally my classroom has a positive learning environment, so I don't know that if you had an African American face in front of my face the kids wouldn't have achieved any better. It goes along with the individual, not the race of the individual.

Howard Cross at Arcadia Middle School echoed this sentiment when talking about hiring an equally qualified black teacher over a white teacher for diversity:

I don't know, I don't know if that's fair. You know what do you do at that point, do you flip a coin? If that's what it was, I don't know, I don't know, if you're trying to appease a community or you really think that you need someone here, so that kids can relate to, other black kids can relate to. I don't know if that's fair. I don't. I can relate to a lot of African American students here, matter of fact, they'll tell you that I'm, I'm the guy who a lot of the African American kids go to.

Other teachers simply wished that the “race issue” was put to bed. Olive Coleman of Lincoln City said about affirmative action in teacher hiring “that’s something that bugs me is when race comes in to play at all. In a perfect world, it wouldn’t.” Arcadia teacher Janelle Ness thought “...the position should go to the best no matter what color you are.” Jennie Barker from Gresham thought that “...it should make absolutely no difference what color they are.” For these white teachers, race does not matter because they perceive it as not directly affecting them. They all use abstract liberal frames to talk about the importance of fairness, and minimize the value of race. Howard Cross from Gresham Middle School and Derrick Williams from WLHS actively pushed against the idea that black teachers might have more value to their students, even when their current teaching population is racially disproportionate when compared to their student bodies. They rejected the idea that race has value, instead focusing on their own experiences with students in their schools.

Teachers also rejected race as important when talking about standardized testing. The question related to the topic of standardized testing was designed to determine whether teachers felt that the achievement gap could be identified via standardized testing. Instead of outright rejecting the validity of standardized tests, many teachers

minimized the role of race in the achievement gap, instead blaming the achievement gap on poverty, but failed to tie poverty to race in any way.

Lillian Thomas from Gresham said she would like to see "...a society where, where race doesn't matter, you know, and, and to me that's the ideal, where you don't have to, um, break things down by race." Amelia Harris of Arcadia Elementary said standardized test results should not be broken up by race "because I don't think you should be dividing up people by race, I just don't." She talked about how socioeconomic status plays a role, but continues to minimize race; "I don't think you should look down or differently upon - but I mean I do understand the socioeconomic, how that plays in, it's all so difficult isn't it?" Olive Coleman of Lincoln City said "...to me I'm really more about the economics than the race." While Olive did tie the systemic cause of poverty to disparate standardized test results, she did not tie racial inequality to economic inequality, thereby minimizing the role of race in systemic inequality.

By tying economics to inequitable standardized test results teachers admit that there is some systemic responsibility for the achievement gap. However, they do not tie socioeconomic status to race. Teachers may have avoided tying lower standardized testing scores to race because they felt it would be an argument that people of a certain race were inherently deficient. Teachers readily tied poverty to the achievement gap as it is a less taboo topic to discuss, but avoided tying low socioeconomic status to race. Teachers minimized race when talking about standardized testing to avoid saying that people of color inherently score lower as a result of their race.

Teachers also minimized race when asked to define race. 3rd grade Arcadia Elementary teacher Amelia Harris said "I don't appreciate filling out forms to tell my

race, I don't know why you have to do that, I'd rather not do that, just treat me as a person. The human race, how about that." Amelia implied that race no longer matters in the United States, emphasizing color-blindness as a positive quality, and ignoring racial inequality. Gregory Wheeler, also of Arcadia, valued "Who are you as a person...skin color means nothing to me...it really doesn't. You know it's, it's just a color, haha to me." When asked about her race, Gresham literacy teacher Daisy Young told me that she is white, "...but generally, I'm an American." Daisy characterized herself as white, but also tied whiteness to being American, simultaneously defining people of color as un-American.

Teachers also minimized race when they discussed race in their classrooms.

Arcadia Elementary teacher Jennie Barker felt it was important to tell me that she talked about the protests in Ferguson, Missouri in her classroom. She raised and shook both of her hands dismissively while rolling her eyes as she talked about oppression.

...And we've talked about Ferguson, and people were like 'oh we're oppressed, we're oppressed' and a lot of kids were like 'that happened years ago and they fixed that,' it's kinda cool to see them do that, so yea, you know we've had conversations like that, constantly."

Jennie encouraged her students to ignore systemic oppression, and feels that racism has been "fixed." Janelle Ness said she specifically avoids tying conversations in her classroom to race. "They, if you ask them when we talk about it, they don't look at someone as color, they're ok with it. They have friends that are colored – that are black, so we discuss it, do we have to? No." Janelle used the term "colored," which she quickly corrects to a more modern racial term, which seemed to be a result of her previous use of the word "color" in her statement. Janelle also said that her students actively work to avoid discussions of race, and encouraged this in her classroom. Gregory Wheeler

echoed this sentiment, saying “I think we’re obligated to teach them about equality and fairness and that race, we’re all the same...” When using the frame minimization of race to talk about classroom experiences, teachers said they avoided discussions about race, or praised students when students expressed that racism was no longer an issue. All three teachers here teach in Arcadia; implications of this are elaborated on in the next chapter.

Teachers used the minimization of race frame to move away from discussions of systemic and institutional racism, and to not seem racist when talking about student test scores. Teachers actively sought to downplay their whiteness and privilege associated with their whiteness, and praised students in their classroom who avoided discussions related to race. Teachers often encouraged color-blind thinking in their classroom, and occasionally praised students who indicated that racism is dead in the United States. Teachers’ discourse surrounding the minimization of race reveal that race continues to be a taboo topic among many people, a norm that teachers pass on to their students.

Color-Conscious Frames

I developed four frames of color-consciousness that were present in teachers’ data. It is likely that these four frames, which were identified in statements by teachers, would be found in discourse by other groups as well. I named the four frames of color-consciousness using language similar to the language Bonilla-Silva (2013) used when naming his four frames of color-blind racism. These names reflect the content found within each frame. I defined the frames based on the content in each frame group. Below, I analyze major discursive themes used by teachers within the frames social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, and acknowledgement of racism.

Social Liberalism

Statements framed by social liberalism recognize that historical and institutional racism exist in our society, and that people are affected by these systems. Themes associated with social liberalism include the idea that race is systemically tied to poverty, a recognition of historical racial inequities, and an understanding that institutions, including the government, have played an active role in perpetuating inequality. Generally, social liberalism is tied to two essential themes: the recognition of historical and systemic racism, and the acknowledgement that these systems affect individuals. Social liberalism is a strong color-conscious frame, and includes some of the strongest anti-racist language found in teacher responses. Social liberalism also often co-occurs with codes from the systemic responsibility and acknowledgement of race code families, indicating that people often identify institutional racism, see systems as responsible for ameliorating its effects, and acknowledge the power of race in society.

The social liberalism frame was frequently used by teachers when giving examples of racism, and when giving examples of what can be done to close the achievement gap. When talking about racism, teachers either gave examples of racism that were institutional, like redlining or inequitable educational resources for people of color, or mentioned specific news events that they could then explain, like the cause of riots in Ferguson, or the events that led to the death of Eric Garner in New York City. Teachers talking about institutional racism and the achievement gap largely reference inequitable funding structures affecting students of color, and related solutions, including redistribution of educational funds, and lowering class sizes.

Teachers who used social liberalism to frame racism talk about the effects of institutional racism on their students. Pat Dunn from Lincoln City HS said that examples of racism could be "...anything from job discrimination, to housing, to education, um, lower standards [for black students]." Al Mathews from Arcadia HS felt that the "...civil rights violations that have taken place against African Americans, against black people, slavery, definitely an example. I would, I would even say things like, things that are currently going on [Ferguson, Baltimore, etc.]..." Other teachers provided specific examples of institutional racism that they heard about in the news. Daisy Young talked about disparate expectations uncovered through a story on National Public Radio:

I heard just recently on NPR they had an article, or a segment on daycares and how punishment in daycare, you know this woman was repeatedly called in, expelling her son, and she said why, what's happening, 'well he flipped over a chair, he yelled at the teacher' well he's three, three year olds sometimes do that, and she was at a birthday party, for a white child and white parents, and she was telling them about what was happening, and they said 'what are you talking about, my kid does that all the time.' Some of their stories were more horrendous, their kids were spitting, biting, but, they were trying to expel essentially her three year old from daycare. And once that starts um, it's hard to stop that process, and then it's also talked about in public schools, you know the majority of the write ups and referrals are from African American or minority groups.

Daisy first talked about a story she heard about disparate education, then mentions more broadly that students of color are more likely to be written up than white students.

Marcia Perry from Du Bois Elementary recognizes that racism exists in educational systems, and that she plays a role in its perpetuation:

I live in [suburb of Lincoln City], now very white, and I moved there because I hated the Lincoln City school system that was before I became a teacher because I wanted my daughter to have better and they are better. There's a hell of a lot more money there. Um, I experience racism whenever I walk in to her school, then I walk in to my school, it's, it's, um, it's what, it's the haves and the have-nots. I work for the have-nots.

Johanna Ellis, a teacher at WLHS, worried that people fail to see that value in her students, and purposefully direct resources away from them as a result.

I don't think anybody gets it. I don't think anybody sits down and sees the real thing that's going on and I, I don't think they see the value of these really brilliant young people. They're so cool. For every, for all of things that they need and don't have, the support they don't get, the abuse they encounter, they're wonderful.

Johanna recognized the individual assets in her students because she sees them in her school. She is afraid that others might not view her students as positively as she views them and knows them, worrying that resources are directed away from them as a result of beliefs about their race instead of their individual merits.

Some teachers mentioned the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, or the death of Trayvon Martin in Florida as examples of the effects of institutional racism.

Gregory Wheeler of Arcadia Elementary ruminated on racism:

...there's a lot of people who don't like other people because of their ethnicity, and even women, there's people who look down on women because they're women, the whole Ferguson thing, a lot of problems down south, I mean, it's everywhere, unfortunately, we talk about, a lot about judging people for people, not for what color they are or where they come from.

Gregory's statement begins with an acknowledgement that racism caused the riots in Ferguson, but then moves to minimize race, saying that you should judge people for people. Crystal Elliot of Lincoln City references Trayvon Martin when she spoke about racism, saying "...we got all sorts of it [racism] all over the place, Trayvon Martin, the thing that's still going on, minorities or majorities, making negative comments or generalities about people from other races." Lincoln City HS teacher Terry Tyler also references the shooting of Trayvon Martin, and said that, as an example of racism, Martin's shooting is "...pretty clear cut." He talked about people blaming Trayvon

Martin for getting shot, then references the shooting of Renisha McBride by a white homeowner in Detroit after she came to his door to get help after her car broke down in his neighborhood.

Trayvon Martin, [they say] it was his fault without knowing any facts, or knowing the facts, they always know who's right and who's wrong, a woman goes to a door and says I'm in trouble, gets shot through the door, she's wrong, well why was she wrong? Because she was black, but it doesn't happen the other way.

All of these teachers who frame modern events in the news as racism expressly mention race in their answers, and talk about discrimination.

There were 14 teachers who used a recent example of racism in the news (e.g. the death of Eric Garner in New York City, or the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO) to talk about racism in the United States. However, only five linked the events to systemic racism. Other teachers who mentioned these events often cited them as examples of racism, then made comments that fell in to color-blind frames. It is important to differentiate people who frame modern examples of institutional racism using socially liberal themes from people who simply invoke racially-based news stories as “racist” without tying those stories to systemic racism, or using them as examples of reverse racism. Lillian Thomas from Gresham is an example of a teacher who referenced a news story of systemic racism, then re-framed it using color-blind language. She talked about the prosecution of the six officers in Baltimore as an example of people making an issue about race when, in her opinion, there is no issue. She spoke about what the death of Freddie Gray and ensuing events in Baltimore look like “...from the other side,” as a white person:

...[people] coming to these conclusions about crime when it hasn't officially been decided, and who was it in Baltimore, is it um, Mosley? I

think? She's a DA, (yea, the one who indicted the six police officers) and she almost has them convicted, the way she talks, and at one point in one of her speeches, she said now is our time. That disturbs me. Now's my time. Now's our time, and um, I think to myself, our time for what? What is it? What is it that it's our time for?

Lillian expressed fear in her answer, and pushed against the idea that people working within the structures of institutional racism were responsible for Freddie Gray's death. Lillian seems to be invoking "reverse racism," implying that racism is no longer an issue as she questions the need for people to protest in Baltimore. It is important to differentiate statements like Lillian's from teachers who used socially liberal themes to frame modern examples of systemic racism in order to draw a line between teachers who understand how systemic racism operates, and people who use these events to confirm color-blind beliefs about the world. Often, teachers cited modern, media-based stories like Trayvon Martin or Michael Brown when giving examples of racism, but then were unable to explain how those events were racist. This highlights a gap between peoples' individual beliefs about racism, and what is portrayed as racism in the news. Teachers who were unable to describe how news examples of racism fit the definition of racism more often used color-blind frames to talk about race and racism than people who used color-conscious frames.

Teachers also framed closing the achievement gap using ideas from the social liberalism frame. Teachers focused on two main issues when addressing institutional racism and the achievement gap: equitable funding, and lowering class sizes. Rex Simon from WLHS talked about re-working school funding across the state in which Lincoln City is located so students with more need have access to more resources. "In order to give every kid the same deal, the same opportunity, you'd have to spread the financing of

it out across the state, so that it was more uniform.” Ginger Strickland also of WLHS believed that “...every student in America is entitled to a certain amount of money to be paid for the education of them.” Du Bois Elementary teacher Crystal Elliot agreed, saying that she would like to see funds “...get divvied up equally, you know, per capita, this is how much each school district is given per kid. You can’t really help where you’re born.” Daisy Young from Gresham spoke about students in urban schools having fewer resources, and her desire to make school funding more equitable:

But for funding, that everyone would be guaranteed a certain amount to make education work, and there’s too many kids stuck sitting on radiators on the side with no books and they’re just kinda observing class as it’s passing them by, and I think that’s a complete injustice.

Daisy recognizes that urban schools often have a dearth of resources, and describes the inequitable distribution of resources as injustice.

Janet Sharp from Arcadia HS had specific examples of what can be done with more equitable funding structures.

I would make sure that every kid in America had the opportunity to go to a school in a safe neighborhood in a modern school, a facility where every school had the same technology available for the kids, um, that every school had the opportunity to hire good teachers, but probably more important, good administrators.

In all cases, teachers tied the racially based achievement gap to inequitable school funding structures, and express a desire to level the financial playing field. The recognition of inequitable funding structures is recognition of systemic racism, and is incorporated within the frame social liberalism.

Teachers who used social liberalism to frame the achievement gap talked about using those funds to create after school programs, improve school technology, attain more resources, provide more nutritious food, or transform schools in to community-

oriented learning centers. Teachers also mentioned lowering class sizes in urban areas if urban funding were increased. Ruth Wise and Maureen Banks, both 2nd grade teachers at Du Bois Elementary, talked about lowering class sizes as key to the success of students in their classrooms. Both have 29 students in their classrooms. Ruth said "...I mean, it's proven that smaller class sizes, you know, you get results," while Maureen pleaded "...K-2, if you could just have smaller classes, just more bodies, you just need more bodies." Toni Murphy at WLHS talked about lowering class sizes as common sense. "I think class size is a big factor, it's definitely a big factor, you can definitely teach 13 kids better than you can teach 23 or 33." Gresham teacher Priscilla Fletcher suggested that there are people who think that urban students are "lost" at a young age, and therefore they have resources directed away from them. Further, she said the best way to close the achievement gap is to "...reduce class sizes." She made an argument against saying that 2nd grade children are "lost," and for increasing the number of teachers in urban areas.

How do you, at that age you can't say that these kids are lost just yet, they don't want to learn, they're 2nd grade kids, you can still pull them in, but how is one teacher supposed to do that? It's not possible. It's not. You want to differentiate instruction, you can't do that! By continuing for not giving them that funding, if you want to go that way, you're not going to, it's not possible, it's just not.

Priscilla believed that law and policy makers may have negative preconceptions about educational systems in urban areas, and the students within those systems. She believes that the denial of resources on a systemic level is wrong, and that individual students are affected by decisions that are made at institutional levels.

Teachers used tenets of social liberalism in a variety of ways. They defined racism as institutional and systemic often using modern examples to identify racism in our society. They talked about the achievement gap as the result of institutional racism,

and described methods for addressing institutional racism when talking about closing the achievement gap. Teachers who used the social liberalism frame recognized that racially based systems affected experiences for students and outcomes for people of color in larger society.

Constructivism

Statements found in the color-conscious frame constructivism recognize that race is socially constructed, and further that issues like segregation and socioeconomic inequality are the result of the social construction of race. Teachers across all areas most often used themes within constructivism to define race, and to talk about segregation. It is important to note that far fewer teachers who used constructivism to frame race and segregation than used the color-blind frame naturalization to discuss the same topics. Responses framed by constructivism did not often include strong anti-racist language. In addition, constructivism rarely co-occurred with other frames, and was most often found as participants defined race, or described the existence of segregation; it was rarely found in the answers to other questions.

Teachers who used constructivism to frame race talked about race as people drawing lines between characteristics that had no merit in a scientific understanding of the world. Angelo Baker from WLHS talked about race as allowing one to make “artificial distinctions” between people “...which enables one person to feel superior over another person and act on that superiority to demean, take away from, or, somehow treat that person not well.” He said this “often shows up in skin tone” because it takes little investigation beyond looking at someone to notice they look different. Kristi French from Arcadia described race as “a physical attribute, it’s based on, solely the color of a

person's skin and their ancestry." Kristi's colleague Al Mathews agreed. "I believe it's physical. I think any differences you see from one race to another are not because of the race, it's because of the environment that we were raised in." Other teachers directly recognized race as a construct. Janet Sharp of Arcadia said she would say "...that race does not exist, it's a human construct." Gresham HS teacher Matthew Nichols said "...well they're just talking about race as a construct on this American life, that brought to mind all of this, my previous sociology training, so yea, something we construct, like most things."

Other teachers used the frame constructivism to talk about segregation, saying that the social construction of race led society to draw artificial lines. Teachers talked about the gerrymandering of school districts and cities to perpetuate segregation, redlining programs in the 40's and 50's as responsible, or linked poverty and race, saying that economic segregation results in racial segregation. Arcadia HS teacher Janet Sharp believed that "it's [segregation] a combination of advantaged whites and political influence on you know, how you gerrymander school districts, draw lines here and there." Matthew Nichols from Gresham said about segregation "I think it's still a hold-over from redlining which was a government's program so there's segregation based on schools, so the government says, well you're going to a neighborhood school, so basically, to live segregated from one another." Lincoln City teacher Marcia Perry directly mentions red lining:

I'll have to say more local, maybe state government, because, you know, clearly segregation is alive and well living in Lincoln City. Huge huge huge. If you're gonna blame someone, I have to go back to the whole poverty thing, you know who do you blame for the poverty thing, you blame the businesses left Lincoln City. What about the red lining? That's local, but local is, you know, more by the state.

Several teachers linked poverty, race, and segregation without blaming individuals within those systems. WLHS teacher Angelo Baker was careful to tie race and poverty together without implying that one's race is what makes them poor. He talked about modern segregation.

Economics clearly have something to do with that. Economics are such that we know that poverty and race have a correlation – not a cause, a correlation, performance in education are related to economics as much as they are to other things, economics has a part of that, where people live.

WLHS teacher Rex Simon also believes segregation comes down to government accountability for perpetuating segregation along economic lines. Rex believed that the way education is funded creates situations that perpetuate poverty, and people of color are more likely to already be living in poor areas. He said “That’s definitely discriminatory, the failure for the state or some agency that’s above the local municipalities to spread the money out, that’s what’s gotta happen.” Priscilla Fletcher from Gresham was vehement when she talked about economic segregation. She believed that the rich perpetuate systems of poverty that racially and economically segregate us, which divides the country in to groups. When asked who is responsible for segregation, Priscilla said

...I think that the government, and the, that 1% that top 1% of the upper-upper class has done a great job in continuing to keep the classes separated, but not just by race, by socioeconomic status. And I think they are really trying to squash the middle class so there’s only going to be a lower and an upper, and an upper will stay together, and the lowers will stay together and that’s the way it’s gonna be. (So you think it’s, you think it’s perpetuated by wealthy?) Money, yuppo. It’s all about money. It’s all about money, and they want to keep their money and I think that by sitting in overcrowded schools, especially poor, continue to keep them poor where they’re trying to live on the streets, and they’re maybe not even graduating, “we don’t have to worry about them,” they’ve done such a great job of making everything so separate that they continue to make

these schools where it's almost impossible to have people achieve even if they really wanted to, you know, poor teachers down there.

The teachers who used constructivism to frame segregation were committed to the idea that segregation was not a natural occurrence, and posited several plausible systemic reasons why segregation might still occur. In all cases where teachers framed statements by constructivism, they recognized that segregation was indeed unnatural, and that it is perpetuated by systems.

Systemic Responsibility

A number of teachers drew upon a way of understanding racial inequality that highlights the role of large-scale systems. I call this frame “systemic responsibility.” Teachers who used this frame explain the lack of success for people of color in American by talking about the lack of high-quality educational systems, the proliferation of poverty in areas with majority people of color, and a lack of community and social supports. Teachers who used the frame systemic responsibility often recognized the actions of systems on individuals, and suggested ways that those systems might be improved to undo the effects of poverty. The frame systemic responsibility included both statements that tied systems to racial inequality, but also statements that tied systems solely to economic inequality. This frame was often found in statements in two nearly binary relationships: in conjunction with social liberalism and acknowledgement of racism using strong color-conscious language, or on its own, instead loosely tying systemic economic inequality to race using weaker color-conscious language or sometimes the color-blind frame minimization of race. Minimization of race co-occurred with systemic responsibility when a respondent said that the racial achievement gap had less to do with racial inequality and more with economic inequality, thereby emphasizing systemic

responsibility while minimizing the role of race. The strength of color-conscious language was dependent on the code families that co-occurred with teachers' statements.

Systemic responsibility was used heavily by teachers in all areas to frame racial inequality. Teachers who recognized systemic responsibility focused nearly wholly on the cause and amelioration of the achievement gap. Teachers across geographic areas and grades also talked about poverty as a systemic cause of inequality, but did not always link race to disproportionate amounts of poverty. These teachers' responses will be presented separately from teachers who linked poverty to the cause and closing of the achievement gap.

Teachers identified several systemic causes for the achievement gap including concentrated poverty, fewer resources, a lack of adequate early childhood education, and fewer opportunities in areas with majority people of color. Teachers who used systemic responsibility to frame the achievement gap often cited poverty as the main cause of the achievement gap. Janelle Ness from Arcadia said that the achievement gap exists because "...the majority of blacks are low socioeconomic, come from a low socioeconomic background, and I think that plays a very big part on your education." She goes on to link poverty to historical racism, and how "...they're still not as, um, looked at as equal, we're still not there yet." Kristi French also of Arcadia agreed, saying that the achievement gap exists because "...so many black families live in poverty." Alma McBride from Gresham thought the achievement gap has more to do with "...economical situations as opposed to their race. And, unfortunately, race, or people of color, is directly tied to SES." Alma's colleague Devin Tucker seemed incensed at the question, as if the answer were obvious. He said

Well, um, it's pretty obvious. You know? And unfortunately, I don't know how I can personally be able to overcome it. I mean, when you're looking at the SES and you're looking at where the majority of races are and then you look at the resources that they have, and you look at the fact that public education is funded [inequitably], it seems like it trickles down. It seems like, it's a racist country.

These teachers are careful to tie poverty to racial inequality, but do not say the link is a casual one. These teachers feel that the system of poverty, which is tied to race, is the cause of the racial achievement gap.

Other teachers pointed to there being fewer community resources to explain the achievement gap. Gresham teacher Glenn Gilbert said that the cause of the achievement gap is "...not a simple answer." He elaborated: "part of it is funding of schools, who has what versus others, I just read in the paper in Lincoln City, their schools are short books." He goes on to say that he also read that "pallets of books" were found in several closed Lincoln City schools. Glenn feels that there is a problem with the distribution of resources to city schools, and then at a local level, the distribution of resources that make it to schools. WLHS teacher Derick Williams said "I feel most certainly some of the policies at least the Lincoln City School District that the social promotion and, and a lack of resources and a lack of interventions." While Derick does point to social promotion as a systemic problem, he also cites a lack of resources and interventions that widen the achievement gap. Johanna Ellis, who grew up in Lincoln City, said that she experienced the lack of resources herself in the form of the classes she could take. She said "I couldn't take German, my high school didn't offer it. I wanted to take calculus as a senior, but there were only four kids in my school who were ready for it." In all cases, teachers who cited a lack of resources described systemic debts that were owed to students of color.

A dearth of high-quality early-childhood education was often cited as a cause of the achievement gap. Johanna Ellis from WLHS talked about her job as a high school teacher as being “triage.” She said the greatest need is for “early childhood education. Critical. What I do as a high school teacher, is triage. It’s academic triage.” Her colleague Ginger Strickland agreed when it comes to the cause of the achievement gap, “It’s opportunities in the early childhood education.” She said that often child-care services in the city park a kid in front of the TV, and call that education. She said people need places where “...they take your child to the zoo, and to museums, and plays, and that’s giving them an opportunity to see something outside of their community.” WLHS teacher Rex Simon spoke the most passionately early childhood education in relationship to the achievement gap.

We really, really need quality pre-school, and it should start when they’re three. And they should be free. And it should be really beautiful, inviting atmosphere, for these little kids and place where the parents could drop ‘em off, and if they have to drop ‘em off at six o’clock to make it to their minimum wage job, and can’t pick ‘em up ‘til 6pm, so be it. It should be free. And it should be really inviting, and if they had that, this thing [the achievement gap] would be erased in a matter, honestly, one generation. 15 years.

Teachers spoke about a lack of high-quality early childhood education, and the potential cost of early childhood education as being exacerbating factors of the achievement gap.

Both the quality and cost of early childhood education, especially in urban areas, could be addressed on a systemic level to close the achievement gap.

Teachers also spoke more broadly about opportunity as being the cause of the racial achievement gap. Susie Bridges from Arcadia Elementary said the achievement gap exists because “...on one level it’s because they have not had the educational opportunities.” Gresham teacher Howard Cross tied together location and economic

resources. He said "...I'm not going to so say most, a large number of blacks in this country don't have the same educational opportunities because they come from neighborhoods where they don't have the resources." Rachel McKenzie of Arcadia said that often

They [people of color] don't have the opportunities a lot of times as whites do, um and if, inner cities are usually, um, contain a lot more of the black background, that are struggling not all of blacks, but um the, the blacks that live in a more um rural area, rural area, that have those opportunities they excel, very well, if not better than whites, so I think it's just opportunity.

Teachers who used systemic responsibility to frame the achievement gap spoke about the disproportionate amount of people of color living in poverty, fewer community resources, lack of early childhood education, and lack of opportunity as causes for the achievement gap. Similarly, teachers also relied on the systemic responsibility to frame statements related to closing the achievement gap. Teachers concentrated on three systemic foci when talking about the achievement gap: addressing socioeconomic inequality, increasing child care and early childhood education, and creating community schools that provide education and services beyond traditional models.

Teachers often related the closure of the racial achievement gap to the elimination of poverty. When asked what can be done to close the racial achievement gap, Arcadia Elementary teacher Gregory Wheeler said "I look at it and I realize, socioeconomic, the wealth is a big deal, I'm talking more from just a school perspective, because that's how I see my life in the classroom." He said that socioeconomic inequality is a national problem, and "I'm sure that all ties in to race and socioeconomic, if you just go back to need, it doesn't matter if you live here, do you have the need? Yea? Then we have to fund it." Alma McBride from Gresham talked about families who are unable to spend time

with their children because of the wage gap. "...there needs to be a rise in um, ah, minimum wage haha, um, because the, and that actually has not kept up with growth in other areas, it's incredibly sad." Toni Murphy, who has a portion of her interviewed analyzed in the next chapter, also said that if you want to get rid of the racial achievement gap, "...you have to get rid of the poverty first." Teachers framed the closure of the achievement gap as a systemic issue as they viewed the idea of socioeconomic inequality as a national and systemic problem.

Teachers also identified systemic responsibility in the dearth of early childhood education available to people of color, especially in urban areas. Teachers emphasized the importance of quality early childhood education to closing the achievement gap. Gresham teacher Alma McBride: "I think that a good place to start would be free early learning. For all kids, a place to go. Um, an all-day place to go, so we can try to minimize that gap that's starts out at the very beginning." While Gresham teacher Lillian Thomas had expressed reservations for affirmative action, when it comes to closing the achievement gap, she said "...I don't even mind those early child, for the cities, so universal pre-k for the cities, for areas of concentrated poverty." When asked what can be done to close the achievement gap, Susie Bridges from Arcadia was quick to answer: "Early Childhood. Teaching families to be better, how to be a parent – not that they're not trying." The frame cultural racism slips in to her answer, but she also clearly expressed that there is systemic responsibility for closing the achievement gap, and that early childhood education could be the answer. WLHS teacher Rex Simon was also quick to point to the need for early childhood education to close the achievement gap. He said:

My best idea is, Arne Duncan was just talking about it on the radio today, 40% of the kids that're in the three year old age and up do not have access

to any pre-school. Oklahoma, where they did put it in, any they pushed it, Oklahoma has pre-school and it's free, and it's beautiful, and everything is bright and colorful, and everybody goes, and all of that, and it's like after care in the works, if you had that, that would erase the inequality.

Teachers pointed to universal, free early childhood education as being a systemic solution for the systemic problem of the racial achievement gap, framing their answers with systemic responsibility.

Several teachers pointed out the need for community-oriented schools that are able to provide more than educational services to the community's children. Pat Dunn from WLHS said that "involving the families and communities" is essential in closing the achievement gap. Gresham teacher Sally Bell said "I honestly would want to see more, I'd want to build back the community and community involvement, and community involvement across economic barriers, across cultural barriers, across gender barriers, um, I think working together to solve community problems." Du Bois Elementary teacher Marcia Perry, whose interview is detailed in the following chapter, said "I would make community schools, truly community schools that meet the needs of the community, for this particular community it's the hunger, the homelessness, the addictions." Teachers talked about collaborative community education that addresses many of the problems teachers see in their communities.

Teachers identified socioeconomic problems and early childhood education as they discussed the cause and closure of the achievement gap. Teachers who used systemic responsibility to talk about the achievement gap spoke about systems of people and organizations as important to closing the achievement gap. Systemic responsibility was largely used by teachers to frame the cause and closure of the achievement gap.

Acknowledgement of Race

Teachers who used this frame acknowledged that race exists, and that racism is a problem. They recognized that diversity was important in teacher hiring, and acknowledged the importance of teaching about race in their classrooms, and also acknowledged the importance of splitting up standardized test results by race. Statements framed by the acknowledgement of race were most often strongly color-conscious. Codes found in the acknowledgement of race frame most often co-occurred with codes from the social liberalism frame, and less often with codes in the systemic responsibility frame. Some teachers who employed the acknowledgement of racism frame acknowledged their own privilege, or, often among teachers in urban areas, reported that teachers of color might be better equipped to serve their students.

When talking about hiring a black teacher over a white teacher to increase the diversity of the staff WLHS teacher Pat Dunn acknowledged the value of teachers of color, especially to students in his school. "...it's not uh, unfair at all. You bring in someone to make the staff more diverse, to represent the school and the student body." Crystal Elliot from Du Bois elementary said "I think that even students need to see diversity, I mean, the world is diverse, they need to see diversity in their staff." Arcadia teacher Rachel McKenzie talked about the value of hiring a black teacher over a white teacher for diversity, even in her rural school:

I don't think there's anything wrong with that, I mean, I don't like that they only hired the black person because of that, but, if they have the same criteria, and they're already like doing what they're supposed to be doing, they're really strong teacher, I don't see anything wrong with that because we're pulling something different in to our district and that's called diversity, and they might have something to give to our district that the other person could not. That's actually a positive thing.

First, Rachel says that the abstract liberal idea meritocracy is important, but then she acknowledges that a teacher of color might bring something to Arcadia that a white teacher might not be able to bring. Janet Sharp, another teacher in Arcadia said “I think if, I think you have to have that [diversity]. I think our kids need that they need exposure to difference, diversity.” Her colleague Kristi French gave a bit more detail on the value of teachers when talking about race in the classroom. “I do, however, believe that a black teacher, because of their experiences in the world and because of our society, a lot of racist emotions, that person may be able to offer more insight in to things that the white teacher would not.” Matthew Nichols in Gresham elaborated on the idea of value that a white teacher might not be able to provide.

You know, the majority of the staff is white and they’re teaching a completely African American population, how are you supposed to, because there is this barrier that exists, how are you supposed to convince them that what I’m telling you [is] the way forward. You know, the way forward for you, the way for you to better yourself is this, like prescribe, do well academically, study hard, go to college, when I look completely different and my background is completely different than yours, and I have no idea what you’ve gone through and what you experience every day. The idea of having more African American teachers to relate to students, just on the skin color basis, we have a similar background, we’ve been through similar things, this is the way you overcome that, it’s an important thing to have.

Teachers across urban, suburban, and rural areas used the frame acknowledgement of race to talk about the importance of diversity among the teaching staff in their schools.

Fewer teachers acknowledged race as an important topic to teach in their classrooms. Most teachers who included race in their curriculum included it in a cursory way, saying they teach about the civil rights movement, but do not relate it to individual student experience. Teachers referenced here acknowledged the importance of teaching race in their classrooms, and actively sought to create ties between their students and the

idea of race. Kristi French from Arcadia HS spoke about teaching about race in her literature classroom. When asked if she is obligated to teach about race, she said “I just do. I think it’s important. Especially if they ever leave this area, they’re gonna be in culture shock, and I don’t want them to leave and immediately think that everyone who is not like themselves is a bad person.” Diana Holt, a teacher in Arcadia, talked about teaching her students about the civil rights movement in an effort to get her students to role play what it would have been like to be a student of color during integration, and to think critically about their parents.

Our biggest discussion was calling them “blacks” or “colored,” so we talked about appropriate terms, it’s African Americans some other discussions we’ve had are with Ruby Bridges, we used that as a basis to pretend you are Ruby Bridges, and we went through the whole scenario, and I think that’s when it hit them like wow that wasn’t that long ago, I mean our grandparents were alive, and how far it’s changed.

Pat Dunn at WLHS talked about news events involving racism with his students. He said he talks about

Everything from Ferguson you talk about that in your class to history, in that culture, it’s the lower class vs. the higher class, it always comes down to race, minorities, rich, poor, discrepancies or uh prejudice it always comes up. You know? Almost without making it “make sure you mention race” because it’s part of, you can’t help it, you can’t escape it.

The last part of his statement was said in a matter-of-fact way, as if racism is, unfortunately, part of his and his students’ lives. Rex Simon, also at WLHS, agreed with Pat, saying that all you have to do to talk about race is to “...pull the newspaper out, look at the Ferguson issue, the Trayvon Martin case, [we] do point and counterpoint and discuss that, write persuasive essays, talk about solutions. That’s how you can get in to it in a deep way.” Teachers who acknowledged the role of race in their classroom taught

about race in ways that were color-conscious and progressive, asking students to critically think about issues from Ruby Bridges to Ferguson.

Teachers also acknowledged the role of race the breakdown of standardized test result. While some teachers said immediately that breaking down standardized test results by race was a positive practice, the teachers presented here acknowledged that breaking down standardized test scores by race was, as WLHS teacher Rex Simon said, "...a double edged sword." Teachers who framed breaking down standardized test results by framing it with the acknowledgement of race understood that it is important to identify the systemic effects of racial inequality through these results, but also that the results could be used to tell a story that focused on cultural racism.

Johanna Ellis of WLHS said that breaking down standardized test results based on race said "...it feeds both sides of the – you know it feeds racists who say "look, look how stupid they are! We give them all this money and they're still stupid...and it feeds the other thing, like you're not treating us fairly." Sheryl Garret of Gresham High School echoed Johanna's statement:

...I think the intent is to show that there is an achievement gap, and then use this data to provide additional resources, but I think in practice, what happens is, 'look ah, blacks have lower tests scores, blacks are dumb they should have no extra resources.' I think that's what happens in super laymen's terms, in actuality, I think they, I think some people are thinking 'why should we commit additional resources to people who are underachieving?'

Gresham special education teacher Priscilla Fletcher spoke about kids coming to her upset that they did poorly on standardized tests. She described an instance where she comforted a student of color who immigrated to the United States who cried when she saw her test scores.

And I have to say it's gonna be ok, and, and, no wonder you feel horrible about yourself, we're sitting here, again, crushing these kids before, we're not giving them the same expectations, it's like a marathon runner, here you have a kid that's person A who's training, who has been training for this all of their life, and has been eating right and you know, adequate nutrition and everything, and here's this other kid that just decided, o well, I'm gonna start, I think I'm gonna do a marathon, maybe overweight, not eating, not working out, like, [state] is expecting them to achieve the same time for a marathon. Even though there were a whole bunch of other factors in there. And it's not right. It's not right. But that's what we do.

Teachers who understood that standardized test results could be disparate as a result of inequality acknowledged that the data itself could be used to tell a story of systemic inequality or personal failures. Priscilla illustrated how inequality affected her students personally, and acknowledged the systemic inadequacies of standardized testing in general.

Teachers who acknowledged the value of race in teacher hiring, the value of race in lessons on historical and modern civil rights, and the role of race in the standardized testing results were some of the same teachers who framed statements using social liberalism, recognizing institutional and historical racism. Many of these teachers recognized the value of diversity in teaching staff and curricula, and recognized that standardized test results could be used to tell negative stories about their students. However, it is important to recognize that far fewer teachers used the frame of acknowledgement of race compared to teachers who minimized race.

Conclusion

Of the themes discussed above, two topics were framed more consistently than others across geographic areas. Teachers who talked about increased violence in urban areas as compared to suburban and rural areas most often used the cultural racism frame. They placed the blame for higher levels of violence in urban areas on the "culture" of the

people living in those areas, which they saw as dysfunctional in a variety of ways. Conversely, when talking about the educational racial achievement gap, teachers placed the blame on systemic poverty, a dearth of early education resources, and a lack of high-quality educational experiences.

There is dissonance between these two topics. While a few teachers saw the causes of violence as systemic, the vast majority of teachers placed the blame on people; families and communities who fail to provide their children with the “right” values. Similarly, while a few teachers placed the blame for the achievement gap on individuals, teachers overwhelmingly cited systems as the cause for the racial educational achievement gap. On one hand, teachers characterized education as a systemic problem, and on the other, violence as a personal problem. The competing ideas of systemic versus individual responsibility for violence and the achievement gap are common even among individual teachers’ responses.

Teachers whose data were present within color-blind frames may have also had data present in color-conscious frames within separate topics, or occasionally, within the same topic. Data was presented in this way in order to identify the consistent ways which teachers talk about race and educational issues across all areas, but within specific topics. In the next section, I will examine how teachers’ uses of these frames varied across urban, suburban, and rural settings.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS - TEACHER RACIAL IDEOLOGY

Teachers in urban, suburban, and rural areas framed race and inequality in different ways. I use Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of racial ideology (abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of race), and four frames of color-consciousness that I identified in the data (social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, and acknowledgement of racism), to analyze the ways that teachers frame racial inequality in education. Teachers from all areas framed race and educational issues in a wide variety of ways. There were very few teachers who only used color-blind or color-conscious frames to talk about racial inequality in education. I placed teachers in to three ideological groups in order to compare the racial ideologies of teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia. This chapter will accomplish two goals: first, it will define color-blind, transitional, and color-conscious racial ideologies to describe the range of racial ideologies found in the data. Second, I use those groupings, and the eight frames of racial ideology identified earlier to explain the differences among teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia. I found that teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia employ specific frames within each area to talk about racial inequality in education.

As a researcher I recognize that it is impossible to accurately describe someone else's full racial ideology without knowing their inner thoughts and feelings. In this research, I am analyzing how teachers are presenting and describing their racial ideology. Color-blind and color-conscious frames were present in participant data; I placed teachers

in to color-blind, transitional, and color-conscious groups in order to compare teacher racial ideology across areas of differing racial composition.

Color-Blind Group

Teachers in the color-blind group consistently framed statements using language found in Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blind racism (abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and the minimization of race). There were 11 teachers whose responses overwhelmingly matched language found in Bonilla-Silva's four frames of color-blind racism. Ten of the teachers in the color-blind group whose responses could overwhelmingly be described as color-blind also had a few responses that fit in to one of the four frames of color-consciousness. Only one teacher, Saul Carter – a teacher at Arcadia High School – framed all of his statements solely using the four frames of color-blind racism. I included a short analysis of Saul's interview below to highlight the extreme end of color-blind racial ideology.

Saul is a 55 year old history teacher who has been teaching in Arcadia High School for 24 years. Saul was the only teacher in the study to frame all of his statements using color-blind frames. Saul was also the only teacher to conduct the interview while continuously walking around. He insisted on placing my recorder in his pocket, and was constantly in motion for the duration of the interview. He seemed agitated at the beginning of our interview, but grew more comfortable as the interview progressed, as he seemed to realize that I was not going to challenge his views. Saul said he would “describe himself as a person” when asked to describe his race, simultaneously minimizing race and downplaying the effects of institutional racism. When asked if he would consider marrying out of his race, Saul says

Number one, I don't see any race. Been, flat out, (OK,) no, *let me talk now!* There is one race, that is the human race, there is no Italian, or African American, or anything like that, only one group. And people, and I would say, I'm a Christian person, create, this wasn't evolution, because if you do believe in evolution then it's very easy to be a racist alright? And he drew a lot of his idea from evolution, go to the declaration of independence, and it says 'all men,' that means women too, 'are created equal' stop right there. We are all created equal. Some of us are a little taller or shorter, but we are all human beings. (Emphasis added where respondent looked me in the eyes, pointed his finger at me, and took a step towards me)

His statement begins with an affirmation that he is indeed color-blind, then also minimizes race, and frames all races as being on equal footing, a key part of abstract liberalism.

Saul said that the achievement gap is created by people, and that it is not real.

While he said he does not separate people by race, he goes on to say that the achievement gap exists because "...black people have broken families, and that starts at home, you gotta keep families together." Saul used the frame cultural racism to place blame on individuals, and further characterize black families as broken. Saul would support additional support for urban public schools but "I don't want to see that boost become a hammock." He then said "...let's say a reason that I'm denied going to medical school because I was white or not dark enough, compared to someone else," espousing the abstract liberal ideal of meritocracy, and minimizing race by ignoring that race has a value. Saul said that standardized tests are "more psychological exams" than anything else, and further, "...if you're creating a test to favor one group of human beings to another group of human beings, that is the dirty D word, discrimination, and reverse discrimination is discrimination." Saul then re-emphasized his meritocratic, abstract liberal ideals, saying that if you have a black and white teacher candidate "You take the best. You don't worry about what color they are, you don't worry if they're a man or a

woman, you take the best candidate.” While this example of meritocracy in teacher hiring was extreme, it was also characteristic among teachers who framed teacher hiring using abstract liberal frames.

Saul also taught for two years in Lincoln City; he then talks about different races of kids interacting in his school.

We had our black kids fighting, we had our white kids fight, we had a mix, nobody really said anything about it, I think, it has been created by media. Ah, just by, attitudes people have, a racial test, diversity, all this stuff is building in to this, treat ‘em like a human being, and throw this stuff [the idea of racism] away! Yes, [there are] all white schools, all black schools, when I was in Arcadia high school we had maybe two or three black students, I didn’t know ‘em real well but I knew ‘em, they seemed like standup fellas, I knew they were a little special ed., but that didn’t seem to matter a whole lot to anyone...

As Saul said the words “special ed.,” he hung his head loosely bobbing it back and forth on each syllable of the phrase, and slackened the muscles in his face, while half-closing his eyes. Saul’s statement is consistently color-blind. He framed segregation using naturalization, minimizes race, and then uses the frame cultural racism to tie intellectual disability to a specific race in his school growing up. He ended the interview by saying “...we’re all human beings here, it doesn’t matter what color you are, or what your heritage is, this is America.” Saul believes in the meritocratic United States, equating the principles of color-blindness with being American.

Saul tried to ignore the existence of race throughout our interview, but occasionally framed statements using cultural racism, which helped me recognize that he does in fact attach value to race; his description of people of color that he knew as “...a little special ed...” tie intellectual disability to race. Saul hit on all four frames of color-blindness throughout our interview, but most heavily uses the frames abstract liberalism

and minimization of race. Saul seems to employ cultural racism less often because it may conflict with his ideas about the existence of race and what that construct is used for. However, his statements on violence, the achievement gap, and personal interactions with people of color reveal that he does indeed individual tie qualities to race. Saul's racial ideology may be considered a text-book example of color-blind racial ideology, and can be used to compare the range of ideologies expressed by other teachers as no other teacher in the study used color-blind frames as often and consistently as Saul.

The other ten teachers whom I placed in the color-blind group occasionally mixed in two-frames of color-consciousness during their interviews. These teachers used frames of systemic responsibility which were often bracketed by statements that emphasized personal-responsibility and individual, cultural racism. Arcadia teacher Susie Bridges' statements on the racial achievement gap highlighted the conflict between systemic responsibility and cultural racism:

That, that'd be hard to say. I know on one level it's because they, have not have the educational opportunities. But then, I know if I were to look at, just say [large diverse town's] schools, I know a lot of the black children have, they're getting a good education, but they still don't...I think home values, probably what holds them back the most is that educational isn't valued at home. And, and they come in to school so far behind and, and, to close that gap, is so hard because they need the, you need the home environment.

She starts her statement by pointing out that people who are black have fewer educational opportunities, indicating that there is systemic responsibility for closing the achievement gap. Then, she says that the people in that environment are getting a "good education," then highlights home values as a key problem in the achievement gap, a key component of cultural racism. Seven other respondents who used majority color-blind frames also used language related to systemic responsibility, mostly in concert with statements

related to cultural racism. Aside from Saul Carter, the 10 other teachers in the color-blind group occasionally used color-conscious frames to talk about race and education. However, teachers in this group relied much more heavily on color-blind frames than teachers in other groups.

Transitional Group

There were 18 teachers whose responses used frames from both Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blindness and the four frames of color-consciousness identified in chapter four. I placed these teachers in a category I call "transitional." I chose the term transitional to represent these teachers' ideologies as it represents a point between two competing, and dynamic ideologies.

The 18 transitional teachers used consistently used four frames to describe racial inequality in education: two color-blind frames (cultural racism and minimization of race) and two color-conscious frames (systemic responsibility and social liberalism). While other color-blind and color-conscious frames were also present among these teachers, cultural racism, minimization of race, systemic responsibility, and social liberalism were used by the majority of transitional participants to frame racial inequality in education.

For example, when talking about providing additional funding to address educational debts in urban schools, Joanna Ellis, a Health teacher at WLHS, used both systemic responsibility and cultural racism to describe how she would spend money in urban areas. She opened by framing the problem as systemic: "Early childhood education. Critical. What I do as a high school teacher, is triage. It's academic triage."

She then emphasized that she recognizes her students are behind and that it's difficult to catch up. She said:

...maybe if we could get the kids early enough and educate them in some meaningful way, um, it wouldn't be a vicious cycle of, how many girls are there that are out there having kids right now? Are they going to read to the kids? Is there going to be more [parents reading to kids]? Probably not. I mean, you kinda get what you get.

At the beginning of her answer, Joanna used systemic responsibility to frame the problem of inequitable funding, saying that early childhood education is necessary to address educational debts. During the second part of her answer, she mentioned young women having babies at a young age, and then links young women having babies at a young age with not reading to them, and that they would probably continue the cycle of having uneducated kids. Stating that black women who live in urban areas are more likely to have babies at a younger age and further, that they probably will not read to them fits with Bonilla-Silva's (2013) frame of cultural racism as it places negative values on individual people based on their race.

Howard Cross is another teacher who drew on both color-blind and color-conscious frames to talk about racial inequality in education. Howard, an English teacher at Gresham Middle School, talked about what can be done to increase diversity in the selection of classroom materials in schools. He was animated as he made his statement, gesturing often with his palms out and open. He said:

...maybe through culture. You know, like encourage students to read um, books by black authors, and I just want to say black, but I want to say Hispanic, people who aren't like them, listening to music, um, studying, um, them, and their textbooks, um, it would be nice if we had more - minority teachers but, but that's, I don't think that's the school's fault, I really don't. Yeah, I think it's the system or the fact that many minorities, a lot just don't go in to education, in this school and the high school we have, we have um, an African American [administrator], an [other]

African American [administrator], um, I think we have one of, and they're all good people I know them very well you know, I don't even think of them as black. They're just who they are, and I think the students get to know them as people too so that would help, but I don't know how that happens, but I think it, you know, the government doing things, I think maybe if you really wanted to encourage acceptance of diversity, maybe we could work it in to the curriculum, you know.

At the beginning and end of his statement, he talks about how contact with racially diverse curricular materials could encourage mixing of races in society, and talks about how people of color might be systemically discouraged from going in to education.

These two statements are consistent with social liberalism, a frame of color-consciousness, as they recognize that institutional racism is responsible for a dearth of teachers of color, and a lack of diverse curricular materials. However, in the middle of his statement he frames two black administrators as race-less, saying "I don't even think of them as black," a statement that minimizes the role of race, and is consistent with Bonilla-Silva's (2013) description of color-blindness.

There are teachers in the transitional group who use frames from either color-blind or color-conscious ideologies more than the other. In all cases where teachers leaned in one direction, they still made strong and/or consistent statements using a frame from the opposing ideology. Jacquelyn (Jackie) Alex, another health teacher at West Lincoln High School, recognizes that racism causes much of the inequality she sees in her school, and understands that racism is institutional and systemic. She frames many of her statements using social liberalism, saying that "...a lot of the problems we have, is, it comes down to racism and everything, it stems from, this broken system." She also frequently uses the color-blind frame minimization of race, saying "We're all just human beings!" in relationship to segregation, and saying that hiring an equally qualified black

teacher over a white teacher for diversity “absolutely” discriminates against whites, and also says “I call it reverse racism.” Throughout her interview she leans on frames of color-consciousness related to systemic responsibility and social liberalism to talk about educational inequality. However, she also consistently uses the color-blind frame minimization of race to talk about how race does not, or should not matter in today’s society. While Jackie leans towards color-conscious statements, her consistent minimization of the role of race places her in the transitional category.

Teachers in the transitional group were unaware their discourse often represented two competing ideas. They used language from color-blind and color-conscious frames, sometimes within the same statement, to talk about racial inequality in education. Transitional teachers’ statements most often employed the frames minimization of race and cultural racism from color-blind racial ideology, and systemic responsibility and social liberalism from color-conscious racial ideology. Analysis of teacher discourse in chapter four explains the near omnipresence of two of these frames, as teachers from all areas most often employ the cultural racism frame to talk about violence, and the systemic responsibility frame to talk about the achievement gap.

Color-Conscious Group

There were 14 teachers who overwhelmingly used frames from color-conscious racial ideology to discuss racial inequality in schools. Systemic responsibility and social liberalism were most commonly used by teachers in the color-conscious group. 14 of 15 of these teachers also used the frame acknowledgement of racism to talk about race, and 9 of 15 used language related to constructivism. Like the transitional and color-blind groups, teachers in this group were complex; 13 of 15 teachers used some color-blind

language to frame their talk about race in education. Only two teachers, Janet Sharp at Arcadia High School and Angelo Baker at West Lincoln High School never used color-blind frames to talk about race in relationship to education.

The teachers in the color-conscious group seldom mixed in frames from color-blind racial ideology, but when they did, they most frequently used the cultural racism, and minimization of race frames. Pat Dunn, a social studies teacher at West Lincoln High School, displayed many of the characteristics typical among teachers in the color-conscious ideological group. Pat relied on frames of systemic responsibility, social liberalism, and the acknowledgement of race to talk about racial inequality in education. However, Pat also employed frames of cultural racism when talking about violence and solving problems related to the achievement gap.

For example, when Pat talked about the achievement gap, he leaned heavily on frames of systemic responsibility and social liberalism. He said that messages from society and lack of high quality educational opportunities limit students of color's ability to achieve in urban areas. Pat was seated in a reclining chair across from me. He took a deep breath before he answered, then slowly and deliberately said:

So why don't they achieve? Um, opportunity. Faith in themselves, or others, belief in them, uh, prejudice, discrimination, mindset. Background, and anything and everything that they've been exposed to seems to tell them, that's what you should be, so, I don't believe and I don't think I ever did, but more so now with all of my experience, it is definitely not because they can't achieve. I said that these kids that, the other school, now take that kid from the earliest age, instilling in them that they will achieve, that they can achieve, that they will be the brightest and the best, and have every opportunity to achieve, they're gonna do everything, maybe they won't score as high as everyone else, but they'll go to all the schools that everyone else will go to. It won't begin in 6th grade or even 1st grade, it begins uh, on the first day. The person holding you starts it. So that's why there's an achievement gap. How do you fix

that? How do you get in to every house and tell them that it's not ok. It's not ok not to go to school.

Pat frames a dearth of opportunity as a systemic responsibility, and indicates that the socially liberal ideas of discrimination and prejudice can affect students' ability to see themselves as people who achieve. However, he also indicates that "The person holding you starts it," and that parents are not telling their children that they have to go to school to be successful, indicating that he also believes that parents are also individually responsible for contributing to their child's growth, which is related to the color-blind frame cultural racism.

Pat unequivocally supported additional funding for urban schools, and affirmative action in college admissions. When asked if he would support expanded college admissions based on class rank, Pat said "I would want more. I assure you these kids can do it - they may need some resources to get them [ahead], but they have the intellectual ability to do it." When asked whether hiring a black teacher over a white teacher to achieve diversity among school staff that is 97% white is preferential treatment, Pat said "...it's not discrimination, it's not unfair at all to bring in someone to make the staff more diverse. To represent the community and student body." Pat then asked me why the hypothetical school in my question was 97% white; I turned the question back on him. He said there may be cultural biases in the Praxis testing, and a lack of people in the community who support the teaching profession. Pat supported affirmative action and acknowledged race and racism in his answer about teacher hiring, clearly drawing from both color-conscious frames.

However, as was often the case when teachers spoke of violence, Pat leaned on the color-blind frame of cultural racism to talk about personal responsibility in

communities. Pat believed that violence is the result of students' home lives, saying that a lot of kids need money and jobs, and that the stresses of these things cause them to lash out. In his words, "They're shell shocked. These kids live in a war zone. They live in a very dangerous, scary place. It's not uncommon at all for our kids not to have either parent in a household." Color-conscious teachers in urban areas were more likely than color-conscious teachers in other areas to frame increased violence using cultural racism. Teachers in urban areas often told personal anecdotes about violence while teachers in suburban and rural areas spoke more generally about increased violence in urban areas. A thorough discussion of this difference is presented later in this chapter.

Pat thinks that segregation is a societal issue, and that everyone is at fault. He said "...in this world where we, we co-mingle, co-exist, and co-habitate, you gotta go [to diverse areas]." When asked about what can be done about segregation, Pat suggested that it is a political and socioeconomic issue, then mentions gentrification. Pat does not believe in busing kids outside of the city because he thinks kids would dislike being bused outside of their neighborhoods. Pat is currently engaged to a black woman, said he often thinks about how his child would be biracial, and then said he asks himself where he would want his child to live and go to school. He said he would send his child to a more diverse school at the expense of academics: "I want them to see the cross, across culture. So yes, I'd give up a few points for him to move to a more diverse school." Pat used socially liberal frames to talk about race, and acknowledges the importance of diversity for himself and his family.

Finally, Pat thought that the racial inequality in education is a societal issue, and believes combination of efforts would be needed to close the achievement gap. When

asked about expanded college admissions based on test scores, Pat said, “You said to me about, you know those students getting to college if they’re in the top 10%, how about the top 30? Education is the best thing that we can do for them.” Involving families and communities is key; you have to have buy in from the community. He also mentioned the need for a more diverse teaching population: “...we need more minorities, women, uh, different race, religions, teaching.” Pat’s statements about affirmative action and community engagement fall in to the color-conscious frame of systemic responsibility, while talking about diversity in the teaching population is an acknowledgment of racism as it recognizes a dearth of teachers of color in the teaching population.

While Pat sometimes uses frames of cultural racism to frame statements related to violence, the vast majority of his statements lean on frames of systemic responsibility, social liberalism, and the acknowledgement of racism to talk about race. This is consistent with other teachers in the color-conscious teachers across urban, suburban and rural areas, with the exception of Angelo Baker at WLHS and Janet Sharp at AHS, who used no frames of color-blindness to talk about race and educational issues during our interviews. The overwhelmingly majority of teachers placed in the color-conscious group teach in Gresham or Lincoln City, areas with many students of color. I will describe and discuss the differing racial ideologies of teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia in the following sections.

Ideological Groups in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia

In the following sections, I discuss the racial ideologies of urban, suburban, and rural teachers as a group, then, interview data from teachers in each area are presented in detail to examine how teachers in different areas frame racial inequality in education. I

highlight frames that were nearly ubiquitous or absent in statements by teachers in urban, suburban, and rural teachers are presented to conclude each section. I argue that teachers frame discourse differently depending on their experiences with students of color and people of color in their communities.

Urban Teacher Racial Ideology – Lincoln City

There was significant diversity among teachers at DuBois in how they framed racial inequality. Seven teachers framed statements related to education and race using color-conscious frames, six were transitional, using a mixture of color-blind and color-conscious frames, while two fell in to the color-blind group. A table of teachers and their ideological designation is provided below:

Table 5.1

Lincoln City Teacher Ideological Groups

Color-Blind	Transitional	Color-Conscious
Ginger Strickland	Ruth Wise	Troy Kelly
Olive Coleman	Maureen Banks	Rex Simon
	Marcia Perry	Toni Murphy
	Joanna Ellis	Angelo Baker
	Jacquelyn Alex	Terry Tyler
	Derrick Williams	Pat Dunn
		Crystal Elliot

Only one teacher, Angelo Baker, relied solely on color-conscious language to frame discussions about race and racism in relationship to education. All teachers except Angelo used frames of cultural racism in some of their answers. Urban teachers who used the frame of cultural racism frequently talked about things that they may have seen or heard as they interacted with students: students having children at a young age, parents not reading to children, violence at home, and a lack of coping skills. Teachers in urban

areas also cited the need for parenting classes for their students' parents. Frames that were common among teachers and the implications of those frames are discussed below.

Ideological Commonalities among Lincoln City Teachers

There were several frames that were either nearly ubiquitously present or entirely absent in urban teachers' interviews about race and education. 14 of 15 teachers in urban areas used themes related to the color-conscious frame social liberalism in their interviews. Second, 13 of 15 teachers used themes related to the color-blind frame cultural racism in their interviews. Finally, the color-blind frame naturalization was nearly absent in interviews; only two of 15 teachers' interviews contained this frame.

Urban teachers nearly uniformly framed statements using socially liberalism. Nearly all teachers indicated that institutional racism is present in their communities. For example, Johanna Ellis recognized that race is tied to economic inequality and opportunity. When asked about the achievement gap, Johanna said that it exists because of poverty and "That's it." She said "There are black people in my daughter's school that have the same resources that my daughter is so lucky to have, and guess what, they have money." Descriptions of institutional racism varied. Terry Tyler and Pat Dunn said that disparate results on standardized tests, including the SAT's and Praxis, result in fewer teachers of color. Jackie Alex talked about how money is distributed inequitably to educational and healthcare related institutions in inequitable ways in her community that break down along racial lines. Ginger Strickland talked about how segregation is partly the result of municipalities outside of Lincoln City refusing to exchange students via a busing system, creating concentrated poverty. Derrick Williams spoke about social promotion, lack of resources, and a lack of interventions converge to limit opportunities

for students in his school, comparing the school he teaching in to the resources in his daughter's majority white, suburban school. Crystal Elliot believed that higher performing schools are able to offer more money to teachers who are in high demand, including teachers of color, leaving low-performing urban schools with fewer teachers of color. Socially liberal themes were nearly omnipresent in urban teachers' interviews, including among teachers who framed the majority of their statements using color-blind themes, and were also in transitional teachers' statements. I discuss why I think teachers in urban areas readily frame discourse with social liberalism in the next section.

Interestingly, urban teachers also commonly used cultural racism to frame a variety of topics. 13 of 15 teachers framed statements using some kind of cultural racism (Jackie Alex and Angelo Baker were the exceptions). Eight teachers framed violence as cultural, saying that increased violence in urban schools is the result of violence in students' homes and neighborhoods, or that violence was part of the students' culture. Seven teachers said that the achievement gap is the result of a negative home life, including parents who care too little about education, and expressed the idea that parents in urban areas do not advocate for their children in educational settings enough. Six other teachers indicated that they thought that their students were having children at too young an age, indicating a dearth of sexual responsibility. A total of six teachers indicated that they would like to see parents in their community attend classes intended to improve their interactions with their children. One teacher indicated that the achievement gap is the result of broken homes. While some teachers used the frame of cultural racism more frequently or strongly to frame statements about race and education, nearly all teachers indicated that problems with educational achievement stem from students' culture, home

lives, parents, communities, or sex lives. I discuss why urban teachers might use this frame extensively in the next section.

The color-blind frame naturalization was notably absent from urban teachers' interview responses. Only two teachers, Derrick Williams and Ginger Strickland, used frames of naturalization to talk about segregation. Both teachers said that people gravitate towards people that are like them, and further indicated that people want to live in a community that mimics beliefs and values, indicating that beliefs and values are tied to race. Derrick said "...I think people just gravitate towards their groups," and Ginger said "...likes stay alike, you, you want to be with the people who you know who they are." All other teachers explained segregation as the result of institutional racism, socioeconomic status, redlining, or some form of government intervention. The lack of the naturalization frame in the discourse of urban teachers may speak to their personal experiences in Lincoln City. Urban teachers more readily see the effects of economic segregation and redlining, and may directly attribute segregation to those forces. In this way, Lincoln City teachers can see that segregation is not in fact natural, and instead see it as perpetuated by systemic forces or people.

While the frames social liberalism and cultural racism were nearly ubiquitous among Lincoln City teachers, teachers were reluctant to describe differences between blacks and whites as natural, instead citing specific sources that cause and perpetuate segregation. The consistent use of these frames to talk about race and education differed from frames that were consistently used among both suburban and rural teachers.

Racial Ideology in Lincoln City

Teachers in Lincoln City framed statements related to race and educational inequality more consistently with color-conscious frames than teachers in Arcadia. However, they most often employed two frames on two topics. They used social liberalism to frame institutional racism, and they used cultural racism to frame violence in their school and the surrounding community. Teachers in Lincoln City far more often told personal stories about their students that fell in to these frames, using stories as proof that their beliefs are valid. A story from each of those topics and frames is shared below.

I was introduced to Toni Murphy at WLHS by Rex Simon, whom I had interviewed a few days prior. Toni was walking the halls making sure students got to their classes during a class change when I met her. She was warm and effusive from the start, introducing me to students as we moved through the halls. We found a small room located out of the library, but before we stepped in, Toni caught the eye of a tall student headed to the bathroom. They greeted each other warmly, smiling, and gave each other a small side hug, which seemed natural. They spoke briefly, and then Toni introduced me to the student, telling the student that I was there to do research on teachers. The student made a joke about Toni being a good candidate because she talked a lot, and both Toni and the student smiled and chuckled to each other. Toni excused herself, said goodbye and led me to the classroom.

As it turns out, the student I had just met came up in the first section of our interview. When asked if more money should be allocated to urban schools to reduce the achievement gap, Toni says that more than money is needed to close the achievement gap. She tells me this story about the student I had just met:

Our number one student you just met in the hallway in the way in, who's our number one 11th grader, is homeless right now. Would a teacher know that? They would not know that. I only know that because I spend 90 minutes with her individually each day, you would not know that, she comes to school on time, she gets - she's our number 1 student, she has straight A's she has a great attitude, she's excellent, she's a little socially informed in some ways...you know. So she has no hot food at home. She can't wait to get to school to get hot food, and these couple weeks we don't have hot food [the cafeteria had electrical problems], the girl is hungry. And she's tired, and she's bringing her little sisters all the way from East Lincoln City every morning, but you wouldn't know that unless you're sensitized to some of the things that some of our kids could potentially be going through. Is that a factor of performance in the classroom...when you're greeting a child in the morning and you're yelling at them because they don't have a uniform on, how do you know that they even had a washing machine that was working or a parent that was supportive of that? Or maybe the parent just didn't give them money for a uniform, maybe they have one shirt? You know, I mean, you just, sometimes the way teachers approach the kids, they have no - this kid didn't eat breakfast, you know? Or who knows what happened in the house the night before. And it's not every kid, but you don't know which one it is.

Urban teachers told the stories of their students to illustrate their points. They could see inequality in systems, and understand that their students often experience adverse conditions in their home lives that might affect their performance in the classroom.

Urban teachers used also used stories to portray their students' home and community cultures as violent and dysfunctional. Ruth Wise, a second grade teacher at Du Bois Elementary, asserted that students see violence in their homes and communities, and that this violence is then brought in to schools. She told a story about a student who was exceptionally aggressive in her classroom.

I had, you know, a really violent child you know, in previous years, and he was so, so violent, I mean, he would, you know, at the drop of a dime, um, flip over chairs - he would hit people, stab people with pencils, he would - he tried lighting the school on fire one day. I mean, just, I was aware of his background and it was...abuse. It was violence. And he was actually taught that you get enjoyment from hurting other people, um...it was during this, like, earlier formative years, and that just...carried over. And I

mean, they're learning how to cope and learning how to act, and you know, and I mean - he'd run around the room, and some children you can stop that and you could see, you know, certain trigger behaviors, ok, they're going to get to that point of like blowing up and acting out, rather than being violent - it was a serious case, and his brothers were the same.

Ruth described her student's violent activities as the result of indoctrination from his home life, something she asserts is the cause of violent behavior in other students.

Stories related to aggressive or violent acts in schools were common among teachers in Lincoln City.

Urban teachers' racial ideologies are shaped by what they see in their schools and communities and their interactions with students, and family and community members.

Teachers overwhelmingly recognized that systemic racism exists, and gave examples of it in their schools. Teachers could see and talked about not having school nurses, guidance counselors, books, large class sizes, inconsistent student scheduling, the effects of concentrated poverty, and inadequate and outdated facilities. Ruth Wise at Du Bois Elementary, whose statement on violence are detailed above, spoke about what she needs in her classroom to help close the racial achievement gap:

...I mean it's proven that smaller class sizes, you know, you get results, and still, it took half a year to get 2nd grade to go down from 35 to 27 kids. There are materials available, but just having them organized, and having it easily available, because a lot of materials are just shoved in to like one little area and forgotten about, and then to like, be able to give those materials that are already there to the teachers, and to the students? You know, [they need] books to go home.

Ruth saw materials in her school and in the school district that are not being allocated efficiently, and recognized that classrooms are too full, often for much of the year. She knows that other districts have books that students can take home, and values that for her students. Ruth's statements were congruent with other Lincoln City teachers who

recognized the educational debts in their schools that were not being paid. However, they also saw and talked about violence between students in the school, students dealing drugs, sexual irresponsibility, and single parent homes, framing these things with cultural racism, saying they are students' responsibility, and are inherent. Ruth's framing of violence and the achievement gap were common among teachers in urban areas as they see both racially based inequality, and violence in their schools and communities.

When teachers frame violence using cultural racism and the achievement gap using social liberalism they are delimiting the level at which they are willing to apply their personal analyses of those topics. When urban teachers are saying that institutional racism must be challenged in order to address the achievement gap, they are recognizing a systemic debt owed to their students which should be paid by systems. As they say that increased violence in urban areas is the result of culture, lack of education, or lack of values, they place a negative systemic label on people of color that are applied to individuals within that group. Further, the individuals within those groups are expected to change behaviors that teachers report would decrease violence in urban areas. These individual acts include things like practicing sexual restraint, and being more responsible for their children's education both at home and at school. Teachers may place responsibility on students and families because they see violence being perpetrated by individuals. Conversely, they may look at their students as a group who are affected by fewer educational resources and opportunities, place the blame on systems.

Suburban Teacher Racial Ideology - Gresham

Nearly half of teachers from Gresham fell in to the transitional group, while the remainder were more commonly placed in the color-conscious group, and less commonly

placed in the color-blind group. As the table shows, two teachers framed statements related to education and race using mostly color-blind frames, six used both color-blind and color-conscious statements to frame race, and five teachers used majority color-conscious frames.

Table 5.2

Gresham Teacher Ideological Groups

Color-Blind	Transitional	Color-Conscious
Jennie Barker	Priscilla Fletcher	Alma McBride
Lillian Thomas	Brook Snyder	Devin Tucker
	Sally Bell	Daisy Young
	Katherine Rice	Matthew Nichols
	Howard Cross	Sheryl Garrett
	Glenn Gilbert	

While I placed some teachers in the color-blind group and others in the color-conscious group, in fact no teachers used exclusively color-blind or color-conscious frames. 18% of students in GSD are students of color; teachers had far less contact with students of color than teachers in Lincoln City, and far more than teachers in Arcadia. Teachers in Gresham framed statements more consistently with color-conscious frames than teachers in Arcadia, but used frames that differed from their urban counterparts.

Ideological Commonalities among Gresham Teachers

Several frames were either consistently present or absent among teachers in Gresham. All 13 teachers made statements that fell in to the color-conscious frame systemic responsibility, while 12 of 13 teachers made statements that fell in to the color-blind frame cultural racism. Only three of 13 suburban teachers made statements related to the color-blind frame abstract liberalism, and only two of 13 teachers made statements related to the color-blind frame naturalization.

All 13 Gresham teachers mentioned some kind of systemic responsibility when talking about race and educational issues. All 13 mentioned some kind of systemic responsibility as the cause of the achievement gap, eight talked about systemic responsibility for closing the achievement gap, and three mentioned systemic responsibility as the cause for increased violence in urban areas.

When talking about systemic responsibility and the achievement gap, most teachers spoke about there being fewer resources due to poverty. Devin Tucker, an Art teacher at North Gresham Elementary, said

...when you're looking at the SES and you're looking at where the majority of races are, and then you look at the resources they have, and you look at the fact that public education is funded by property tax, it seems like it's a racist country.

Alma McBride echoed his statements: "...it's all tied together, but more to do with economical situations as opposed to race...[however] race, or people of color, is directly tied to SES." Other teachers were less explicit when talking about race and socioeconomic status. Priscilla Fletcher, Daisy Young, Sally Bell, Sheryl Garrett, Howard Cross, Lillian Thomas, and Glenn Gilbert said that poverty and lack of resources were responsible for the achievement gap, but did not explicitly mention race in their answers. Priscilla Fletcher, Katherine Rice, Howard Cross, and Lillian Thomas expressed that there were fewer educational opportunities in areas with students of color, which led to an increase in the achievement gap. Teachers in Gresham recognized that systemic poverty causes educational inequality, but they do not tie race to educational inequality.

Eight of 13 teachers also felt that systems are responsible for closing the racial achievement gap. Four of 13 teachers felt that universal child-care and early childhood

education would be instrumental in closing the achievement gap. Priscilla Fletcher said to "...give them supports at the elementary level, to get them foundational skills, maybe it would help to keep some kids back in school..." Three teachers said it was necessary to address socioeconomic inequality to address the achievement gap. Two teachers would like to see increased funding for schools with majority students of color. Another two thought a reorganization of schools to increase community involvement in education would close the achievement gap. Sally Bell said she would like to see more community involvement across economic, cultural, and gender barriers. She said she would like to work together to solve community problems: "I'd implement strong service learning, project learning and community interactions." Sally was focused on community-oriented solutions to problems in her community. Throughout her interview, she drew on frames of systemic responsibility and offered solutions that incorporated the thoughts and ideas of the people living in Gresham.

Devin Tucker, Alma McBride, and Brooke Snyder all felt there was systemic responsibility for increased violence in urban areas. Only two other teachers in the study sample used the systemic responsibility frame to talk about increased violence in urban areas; one each in Lincoln City and Arcadia. Devin Tucker grew up in a family that frequently required government assistance to get by. He went to racially diverse rural schools where concentrated poverty was the norm. "...there was clearly a hierarchy, like you had to fight to prove yourself, daily I would have, um, situations where there was a potential fight." He said that people living in urban areas are in survival type-situations, and that schools are often unaware of what is happening at home. He said he often thought he would like to say to his teachers "don't talk to me about algebra when I just

barely got here today.” He understands that systems of concentrated poverty create more stress for students, and that can lead to violence as they did in his own life. Devin said “It’s a harder life for those kids,” a statement which he seemed to own. Devin talked about his own experiences with poverty as an example of the stress you can be under, and said that he often felt like he had to be violent to protect himself in his community.

Brook Snyder agreed that poverty is the main cause for increased violence in urban areas, but that you can teach students to manage their anger in different ways.

People are, are born noble in their pursuit. They want to be better people, many people don’t have the skill set in order to do that, so if we’re educators, we’re part of that, we have to start to look at, at, character empowerment, in our schools.

All three teachers who talk about systemic responsibility related to violence acknowledge that poverty plays a role in the systems that create violence, and offer different reasoning to explain it, or provide systems based solutions to reduce violence. While these teachers used systemic responsibility to frame violence, two of the teachers listed here, in another part of their interviews, also framed parts of their statements on violence using the color-blind frame cultural racism. This highlights how quickly teachers can switch frames, even within individual answers. Teachers who used both frames to talk about violence were unaware they were using different language to talk violence in their answers.

Every teacher in Gresham used the color-conscious frame systemic responsibility to talk about racially based educational equality and rarely, violence. However 12 of 13 teachers, including Devin and Brook, also used frames of cultural racism to frame violence in urban areas. Half of Gresham teachers also used cultural racism to frame the cause for the achievement gap, and two teachers used cultural racism to talk about how the achievement gap should be closed.

The most obvious cultural racism frames came from teachers who literally said that violence is cultural. Jennie Barker said about increased violence in urban areas “it’s their culture, in their neighborhoods, all they do is fight, nobody talks, as soon as someone does something wrong they fight, so it’s a learned behavior.” Katherine Rice said violence is the result of “...upbringing, and the culture that surrounds them--they don’t get enough encouragement from their parents to study, and enough, they don’t understand how important it is.” Glenn Gilbert was sitting across from me at a large, black lab table when I asked him this question. He paused for a few seconds, leaned forward in his seat, and slowly said “there’s a culture of ‘this is how it is,’ and it’s awfully hard to break.” Glenn seemed to reluctantly acknowledge the complacency of people in urban communities, and does not have a concrete answer to this problem. Other teachers pointed to home life and neighborhood as the source of the problem. Priscilla Fletcher blamed parenting, “...or lack thereof...” for increased violence, indicating that she believes urban parents of color lack the skills necessary to help their children remain non-violent.

Devin, also mentioned above as a teacher who framed violence as systemic, thought that parents are unable to provide their children with appropriate coping strategies to deal with anger. Others blamed violence on a lack of two-parent families, or young parents. Howard Cross said that it’s a result of families that have only one parent, and that these families lack time to “...teach their kids what’s right and wrong, but I think a lot of it has to do with competition, you know?” It seems that while suburban teachers believe there is systemic responsibility for the achievement gap, they rely more heavily on personal responsibility to explain increased violence in urban areas.

Half of Gresham teachers framed statements related to the cause of the achievement gap using cultural racism. All teachers who talked about cultural racism in relationship to the achievement gap talked about how parents should be responsible for their children. Sally Bell said there are more "...dysfunctional African American families..." Katherine Rice believed the achievement gap comes from negative home life: "...upbringing, and the culture that surrounds them. They don't get enough encouragement from their parents to study, and enough, they don't understand how important it is." Teachers in Gresham placed a high value on education at home while labeling parents of color as "dysfunctional" and lacking education. It is important to note that all six teachers who mentioned cultural racism in relationship to the achievement gap fell in to the transitional or color-blind ideological groups. This may indicate a relationship between teachers who use the frame cultural racism to talk about the achievement gap and the concurrent use of other color-blind frames on other topics.

Two teachers made statements about closing the racial achievement gap that drew from the cultural racism frame. Katherine Rice said there is a correlation between educational level and birthrate, implying that people of color have lower educational levels and that is related to having children earlier. She also pointed out that "...whites have fewer children," and that parent education is important in closing the achievement gap, implying that parents of color are uneducated. Katherine normalized whiteness by indicating that whites have fewer children, implying that blacks are sexually promiscuous or irresponsible. Priscilla Fletcher said there should be more parental responsibility for children in urban areas: "there has to be some sort of parental accountability, that's across the board, working phone numbers, you are expected to attend all conferences." Similar

to teachers who used cultural racism to frame the cause of the achievement gap; these two teachers expect urban families to be accountable for their children's education regardless of their home lives.

Two frames were notably rare in suburban teacher interviews. Teachers rarely used the naturalization frame to talk about differences between people of color and whites or segregation, and teachers rarely used abstract liberalism to talk about teacher hiring and fairness, which was similar to teachers in Lincoln City. Only two teachers in Gresham used naturalization to discuss segregation, while far more teachers described social structures that exacerbated segregation, framing statements using constructivism. Similarly, only three teachers used frames of abstract liberalism to rationalize teacher hiring or talk about fairness in resource allocation. Far more teachers used frames of social liberalism to talk about teacher hiring and equitable resource allocation. The two teachers who fell in to the color-blind group in Gresham both used frames of abstract liberalism and naturalization in their interviews, while teachers in the transitional and color-conscious groups rarely used those frames.

Teachers in Gresham used frames of systemic responsibility to describe the achievement gap and closing the achievement gap while relying on frames of cultural racism to describe increased violence in urban schools. It is interesting to note that teachers who used frames of systemic responsibility to talk about the achievement gap often used frames of cultural responsibility to talk about violence. Similarly, Devin and Brook talked about both the systemic causes for violence in urban areas, but also mentioned personal responsibility in their answers on violence. While there was some dissonance among individuals, all suburban teachers used frames of systemic

responsibility, and most used frames of cultural racism to talk about issues related to race and education.

Racial Ideology in Gresham

Gresham School District has far fewer students of color than LCSD, but still a much higher percentage than in Arcadia. Teachers in Gresham have less contact with students of color living in poverty than their counterparts in Lincoln City, which may cause them to miss links between systemic responsibility and institutional racism.

However, their contact with more students of color than teachers in Arcadia may explain their increased use of color-conscious frames when compared to teachers in Arcadia.

Teachers most often used two frames to talk about racial inequality in education. Every teacher in Gresham used systemic responsibility to frame some topic related to racial inequality in education, and often told personal stories to illustrate their belief in systemic responsibility. They described Lincoln City schools as lacking books, having large class sizes, and providing fewer opportunities than their own school, indicating that they realize their schools have resources that are not available in Lincoln City. Like teachers in Lincoln City, teachers in Gresham also framed increased violence in urban areas through the lens of cultural racism, often spoke about increased violence as something that is foreign to them.

In an era where standardized testing and accountability have permeated the educational world, it follows that teachers in Gresham framed racial inequality in education as systemic. Teachers in Gresham could literally see students of color having disproportionate amounts of trouble in classes, or absent from higher-level courses altogether. While they could have chosen to rely on personal responsibility to explain the

achievement gap in their schools, many teachers instead chose to blame disproportionate amounts of poverty, especially among people of color in their community. Howard Cross talked about the tracking system in his school as being responsible for a lack of students of color in his high-achieving classes. He said he asked administration why there were no students of color in his classes. He gestured with his hands as he spoke, palms facing up, shrugged his shoulders and showed both open palms to me as he finished his statement:

From what I was told, the disparity is because of the [standardized test] scores so if they chose the students in my class for their writing scores like they said they, did, if we have 15% of the school is black, well 15% of my students are not African American. I have a few, I have like four Asian students, a few, maybe one Hispanic student, and I'm not making a judgement [about these students based on their race], I'm telling you what I have.

Howard recognized and questioned institutional racism within his school, then identified disparate standardized test results as being responsible for the lack of students of color in his class. Many of the examples of systemic responsibility in Gresham were accompanied by a specific example.

Sheryl Garrett is married to a man who is black, a fact she reveals to her students when asked. She said in her interview that her students of color's attitudes changed when she revealed this fact to them. When talking about hiring black teachers for diversity in staff, Sheryl said that having staff students can relate to is important, and that more weight should be given to hiring teachers of color because they are essential in schools.

...you have to have diversity in your staff. Because our children cannot relate. They've told me that, they tell me that all the time. They tell me 'Mrs. Garrett, you're just a light-skinned black person.' That's not - I used to go home crying. Like woooooow. These kids they have no one. But, yea I don't get that as much. We need more black teachers.

Sheryl places high value on racial diversity in staff, and supports hiring black teachers over white teachers for diversity at a systems level as a direct result of her home life, and her personal experiences with students. Sheryl revealed to me that she has been with her husband when he has tried to hail a cab in Lincoln City, and no one would stop. She said has been in stores where her children were followed while they were shopping as if staff expected them to shoplift. She recognized how racism affects her life and the life of her children, and realizes that white teachers will not relate to students the same way a black teacher would as a result of shared, racialized experiences.

Teachers in Gresham used the systemic responsibility frame often, but did not always tie it to race, focusing on poverty instead. While poverty falls under the frame systemic responsibility, if it is not tied to the frames acknowledgement of race or social liberalism, the argument that poverty is responsible for racial inequality in educational systems becomes weaker. The argument that poverty alone causes the achievement gap is weaker because it ignores modern examples of institutional racism, and ignores the effects of historical racism that perpetuate inequality. In order to comprehensively challenge systemic inequality, one must acknowledge that one's race has value, and that the value of one's race affects their life experiences and outcomes. Addressing systemic poverty is important, but addressing the achievement gap is not possible without acknowledging the role of race in systems of inequality.

Like urban teachers, teachers in Gresham also frequently framed violence using language found in the frame cultural racism. Rather than identify increased violence in their communities, they talked about the responsibility of families that seemed distant from their geographical location. They told far fewer personal stories about violence

while continuing to frame urban students and families as inherently violence. Daisy Young, a teacher who is part of the color-conscious ideological group in Gresham, framed statements using social liberalism, systemic responsibility, and the acknowledgement of race up until we talked about increased violence in urban schools. She talked about urban families as having bad values, and as uninterested in becoming educated. She also talked about a lack of values among families of color outside her community; they exist in a foreign place: the city, and they do not apply to the families she sees. When asked why there might be increased violence in urban areas, Daisy said

I would put it back to, um, values. You know, you're not valuing your education, then you're not invested in it and if you're not invested in it you're gonna find other things to worry about and other things to do. You know if you're invested in doing well, getting good grades to stay on the track team to get that track scholarship, um, then you hopefully would be more invested in the, you know, I also think I also think violence is easy to come by when there's less education at home um, typically, that's my assumption um, so again, it's that cyclical ah, thing, black or white, if there's violence at home, if you're not educated there's more chance of violence at home and that just continues. And those families struggle in the cities.

Daisy used color-blind language as she talks about violence. She talked about violence as being perpetrated by people who are less educated, characterizing families of color as uneducated. She recognized that families in cities are struggling, but attributed that struggle to violence inherent in the community and a lack of education at home.

Teachers in Gresham understood that systems affect individuals, but they link systems of power to race less often than teachers in Lincoln City. Further, teachers in Gresham characterized urban families as having a lack of values, and mostly think of violence as cultural, key elements of the cultural racism frame. They also believed that increased violence among people of color does not pertain to families living in their

community, instead explaining increased violence as something that happens in cities. They held families of color in their community up as exemplars of non-violent behavior, even as they recognize institutional racism within their schools.

Rural Teacher Racial Ideology - Arcadia

Half of the teachers in Arcadia School District (ASD) were placed in the color-blind group, while the other seven teachers were placed in transitional or color-conscious groups. Seven teachers framed statements related to race and education using color-blind frames, four used both color-blind and color-conscious statements to frame their responses, and three teachers used majority color-conscious frames. A table of teachers and their ideological group is provided below:

Table 5.3

Arcadia Teacher Ideological Groups

Color-Blind	Transitional	Color-Conscious
Amelia Harris	Diana Holt	Rachel McKenzie
Kristina Myers	Al Matthews	Janet Sharp
Gregory Wheeler	Casey Stevenson	Kristi French
Janelle Ness	Oliver Lindsey	
Katrina Massey		
Susie Bridges		
Saul Carter		

Two teachers in ASD used all color-blind or color-conscious frames to talk about race. Saul Carter was the only participant in the study to frame all statements using color-blind frames, and Janet Sharp was one of two participants in the study to frame all statements using color-conscious frames. Teachers in Arcadia have little contact with people of color. 13 of 14 teachers interviewed were born and grew up in Arcadia, then returned to teach. Contact with people of color in Arcadia is limited to a public bus that brings workers of color to Arcadia from a large, diverse town nearly 20 miles away.

Ideological Commonalities among Arcadia Teachers

Teachers in Arcadia used the frames minimization of race and naturalization far more than teachers in suburban and rural areas. 12 of 14 teachers used the minimization of race frame in their interview. Teachers in Arcadia minimized race across a wide variety of topics. Half minimized race when talking about standardized testing. When asked if we should continue splitting up standardized test results by race, Amelia Harris said “I don’t think you should be dividing people by race, I just don’t.” Janelle echoed that sentiment: “I think you should mix them all together and not say either or.” Casey Stevenson simply said “I don’t agree with it...because opportunities for students to experience things outside of school are completely different and the - ethnicity should not matter.” Casey recognized that experiences outside of school might be different in different areas, and thereby recognized that areas have differing levels of racial composition. However, at the end of her statement she leans on color-blind thinking, negating the role of race in the educational racial achievement gap.

Teachers also commonly minimized race when talking about racism. Al Matthews had this to say about the events in Baltimore:

Um, well. clearly the, you know the, civil rights violations that have taken place against African Americans, against black people, slavery, definitely was an example, um, you know there - I would, I would even say things like - things that are currently going [on], well, have gone on with our - attorney general who just exited, who to me anyway seemed like he was far more enthusiastic about prosecuting civil rights cases against one race [whites] than he was against another, so to me that was racism also. I don’t believe that, ah, someone’s ethnic background should have anything to do with the way they’re treated. Or someone is treated differently because of the color of their skin or the way they look, to me that’s racism

Kristi French said “Honestly, I think so many things are made about race when they shouldn’t necessarily be,” when talking about racism. Similarly, Katrina Massey talked about how she feels that people of color use racism as an excuse.

Um, well it’s been in the news a lot where, policemen go after black people and then they say it’s only because of being black, and sometimes, I don’t know if I always think that’s a correct thing, sometimes they use that as an excuse, I don’t mean just them, just other people, racism as an excuse for, for things that happen. That’s what I guess is the most obvious answer you see on the news.

The sentiment among these teachers is the same: they all feel that race is not as salient as it is made out to be in the media, and that people who play the “race card” are over exaggerating the role of race in their daily lives.

Teachers in Arcadia also commonly minimized race when talking about whether they were obligated to teach about race in their classrooms. Gregory Wheeler issued this color-blind statement minimizing the role of race in his daily activities:

...it’s not, ‘just be kind to these people.’ No, it’s ‘be kind to people.’ You know, be responsible, you know act responsibly. It’s more of the fact. Like, I don’t, again I don’t think of it as race, like I treat ‘em all the same, I don’t care if they’re kids from overseas, we all treat each other the same. I have two words on my board, one is a giant respect, and the other is effort, you know and It really has nothing to do with if you’re boys or girls, you’re African American, you’re white, Latino, it doesn’t matter to me, we’re all here together working together. We push teamwork a lot, so it really doesn’t, it doesn’t matter one bit. My goal is to get them moving forward...

His statement reveals color-blindness on a personal level, while ignoring the role of race in systemic disadvantage. Janelle Ness talked about a story she reads in her class, because she felt that segregation does not exist today.

Yes it comes up, we do have a story in our book, what is it called, if I can think of it, but it’s about Jim Crow laws, and segregation, so the kids are really interested in it, and it’s funny because they don’t see that now. This generation coming doesn’t see that as much as our generation, the

generation before. They, if you ask them, when we talk about it, they don't look at someone as color, they're ok with it. They have friends that are colored - that are black, so we discuss it. Do we have to? No.

Other teachers say simply say that they are not obligated to talk about race in their classrooms. In all cases, teachers believe that historical and systemic racism no longer exists, and that acknowledging the role of racism would be to legitimize beliefs about modern social systems that are untrue.

Teachers also commonly minimized the role of race when talking about hiring teachers who are black to increase diversity in the school. Diana Holt: "I think it should go by qualification, period." Other teachers went out of their way to make sure I understood race should not matter. When asked if it was preferential treatment to hire a black teacher over a white teacher for diversity, Janelle Ness said

What do you mean preferential treatment? Do I think they should? No. I think the position should go to the best no matter what color you are. But that happens. Because everyone has to have so many black people amongst their staff.

Oliver Lindsey felt that the majority opinion in society would be to hire the black teacher for diversity, and stuck by his decision to hire teachers based on merit.

...see I'm on the wrong side of this, because I feel that it's your qualifications, it shouldn't be anything about what you look like, so if you're more qualified, and if you're a black guy and you're more qualified, and you get the job, I'm not gonna hold it against you personally, I'll probably have something to say about the district, you know, jeez.

All of these statements on teacher hiring employ the abstract liberal ideal of meritocracy to talk about teacher hiring while ignoring the historical and systemic effects of racism.

These teachers minimize the importance of race in society by legitimizing the dominance of white teachers in educational settings.

Other teachers minimized the negative effects of race in relationship to the allocation of resources. For example, in response to a question about closing the achievement gap, Janelle Ness explained,

Just make everyone equal, all the same playing field, you don't get special treatment if you are black, you don't get special treatment if you're Spanish, everyone is equal. And I think that's what we have to come to, nowadays, if you're black and you're low income, you get treated differently. You get a better shot at things. I could see why you wanna do that, but I don't think it's fair.

Janelle thinks that low income students of color are conferred advantages that are not had by her students, thereby minimizing the negative effects of race and racism. In all, rural teachers minimized the role of race and racism in society far more often, and in response to far different questions, than teachers in urban and suburban areas.

The naturalization frame was also far more common in discourse among teachers in the Arcadia School District. Overwhelmingly, teachers used this frame discussing segregation. Teachers in Arcadia thought that "...[it's] just where people live and how it is." Dianna Holt echoed that statement saying about segregation "I don't think it's anybody's fault I just think it's a matter of culturally where these people are choosing to live," implying that it is people of color who segregate themselves from whites. Susie Bridges agreed. "It's where they choose to live..." Susie, like Diana, implies that it is "they," people of color, who are choosing not to live in majority white areas.

When asked who is to blame for segregation, Arcadia teachers often deflected the question. Al Matthews:

I'm gonna have to go with, I don't think it's anyone's fault - I, I, I don't know enough about why that has not occurred, why we don't have - I honestly, I don't know, I never really thought about why that might be, but you're right, haha, I know that's true, there is very little, and, um, without really knowing the reason why, I can't really give you much better answer

than I don't think it's anybody's fault, I guess I can't really pin the blame on anyone at this point

Kristina Myers agreed, saying "I don't think it's really anybody's fault, I mean it's there, there's no reason for it not being blended or mixed..." Neither of these teachers can give a reason segregation might exist, instead implying that it is a natural effect. Both teachers also deflected blame for segregation, saying they had no reasons why segregation exists.

Teachers who used themes of naturalization to talk about segregation and desegregation across all areas all felt that no one was to blame for segregation. However, far more teachers in Arcadia stuck to this sentiment, and far fewer recognized that segregation was caused by redlining, government intervention (or lack thereof), and racism. Teachers in the Arcadia School District were far more likely to minimize the role of race when talking about standardized testing, racism, whether they are obligated to teach about race, teacher hiring, and the achievement gap. They more frequently leaned on frames of naturalization to talk about segregation in the United States. They often said either that segregation was a result of where you choose to live, or blamed people of color for not moving in to white communities like theirs.

Racial Ideology in Arcadia

Arcadia School District is located in a community that is nearly entirely white. When teachers talked specifically about people of color in their community, they directly referenced two black families who lived in town. In addition, 13 of 14 teachers interviewed grew up in Arcadia. As a result, teachers and community members in Arcadia have few experiences with people of color in their day to day lives. Minimizing the role of race was common among teachers in Arcadia. This should come as no

surprise, as they did not see race as a salient issue in their everyday lives. In other words, because Arcadia overwhelmingly white, race did not “matter” to the teachers there.

Teachers talked about racism as either something that was far away, or simply said that they have little experience with issues related to race and education. When asked about the achievement gap, Gregory Wheeler said

That’s hard for me to answer because my whole career has been in an area of 99[%] white, well middle class, and we certainly have our fair share of economically disadvantaged students, especially at this building, and I realize that’s a far cry from [Lincoln City], I know a little background for my sister, and some of her schools free or reduced [lunch] would be 100%, it’s hard to speak on that because I haven’t been on that experience ever, I’ve always been here.

Teachers said that they knew little about racially based educational inequality because it is something that they have not experienced. Janet Sharp, who more consistently framed her statements with color-conscious frames than any other teacher besides Angelo Baker from WLHS, also expressed that she felt unqualified to speak on some of the issues presented in this study. Janet, who includes herself in the “us” of Arcadia, talks about recognizing systemic need, but also admits that she does not know what it is like to grow up in a city.

...more money should go to Lincoln City schools because there are huge numbers of people there, certainly we need the adequate funding in this area, but demographically there are so many more people and needs, so they should be taken care of, because we’re not hurting up here that bad. We have no concept of what life is like in the inner city, none whatsoever, so that’s why I’m not sure my answers are any good.

Janet, a life-long resident of Arcadia and consistently color-conscious teacher, questioned her validity to answer these questions and speak on these topics. She recognized that she has little experience with students and people of color, and felt that because she comes from an area with few people of color, she is unqualified to speak about race. However,

Janet also mentioned her own privilege in our interview and framed many of her statements using social liberalism, indicating that she recognized the way that race operates on a systemic level. This systemic understanding of the value of race and the effects racial value may have helped Janet adopt color-conscious racial ideology.

Teachers in Arcadia at all levels more often frame racial inequality in education using color-blind frames because they have little contact with people of color. Because whiteness has been normalized in the United States, teachers in Arcadia can ignore issues of race outside of their community, and instead focus on personal responsibility.

Teachers in Arcadia want students of color to be successful in their school and in schools in cities, and consistently invoke meritocracy, equality, minimization of race, and personal responsibility to hold everyone to the same standards that are present and important in their community. They used color-blind frames, including minimization of race, more often because race does not appear to be a salient issue in their community. Teachers in Arcadia have not had the personal experiences with race that many students in Gresham and Lincoln city have had. They hold students in all areas to the same standards because they do not view race as having value in their community, or in larger society.

Critical Self-Reflection

Though teachers from Lincoln City and Gresham framed more of their statements using color-conscious frames, there were times of critical reflection on their own thoughts that caused teachers to pause and think about their place in racialized American society. I want to share a short anecdote by Marcia Perry in Lincoln City to highlight an instance of critical self-reflection.

Marcia is a 52 year old second grade teacher at Du Bois Elementary in Lincoln City. She had always wanted to be a teacher, but has only been teaching for six years. Marcia used a combination of color-blind and color-conscious frames in her interview, but was clearly actively assessing her ideological stances as the interview progressed, at one point even questioning her legitimacy to teach students of color in her school. There were three clear points during our interview where she questioned why she was giving an answer related to race in a way that showed she was examining her own perceptions and beliefs about race. As I was finishing the interview protocol, it became clear that she had something on her mind; she shifted in her seat often, and looks of concern were passing across her face during pauses. After the final question, I asked her if she had something she would like to add. She paused, looked down at her hands, sighed, then looked me in the eye, and said

...you know when I started, I really, I - when I was in 1st grade – Ms. Joan, I was in love with Ms. Joan, and I then wanted to be a teacher all my life, and then I went to college and I went in to the theater, and boom there I was, and I think part of it was I worked in a non-profit - all my life, I've always worked in a non-profit, and, oh my god, I was so hyped up when I became a teacher at the age of 46! I was HYPED. I was ready. To. Change. *The neighborhood*, I was ready to get in there, and lift kids up by their boot straps and MAKE them succeed, and I'll tell you after 6 years?...There are days that I go home that I *hate* my job. Because it's - I could cry, I'm gonna cry, because, oh my god, I'm sorry (that's ok, people cry, it's ok) it's just, I don't know how to help them. I really am not equipped to deal with kids that are homeless, or kids whose mom is a drug addict, and this kid comes with these - just, he's so hungry for affection, and, for food! And he *doesn't* understand, and he *can't* do it, and It's – It's making me hate my job a little bit, it's not that I don't want to know, I don't know how to help 'em. I could see how people burn out, I'm a little on the burn out side, I'm sorry, I'm so embarrassed. (No, don't be embarrassed.) Did anybody else cry in this? (Yes) ok goood! It's very, it's just very, very, hard job. Especially when I'm not really qualified to do it. (Emphasis added)

Marcia clearly cares deeply about her students. In this statement alone, she recognizes systemic debts owed to her students, and recognizes that she's often incapable of paying those debts.

However, active critical reflection of one's racial ideology was rare. Most commonly, critical reflection occurred among teachers who held more color-conscious racial ideologies. Perhaps this is a result of these teachers recognizing institutional and systemic racial inequality, and actively assessing their own beliefs against what they know about these structures. However, most teachers confidently espoused their beliefs whether color-conscious or color-blind with little critical reflection.

Conclusion

Teachers' interview responses fell in to a range of color-blind and color-conscious frames. I placed teachers in to categories to compare them across geographic areas. Teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia used different frames to talk about their experiences with students of color based on their personal interactions with those students. Teachers in Lincoln City told personal stories about their students supporting the assertion that institutional racism exists in schools, but also that parents and family members are responsibly for increased violence in their communities. Gresham teachers also told personal stories that corroborated their beliefs that there is systemic responsibility for racial inequality both in their schools and in larger society. Unlike Lincoln City teachers, Gresham teachers described violence as something that occurred outside of their community, but like Lincoln City teachers, they placed the blame for increased violence in urban communities on the residents of those areas. Nearly all teachers interviewed in Arcadia grew up there, and returned to teach. These teachers

rarely had day to day interactions with people of color as they were growing up, and as they continue to live and work in the Arcadia. Arcadia teachers consistently minimize race because whiteness and belief in personal responsibility and meritocracy has been so thoroughly normalized in their community. Because race is absent from their immediate community, they continue to teach meritocracy, fairness, choice, and individualism in their communities as racial inequality is all but absent from their communities.

Teachers who teach in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia framed race differently based on their experiences with race in their communities. They drew on personal experiences (or lack thereof) to explain racial inequality in education. They unconsciously drew on color-blind and color-conscious frames as they spoke about racial inequality in education, and often changed the frames they employ as the topic changed. This study reveals that teachers frame racial educational inequality differently as the demographics of their community change.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

I designed and conducted this research to meet two goals: identify the discourse used by teachers across geographic areas to talk about racial inequality in education, and describe the differences in racial ideology among teachers teaching in areas of differing racial demographics. I believe conducting this research is important as each teacher has the potential to shape the lives of hundreds of students. Further, research has shown that teachers who have color-blind racial ideologies negatively affect the educational experiences of students (Dee, 2005; Diamond et al, 2004; Morris, 2005).

There were three main findings that resulted from my analysis of teacher responses to questions related to racial inequality in education: First, I identified four original frames of color-conscious racial ideology present in the data. I used these four frames of color-conscious racial ideology in conjunction with Bonilla-Silva's (2013) frames of color-blind racial ideology to describe the range of racial ideologies found among teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia. Second, I found that teachers across Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia often framed topics related to racial inequality in education similarly across those areas. I found that teachers in Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia framed increased violence in urban areas and schools using the cultural racism frame, and the cause and closure of the achievement gap using the systemic responsibility frame more consistently than all others, revealing that teachers frame some topics similarly across areas of differing racial composition. Third, I found that while teachers' discourse related to violence and the achievement gap were similar

across all areas, analyses of teacher racial ideologies using the eight frames of color-conscious and color-blind racial ideology reveal that teachers within Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia employ specific frames within each area to talk about racial inequality in education. Further, teachers in Lincoln City and Gresham framed racial inequality in education more consistently using color-conscious frames than teachers in Arcadia, indicating that contact with outgroup members also shapes teacher racial ideology. I discuss the implications of these findings below.

Theoretical Implications: Color-Conscious Frames

I used open coding of data in order for new themes to be more easily identified. As I coded data and developed code families, it became clear that Bonilla-Silva's (2013) four frames of color-blind racism were present in the data. Codes I had created during open coding related to color-blindness were grouped within these four frames. The remaining data consisted of statements that recognized institutional racism, understood how systems of power affect individual people, and recognized that race is socially constructed and has value in the United States. These teachers' answers did not fit within the color-blind frames as they were related to color-conscious racial ideology.

Bonilla-Silva's (2013) frames of color-blind racial ideology were obvious in teachers' responses. However, I identified four code families that were related to color-consciousness that were not yet theoretically embedded in the literature. I defined each family based on each family's overarching themes among codes, and created a name for each code group that I thought was consistent with Bonilla-Silva's naming of his four frames of color-blind racism. I named these four code families social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, and acknowledgement of race. These code

families became my frames for color-conscious racial ideology, and significantly aided in data analysis.

Bonilla-Silva (2013) has identified color-blind racial ideology as the most common racial ideology among white Americans. However, my findings give more reason to be hopeful as I identified color-conscious frames among nearly everyone one of my participants. At the outset of my study, I hypothesized that, even though color-blind ideology is the dominant racial ideology among white Americans, color-conscious ideology would be more prevalent among teachers because they are in a more socially-oriented profession. Data from other studies (Ullucci, 2010; 2011) described color-consciousness among white teachers teaching in urban areas, but a description of the complexities of teachers' racial ideologies across areas of differing racial composition is absent from the literature. This research indicates that teachers frame statements using a spectrum of color-blind and color-conscious frames that shift from individual to individual and area to area.

Frames of color-blindness can be found among teachers in all areas. In addition, color-blindness continues to be the norm for white Americans in other professions (Bonilla-Silva, 2013). Identifying frames and discourse related to color-blind ideology can highlight opportunities for growth, especially in teacher education programs, and through professional development. For example, recognizing that many urban teachers see and understand institutional racism, but frame violence using cultural racism, could enable educators design professional developments that highlight the systemic causes of violence in their communities and design policies to mitigate the effects of these systems.

Teacher Discourse across Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia

Teachers across Lincoln City, Gresham, and Arcadia used similar discourse to discuss violence and the achievement gap. Teachers overwhelmingly framed high levels of violence in urban areas using cultural racism, placing the blame for increased violence in urban areas on individuals, including parents, neighbors, and other students. They talked about addressing the problem of increased violence in urban areas on an individual level, suggesting that parents should have fewer children, should be more responsible for the location and activities of their children, and should take a personal interest in their children's education. Conversely, teachers framed the achievement gap as a systemic problem, citing concentrated poverty, fewer resources, a dearth of high-quality early childhood education, and fewer opportunities as the cause of the achievement gap. Teachers used the systemic responsibility frame to talk about closing the achievement gap. They suggested addressing socioeconomic inequality, providing free, high-quality early childhood education, and community oriented schooling could close the achievement gap. There is dissonance between these two frames. Systemic responsibility incorporates the idea of collective responsibility for social inequality, which teachers were ready to apply to students who have disparate educational experiences as a result of the achievement gap. Conversely, cultural racism places negative characteristics on a culture as a whole, which transfers those characteristics to individual people within urban communities.

This trend was most common among teachers in Lincoln City. These teachers told personal stories both about institutional racism and violence in their schools, framing them with social liberalism and systemic racism and cultural racism respectively.

Teachers in Gresham and Arcadia used the same frames to talk about these topics, but were less consistent in their use of these frames when compared to their urban counterparts. Teachers' responses indicate that violence and the achievement gap are similarly framed across all areas, but do not indicate why they are consistently framed in those ways. Future research in this area should focus on discursive themes that remained constant across areas of differing racial composition, especially related to violence and the achievement gap, in order to identify the ways in which ideas and their frames travel across geographic areas.

Racial Ideology and Contact Theory

Teachers in Lincoln City and Gresham frame statements related to race and educational inequality more consistently with color-conscious frames than teachers in Arcadia. Further, I placed teachers from Lincoln City and Gresham more often in transitional or color-conscious groups based on the number of color-conscious frames I identified in their responses. In addition, teachers from Lincoln City and Gresham more often cited personal experiences with students of color and their families as they employ color-conscious frames than teachers in rural areas. Teachers in Arcadia often admitted that they dealt little with race, and often failed to accept their own nearly entirely white community as an example of segregation. As Arcadia teacher Janelle Ness said, "I just think everybody's equal, so there should be no black or white schools, and, I think, in the south that's [segregation] still happening, but here in the north it's not." The idea that segregation was present in our society was acknowledged by Arcadia teachers, but they did think of their community as an example of segregation. Teachers in Arcadia think of themselves as an accepting community while supporting principles like meritocracy,

choice, and the minimization of race, principles which may make life more challenging for people of color living in Arcadia.

Few participants critically reflected on their own racial ideological beliefs; Marcia Perry's example in Chapter five is a poignant example of that self-reflection in action. I placed Marcia in the transitional group as she had a mixture of color-blind and color-conscious frames throughout our interview, but it was clear from her statement that she was deeply passionate about teaching, and cared for her students greatly. This was a common theme among teachers; all of the teachers I interviewed believed what they were saying was accurate, and fair to their students and their families. The teachers in the color-blind group from all areas were color-blind with the intent of treating people fairly, believing that hard work and personal responsibility can change the trajectory of one's life. This is consistent with color-blind respondents in Bonilla-Silva's (2013) study who focused on the American ideals of choice and fairness to explain the racial status quo. Color-blind teachers in rural areas were especially dedicated to these ideals.

The proliferation of color-blind frames in Arcadia as compared to Gresham and Lincoln City may be the result of segregation. Teachers in Gresham and Lincoln City can more readily imagine scenarios where systems of power affect their students because they can see it happening in their schools and communities. In Arcadia, racism is largely ignored because the white community may have trouble identifying systemic racism because they cannot see it in their community. They feel that the few people of color who have moved to Arcadia have been treated fairly when compared with how they treat other members of their community. This is not to say that the people of Arcadia are "bad people" – far from it. Every teacher I met in Arcadia was incredibly welcoming, and

deeply cared about what happened in their school and community. They felt merit and fairness were worthy ideals to instill in their students, and for their community, they believe they are right. However, as students leave Arcadia to experience more diverse communities, and as they position themselves as citizens within the United States, will they continue to ignore institutional racism in favor of fairness and meritocracy, or will they have experiences that lead them to adopting more color-conscious ideology?

Interestingly, all three teachers in the color-conscious group and one teacher in the transitional group in Arcadia stressed the importance of cultural diversity in the selection of classroom materials. They cited specific examples of the materials they included in lessons related to cultural diversity, and stressed how important they felt it was to present this material to students as they have little exposure to diversity in their daily lives. This is important, as recent literature related to contact theory has revealed that even imagined contact with outgroup members can reduce prejudice for outgroup populations (Miles and Crisp, 2014). This highlights the importance of teachers' racial ideology, especially in relationship to their selection of classroom materials. Arcadia teachers who place importance on diversity in the selection of classroom materials may be better preparing their students to live in racially diverse areas. However, the selection of diverse classroom materials was not the norm. The majority of teachers in Arcadia did not think diversity in the selection of classroom materials was important, and did not have concrete examples of lessons related to diversity in their classrooms.

Though teachers in Lincoln City and Gresham had more color-conscious racial ideologies than teachers in Arcadia, the way that teachers in those sites framed racial inequality in education differed. Teachers in Lincoln City used personal stories to

explain institutional racism in larger society, and used cultural racism to talk about violence in their schools. They also rarely used the frame naturalization to talk about segregation in their community, instead often mentioning red-lining, or believing the government or whites to be responsible for segregation, perhaps as a result of Lincoln City's often stark racial segregation. Lincoln City teachers' direct contact with students of color living in concentrated poverty give them a view of inequality that would not be experienced by teachers in Gresham or Arcadia. Lincoln City teachers see their students doing their best in their classrooms despite a lack of adequate resources, large classroom sizes, and often inadequate facilities, then frame the racial achievement gap as a result of institutional racism as they have personal stories they use to back up this argument. However, they also see their students sent to the hospital because of violence in their neighborhoods, they see fights in schools, and they hear about their parents striking their children and attribute those things to a lack of values, a lack of education, and poor parenting. Lincoln City teachers' perceptions of race are shaped by their direct interactions with students. They see their students as directly impacted by systemic inequality, and as both perpetrators and perpetrators of violence.

Gresham teachers also told stories about students of color, but they differed from stories used by Lincoln City teachers. Gresham teachers recognized systemic responsibility for economic inequality in their schools, and told stories that tied together economic opportunity and race, but also characterized urban students of color and their families as inherently and culturally violent. Teachers in Gresham recognized a link between socioeconomic status and achievement in their schools, but did not always link systemic economic inequality to race. However, they often saw students of color

dropping out, or being disproportionately scheduled for honors classes. They also characterized increased violence as cultural, and as something that happened away from their own community. They blamed parents, a lack of morals, and dysfunctional family systems for increased violence in urban settings. However, unlike Lincoln City teachers, they did not characterize their students of color as violent, instead characterizing students of color in urban areas as more violent. Gresham teachers cited specific examples of systemic responsibility related to socioeconomic inequality that they saw in their own community, but did not always tie socioeconomic inequality to race. They also broadly characterized urban students and families of color as culturally violent and lacking values without citing specific examples. Though I found no direct link between Gresham teachers' beliefs about increased urban violence and their own communities, teachers did occasionally cite the riots in Baltimore and Ferguson in their answers related to violence. It is possible that teachers in Gresham link media portrayals of people of color in urban areas to perceptions of cultural violence.

Directions for Future Research

I have several suggestions for future research. It is important to understand racial ideology over time, especially for people who lived in and left homogeneously white communities. Better understanding how one accepts or rejects ideas of color-consciousness throughout their experiences in a diverse community could lend insight in to methods for developing color-consciousness ideology among other populations. An ethnographic study that focuses on the development of racial ideology among people who move from a racially homogenous area to a racially diverse area could reveal the ways that people accept or reject different racial ideologies.

My study is unable to make broad statements about the racial ideologies of large numbers of people living in these areas. A quantitative study designed to take large samples of teachers from these areas would be necessary to make more general statements about the racial ideologies of people living in these different communities. While Bonilla-Silva's (2013) study did use quantitative analysis to describe the racial ideologies of white Americans in general, it is important to better understand how contact with outgroup members might shape one's racial ideology on a large scale in order to confirm that contact with outgroup members shapes racial ideology.

Teachers who had more contact with students of color more often consistently used color-conscious frames to talk about racially based educational inequality. This finding is consistent with contact theory (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), which suggests that greater contact with outgroup members reduces prejudice towards that group. Teachers from Arcadia grew up in areas with homogeneously white populations, and returned to them after receiving their credentials, making it less likely that they would have frequent, voluntary contact with people of color.

Nearly all teachers used color-blind frames to talk about some aspects of racial inequality in education. Teachers' racial ideologies shape the experiences they have with students, and how teachers teach their students about race and racial inequality (Dee, 2005; Diamond et al, 2004; Morris, 2005). If we are to improve the educational experiences of our students, and repay the educational debt owed to students of color, we must address and challenge color-blind racial ideology wherever it exists. This research shows that teachers most often employ color-blind frames with topics like violence, affirmative action in teacher hiring, and segregation. When talking about these issues,

teachers most often invoke feelings related to individualism, relying on choice and meritocracy to describe disparate opportunities, violence, and segregation.

The first step to challenging color-blindness is to define it, and challenge it wherever it is found. Several authors have begun the work of describing color-blind racial ideology and explaining where it can be found (Bonilla-Silva, 2013; Lamont, 2003), and others have begun that work in educational systems (Stoll, 2014, Ullucci, 2010; 2011). Future research should focus on identifying color-blindness at all levels of education – among administrators, school boards, and local educational officials, who have an impact on educational decisions through policy. It is also important to examine color-blind racial ideology among postsecondary educators, especially in teacher education as these professionals are responsible for shaping P-12 student experiences through their students.

It is important to define what we are aiming for. The establishment of frames of color-consciousness in this work, and descriptions of the tenets of color-consciousness among teachers as described by Ullucci (2010; 2011) are useful to identify discourse that recognizes and challenges institutional racism. Efforts should be made to identify color-consciousness among teacher-education students at various levels of study, both before, during, and after teacher preparation programs. Research that addresses whether professional development on color-consciousness has an impact on teacher racial ideology would also be useful.

Importantly, while some research has been conducted examining the racial ideologies of pre-service teachers enrolled in critical education courses (Pezzetti, 2016), there is still a dearth research about the effectiveness of critical education courses and

professional developments in creating lasting changes in how teachers understand the issues that impact the lives of their students. Identifying powerful and lasting methods for shaping teacher racial ideology would greatly improve student educational experiences for millions of students. Longitudinal research would be useful in identifying how teacher racial ideology changes throughout teacher training programs. Research could also examine how that ideology is enacted within classrooms in order to better understand how racial ideology manifests in teachers discourse.

Conclusion

This research identifies several challenges related to teacher racial ideology. Teachers in all areas and all ideological groups used frames of color-blindness, revealing that color-blind racial ideology is still the norm. Further, many teachers emphasize personal responsibility and deemphasize systems, which makes identifying systemic injustice within educational systems difficult. Challenging the color-blind beliefs of teachers is necessary to identify educational inequality in educational systems, and thereby ensure a more just future for all students.

This research also reveals that there is reason to be hopeful. Teachers from all areas wanted the best for their students. They told moving and personal stories that revealed how they deeply they care for their students. Researchers, administrators, and educators would benefit from respecting teachers' care for their students, and use that mutual care for students as a starting point for dialogue related to race.

Teacher racial ideology is hugely important as there is no other group of people in the United States who have contact with as many people as they do. When teachers have color-blind racial ideologies, those ideological beliefs negatively impact student

experiences (Dee, 2005; Diamond et al, 2004; Morris, 2005), and should be identified and challenged. Challenging color-blind racial ideology at all levels is essential in eliminating the historical debts owed to people of color in American society. The identification of frames of color-consciousness among teachers in all areas is reason to be hopeful for the future, but the consistent presence of color-blind ideology should steel our collective resolve.

In the United States, we have made the decision to limit opportunities for some based on the color of their skin. Color-blindness perpetuates this inequality. The normalization of color-blindness makes it difficult to challenge, but not impossible. As people have learned color-blind discourse, so too can they learn color-consciousness. People have to be taught to identify and challenge injustice, work that can be done by educators at all levels. The United States is known as the “Land of Opportunity,” a title that is truer as we work together to challenge systemic injustice.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allport Gordon, W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*.
- Antonovics, K., & Knight, B. G. (2009). A new look at racial profiling: Evidence from the Boston Police Department. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 91(1), 163-177.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2013). *Racism Without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States; [new Chapter on the Obama Phenomenon]*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). Racial attitudes or racial ideology? An alternative paradigm for examining actors' racial views. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 8(1), 63-82.
- Castagno, A. E. (2008). "I Don't Want to Hear That!": Legitimizing Whiteness through Silence in Schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 39(3), 314-333.
- Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 263-274.
- Dee, T. S. (2005). A teacher like me: Does race, ethnicity, or gender matter?. *The American economic review*, 95(2), 158-165.
- Diamond, J. B., Randolph, A., & Spillane, J. P. (2004). Teachers' expectations and sense of responsibility for student learning: The importance of race, class, and organizational habitus. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 35(1), 75-98.
- Farkas, G. (2003a). Cognitive skills and noncognitive traits and behaviors in stratification processes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 541-562.

- Farkas, G. (2003b). Racial disparities and discrimination in education: What do we know, how do we know it, and what do we need to know?. *The Teachers College Record*, 105(6), 1119-1146.
- Fredrickson, G. M. (2002). *Racism: A short history*. Princeton University Press.
- Goyette, K. A., Farrie, D., & Freely, J. (2012). This School's Gone Downhill: Racial Change and Perceived School Quality among Whites. *Social problems*, 59(2), 155-176.
- Kvale, S. (Ed.). (2007). *Conducting an interview* SAGE Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781849208963.n5
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Ladson Billings, G. (2011). Boyz to men? Teaching to restore Black boys' childhood. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14(1), 7-15.
- Lamont, M. (2003). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, A. E. (2004). What Group?" Studying Whites and Whiteness in the Era of "Color-Blindness. *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 623-646.
- Marx, K. (2000). *Karl Marx: selected writings*. Oxford University Press.
- Miles, E., & Crisp, R. J. (2014). A meta-analytic test of the imagined contact hypothesis. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(1), 3-26.
- Morris, E. W. (2007). Researching race: Identifying a social construction through qualitative methods and an interactionist perspective. *Symbolic Interaction*, 30(3), 409-425.

- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), (2015). *Search for Schools and Colleges*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/>.
- Obama, B. (2007). *The audacity of hope: Thoughts on reclaiming the American dream*. Canongate Books.
- Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual review of sociology*, 34, 181.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*, 49(1), 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(6), 922-934.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(5), 751.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(3), 271-280.
- Pezzetti, K. (2016) *Teaching and learning color-consciousness in a color-blind society* (Doctoral dissertation). Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined whiteness of teaching: How white teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 197-215.

- Prins, E. (2007). Interdistrict transfers, Latino/White school segregation, and institutional racism in a small California town. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(4), 285-308.
- Segall, A., & Garrett, J. (2013). White teachers talking race. *Teaching Education*, 24(3), 265-291.
- Smedley, B. D., Stith, A. Y., & Nelson, A. R. (Eds.). (2009). *Unequal treatment: confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care (with CD)*. National Academies Press.
- Solomona, R. P., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B. J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege'. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(2), 147-169.
- Stainback, K., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2009). Intersections of Power and Privilege Long-Term Trends in Managerial Representation. *American Sociological Review*, 74(5), 800-820.
- Stoll, L. C. (2014). Constructing the color-blind classroom: teachers' perspectives on race and schooling. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(5), 688-705.
- Taylor, D. L., & Clark, M. P. (2009). "Set up to fail": Institutional Racism and the Sabotage of School Improvement. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 42(2), 114-129.
- Turner, M. A. (2008). Limits on Housing and Neighborhoods Choice: Discrimination and Segregation in US Housing Markets. *Ind. L. Rev.*, 41, 797.
- Ullucci, K. (2011). Learning to see: The development of race and class consciousness in White teachers. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14(4), 561-577.

- Ullucci, K. (2010). What works in race-conscious teacher education? Reflections from educators in the field. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 137-156.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage Publications, Inc Van Dijk, 1984
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T. A., Kintsch, W., & Van Dijk, T. A. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Weiss, C. C. (2001). Difficult starts: Turbulence in the school year and its impact on urban students' achievement. *American Journal of Education*, 102(2), 196-227.
- Wengraf, T. (2001). The session. *Qualitative research interviewing* (pp. 191-207) SAGE Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781849209717.
- Williams Jr, R. M. (1947). The reduction of intergroup tensions: a survey of research on problems of ethnic, racial, and religious group relations. *Social Science Research Council Bulletin*.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What is your ethnic background?
2. Can you very briefly describe where you grew up?
 - a. Name of city/town and state where Rs spent formative years (6-14)
 - b. Rural/urban, inner city/suburb; big town/small town
3. What kind of people lived in your neighborhood: rich or poor, black or white, etc.?
 - c. Class background and RACIAL and ethnic makeup
 - i. PROBE for racial and ethnic makeup
 - ii. Racially mixed neighborhood, PROBE for EXPLICIT racial makeup (e.g. "how many WHITES in block or street?")
4. How did you feel about the kind of people (class and race makeup) that lived in your neighborhood? (Like it/did not like it/did not mind)
5. Do you remember who were your three closest friends?
 - 5A. Were they school friends, neighborhood friends, or both?
 - d. Probe for class and racial background of friends
 - i. IF Rs had White friend(s) ask:
 1. How often did you see these friends?
 2. What kind of things did you do with this/these friends?
6. Can you briefly describe what kind of school you attended while growing up? (Public/private, Large/small, inner city/suburb)
7. Can you describe the kind of students (student body) in the schools that you attended?
 - a. probe for CLASS and RACE
 - i. if diverse, probe for school composition white/black.

Section B: Current Information

1. How long have you lived in this community?
2. How do you like living and working in this community?
3. In general terms, how would you describe the neighborhood that you live in today? (
 - a. Feeling for the place and RACE and class makeup.
4. Do you feel that you know more than most people around here? Do you feel that you are part of this community? How?

5. Are you currently married, living with someone, dating, or something else?
 - a. class and racial background of SO.
6. People have mixed feelings about marrying out of their race. What is your view on this delicate matter? (Push for explanation)
 - a. probe – and why is that?
 - i. if “For” or “yes and no” ask: Would you yourself consider (or have considered) marrying someone from a different race?

Section C: Overall views on race and class.

1. If I asked you to describe to me in general the kind of people you like, what are the qualities that are most important to you? Probe
2. Can you tell me, in general, what kind of people you don’t like? If life, how would you describe the kind of people who get on your nerves?
3. Does it happen that you sometimes feel inferior or superior to certain people? What kind of people make you feel one way or the other? Probe
4. How do you define the idea of race (“If you had to explain to a Martian what race is all about...”) (This question attempts to get a sense of how people define and understand race.)

Section D: Racism and life changes

1. What is racism in your view? (seek for a definition)
 - a. Probe for an example
2. There is a clear educational achievement gap between blacks and whites in our society. In your opinion, why does this gap exist?
3. The court case *Abbott v. Burke* in New Jersey Provides additional funding for supplemental programs necessary to address the extreme disadvantages of urban schoolchildren. What do you think of this program?
Follow Up: Is it justified? Why or why not?
4. Texas has enacted a law which guarantees admission to state schools for any student finishing in the top 10% of their class instead of relying on test scores. This practice guarantees access for more students of color who may have lower test scores than white students. How do you feel about this practice?
5. Imagine a school that is 97% white teachers hires a black teacher over a white teacher because the school is concerned about not having enough diversity in staff.
Do you consider this preferential treatment?
Why do you think the school is 97% white?

Does this policy discriminate against whites?

6. When school districts report standardized test results, they're required to disaggregate results based on race, what do you think about this practice?

7. There are up to 25 times more incidents of violence against teachers in urban schools than in suburban and rural areas. Why do you think this is the case?

8. Pennsylvania state standards emphasize cultural diversity in the selection of classroom materials.

Do you agree with this practice?

How do you incorporate cultural diversity in your classroom?

9. Teachers are often encouraged to employ the cultural resources found in students' homes in their classrooms.

How would you employ students' cultural resources in your classroom?
(another school?)

10. Are you obligated to teach your students about race?
What would you teach them?

11. Since the Brown Vs. Board of education decision, very little mixing of races in school has occurred in this country. In your opinion, is this the government's fault, Whites' fault, or Blacks' fault?

12. America has lots of all-white and all-black schools (residential segregation). What do you think about this situation?

13. Do you think the government should do something about this situation?
a. what can be done to increase the mixing of races in neighborhoods (residential integration)?

14. Should the government continue busing? (QXQ: "moving kids from all-White or all-Black schools to achieve some racial balance") to guarantee some mixing of the races in our schools?

15. If you were the president of the U.S.A., what would you do to eliminate racial inequality in education?

APPENDIX B

CODE LIST

Code Name (Frame, CC=color-conscious, CB=color-blind)

Color-Blind Frames: Abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, minimization of race.

Color-Conscious Frames: Social liberalism, constructivism, systemic responsibility, acknowledgement of race.

AA.College – Yes (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person unequivocally said “yes” to affirmative action in college

AA.K-12 – No – Institutional Racism (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person believes that the funding would still be funneled to schools that have more and the schools that have greater need will still get less.

AA.K-12 – Yes (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person unequivocally said “yes” to affirmative action in K-12

AA.K-12 – Yes;\$ Accountability (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said yes to affirmative action in K-12, but said that there should be accountability for the money spent.

AA.Teaching – No;Preferential Treatment (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said no to affirmative action teacher hiring, said that it was preferential treatment to hire the black candidate over the white even if they were the same person.

AA.Teaching – No;ExperienceParamount (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said no to affirmative action teacher hiring, said experience is more important than race; students should have high quality teachers then worry about others.

AA.Teaching – Yes;IfEqualQual (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said a black teacher should be hired over the white teacher only if they are equally qualified.

AA.Teaching – Yes;Need Diversity (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Person says that there should be more people of color (x) in their school because diversity is positive.

AA.Why97White – DependsOnPop (Naturalization, CB)

- Teacher indicates that the policy of hiring a black teacher over a white teacher for diversity is only discrimination/preferential treatment if the population of students is overwhelmingly white.

AA.Why97White – Institutional Racism (Systemic Responsibility CC)

- Teacher indicates that there are fewer teachers of color because fewer teachers of color attend college as a result of systemic racial inequality.

AA.Why97White – MoreWhiteTeachers (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Teacher says the school is majority white because there are more white teachers in general.

AA.Why97White – NotDesirableJob (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person says education is not pushed because it’s not viewed a desirable job by black communities, or is not suggested or modeled in black schools.

AA.Why97White – Population Draw (Naturalization, CB)

- Person indicated that the school's teaching population was 97% white because of the racial population of the school's student body.

AGap – Don'tKnow

- Person doesn't know, has no opinion on the achievement gap, or refuses to express their opinion on the achievement gap.

AGap – EarlyChildhood (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists because students of color have fewer high-quality early childhood opportunities that white peers before traditional schooling begins.

AGap – FewerOpportunities (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists because there are fewer opportunities for academic and/or social enrichment in urban areas with concentrated poverty that are majority people of color.

AGap – Funding.Resources (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists because there is not enough funding and/or resources for majority students of color schools.

AGap – Institutional Racism (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists as a direct result of systemic racism.

AGap – Low Expectations (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- There are low expectations, either within a community or within a school, for an individual to succeed which causes the achievement gap.

AGap – NegHomeLife (Cultural Racism, CB)

- The achievement gap exists because student home lives are negative; emphasis on personal responsibility.

AGap – Parent Advocacy (Cultural Racism, CB)

- The achievement gap exists because parents do not advocate enough for their children's education

AGap – PassTheBuck (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists because students are advanced for social reasons.

AGap – Poverty/SES (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap exists because kids are low SES; not getting enough of (x) at home. Absence of personal responsibility.

AGap – Segregation (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The achievement gap is a result of lack of socioeconomic or racial diversity

DeSegBus – No (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person would not support desegregation via busing because it takes away personal choice (of community/school).

DeSegBus – Yes;Non-Forced (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said that busing should be provided if kids want to go to another school, but said that kids shouldn't be forced to go to a school outside of their catchment area. Emphasis on choice.

DeSegBus – Yes;HQSchools (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person is for busing to desegregate if the schools that people are being bused to are all high quality schools. Person supports busing in/out of urban areas to increase racial diversity.

DeSegBus – Yes;Young (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person would support busing in and out of urban areas to increase racial diversity beginning with students in Kindergarten, and expanding through grades as the first cohort of students moves through.

DeSegGov – Yes;NonSpecific

- Something should be done to decrease segregation but nothing specific is mentioned.

DeSegGov – No;SES (Naturalization, CB)

- Nothing can be done about segregation because it's based on economics, or is natural and the government (presumably) cannot control that.

DeSeg – No (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person said no to desegregation.

DeSeg – Yes;Reservations (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person said there should be something done about segregation, but had some reservations. Reservations usually involve choice or personal responsibility.

DeSeg – Yes (Constructivism, CC)

- Person said yes to desegregation

InterracialMarriage – Yes

- Person said they would marry someone of another race.

InterracialMarriage – Yes;Social Prejudice (Acknowledgement of Race, CB)

- Person said yes to interracial marriage, but indicated that the rest of society might be prejudiced against it. Often includes concern for interracial couple.

InterracialSO – Yes

- Person said they would have a relationship/marry a person of another race unequivocally.

ObTeachRace – Yes;CivilRights (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Teacher says they focus on race in the classroom as a way to teach about racism, segregation, and the civil rights movement both historically and currently.

ObTeachRace – No;AlreadyUnderstand (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Teachers are not obligated to teach race because students already understand it.

ObTeachRace – No;Too Young (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Teacher indicates that students are too young to talk about race directly.

ObTeachRace – No;Don'tUnderstand (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Teacher thinks that students misconstrue what is being taught, or teacher feels they are unable to understand the concept of race. Often tied to perceptions that teaching about race would be racist.

ObTeachRace – Yes; Color-blind (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person said they are obligated to teach race, but they use some type of color-blind language to talk about it... "we're all the same on the inside," etc.

OBTeachRace – Yes;EffectChange (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Teaches about race or power to help students identify modern racism, and actively work against it.

OBTeachRace – Yes;Racism (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Teachers are obligated to teach race because students should learn about racism and be exposed to diverse cultures.

POTUS – AddressSESInequality (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Socioeconomic inequality exists and is the root cause of educational inequality.

POTUS – Child Care (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person indicates that there is a dearth of affordable, high quality child care in urban areas.

POTUS – Community Education (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Education for parents and community members; adult continuing education, etc. Recognizes educational debt.

POTUS – Community Schools (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Schools should focus on providing for the needs of the community in which they exist, and they should be funded appropriately for this task. Recognizes systemic debt.

POTUS – Desegregation.Ec.Race (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person suggests that either economic or racial desegregation would work to close the achievement gap.

POTUS - +Funding (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Increase funding for more materials/programs/supports in areas where students of color live in concentrated poverty; recognition of racially based socioeconomic inequality.

POTUS - +Teachers/Staff (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Increase the numbers of teachers and staff in urban schools; recognition of institutional racism via lower qualified teachers, or high class sizes.

POTUS – Equitable Funding Structures (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Funding structures should be changed so that schools receive funding more equitably; recognition that urban schools are disproportionately funded compared to suburban/rural schools.

POTUS – IAT/Contact (Constructivism, CC)

- Person indicates that everyone in education should have implicit bias training, or that contact with people of other races is important.

POTUS – LowerClassSize (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Teacher recognizes that urban areas have higher class sizes, which results in more challenges in urban classrooms.

POTUS – ParentingClasses (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Teachers says that parenting classes should be available to parents; emphasis on personal responsibility.

POTUS – Penalties for Racism (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Institute penalties for government officials or teachers who are caught engaging in racist practices. Accountability.

POTUS – Personal Responsibility (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person says we should focus on changing the behaviors of individuals (parents or students) to effect change.

POTUS – Standards (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person would institute standards to raise quality. Accountability.

POTUS – VoluntaryPhilanthropy (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- High SES should be encouraged to voluntarily give to low SES areas as charity or relief. Emphasis on choice, individualism.

QualNeg – Bigot (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Person dislikes people who group and dislike other people based on the color of their skin.

QualNeg – Personal Responsibility (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person indicated that the negative qualities they dislike in another person are things that the individual should be able to control themselves.

QualPos – Personal Responsibility (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person indicated that the positive qualities they like in another person were things that the individual should be able to control.

Race – Color

- Race is the “color” of someone’s skin.

Race – Culture

- Race is a collection of activities that one engages in as a community

Race – Norms

- Race is a collection of unwritten social cues that one follows to become part of a race

Race – Physical Characteristics

- Race is a physical characteristic, body type, facial structure, color of skin, height, weight, etc.

Race – Place

- Race could be related to place (US, City, Etc.)

Race – Religion

- Race is related to religion

Race – SES

- Race is related to socioeconomic status

Race – Social Construction (Constructivism, Race Description)

- Race is socially constructed and is related to power.

Racism – Against Whites (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person gave an example of racism against whites

Racism – Discrimination (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Racism is acting a certain way towards a group as a result of feelings about how you think that group should act.

Racism – Stereotyping (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Racism is grouping people based on beliefs about how that group of people should act.

Racism – Personal

- Person had a personal experience/story about racism

Racism – RejectionOfDifference (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person says that racism is treating someone different because they are different than you. De-emphasize race.

RacismEx – Institutional (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Example is systemic racial inequality.

RacismEX – NameCalling (Minimization of Race, CB)

- An example of racism is calling someone a name that is derogatory and is tied to race.

RacismEx – ReverseDiscrimination (Abstract Liberalism, CB)

- Person gives an example of racism that is reverse discrimination or describes reverse discrimination.

RacismEx – Stereotyping (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- An example of racism is stereotyping people in (x) way

RacismEx – Symbols (Minimization of Racism, CB)

- Confederate flag, iron cross, etc.

Segregation – Everybody (Constructivism, CC)

- Everyone is responsible for the perpetuation of segregation. Often perpetuated by power.

Segregation – Government (Constructivism, CC)

- The government is responsible for segregation (red lining, policies, etc.)

Segregation – Natural (Naturalization, CB)

- People end up with people like them; it's no one's fault

Segregation – NoOnesFault (Naturalization, CB)

- Person said it's no one's fault/everyone's fault that segregation still exists.

Segregation – SES (Constructivism, CC)

- Segregation is a result of SES; more black people are poor therefore they live in x areas. Person does not say being a person of color makes one poor, but that being poor is correlated with being a person of color.

StandardTest – Color-blind (Minimization of Race, CB)

- The person indicated that all people should be compared on the same level without the color of their skin. Merit.

StandardTest – Good&Bad (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Person says there are good and bad aspects to splitting up test results based on race. i.e. on one hand, it can be used to identify achievement gap, on the other hand, people can say (x) race is inherently less intelligent.

StandardTest – SES (Minimization of Race, CB)

- The person indicated that socioeconomic would be a better way to break down standardized test reporting, breaking away from mention of the racial achievement gap.

StandardTest – Yes (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Results should be separated by race in order to identify the achievement gap.

Violence – AtHome (Cultural Racism, CB)

- There is more violence in urban areas because the kids see violence happening in their homes. Personal responsibility.

Violence – Cultural (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Violence in urban communities is caused by the culture of people who live there. Personal responsibility.

Violence – DearthCoping (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Students lack coping skills, how to argue, settle disputes, etc. Person says that this lack of coming skills comes from the home.

Violence – InNeighborhood (Cultural Racism, CB)

- There is more violence in urban areas because the kids see violence happening in their neighborhoods. Teacher indicates that they should leave, or that there is choice involve in choosing where to live.

Violence – PopDensity

- There is more violence in urban areas because there are more people in a given area, which makes them more violent.

Violence – Poverty (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- There is more violence in urban areas because of economic reasons (a lot of people in one house, money tensions, etc.). Emphasis on poverty as a system.

Violence – Statnotaccurate

- The statistic that there are up to 25x more incidents of violence is not real.

Violence – Story

- Person had a personal story about violence in their classroom or school.

Violence – Stress (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person indicates that students are more stressed out because of poverty, violence, bullying, etc. that there is more violence. Person says stress is a result of systems as opposed to individual characteristics.

Theme – AATeaching.PopMatters (Naturalization, CB)

- Teacher indicates that teachers of certain races naturally gravitate to teaching students of similar race.

Theme – Affirmative Action (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Person directly mentions affirmative action or references affirmative action in a very specific way.

Theme – Babies having babies (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person indicates that people of color have babies at a younger age than whites, and that this is negative.

Theme – Color-blind (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person says something like “people are people,” or “race doesn’t matter anymore.” De-emphasis of race.

Theme – Contact Important (Constructivism, CC)

- Person indicates that contact with people of another race is important to increasing understanding/decrease tensions.

Theme – Cycle of Poverty (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person mentions the cycle of poverty and/or generational wealth inequality. Linked to systems of inequality.

Theme – Deficit (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Teacher thinks about students in an urban area from a deficit perspective.

Theme – EarlyChildhood (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person says that early childhood education could remedy some of the effects of concentrated poverty/systemic forces.

Theme – Institutional Racism (Social Liberalism, CC)

- Systemic causes to racial difference (poverty, resources, etc.)

Theme – Need More Support (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Person indicates that they need more support in their classroom – supplies, personnel, administrative decisions, etc.

Theme – News Example

- Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Freddie Gray, Trayvon Martin, etc.

Theme – Parent/Family Overwhelmed (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- The person indicates that their parents or families are overwhelmed by personal issues. Emphasis on concentrated poverty or a dearth of resources on a systemic level.

Theme – Personal Experience

- Person shared a story or personal experience.

Theme – Personal Responsibility (Cultural Racism, CB)

- Person attributes control over one's situation to that person. "hard-working, lazy, should advocate, etc."

Theme – Poverty (Systemic Responsibility, CC)

- Mentions that poverty is a problem on a systemic level.

Theme – Race Card (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person says people play the "race card," or mention race as being used to get out of something they should be responsible for.

Theme – Racial Capital (Constructivism, CC)

- Recognizing that whiteness gives you some kind of privilege or creates boundaries.

Theme – Reverse Racism/discrim (Minimization of Race, CB)

- Person mentions reverse racism or reverse discrimination.

Theme – RuralBus (Acknowledgement of Race, CC)

- Person brings up the bus that comes from a city with a large amount of people of color bringing people of color to the area.

Theme – Systemic Accountability (Systemic Responsibility)

- Person indicates that a system rather than an individual is responsible for inequality.