Overcoming and Re-envisioning White Resistance to Antioppressive Teacher Education:
Creating Transitional Spaces to Process Difficult Knowledge in Small Groups

Jordan Singer

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN EDUCATION
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

May 2022

Abstract

This dissertation argues that a fundamental rethinking of how Antioppressive teacher education views white teacher candidate (TC) learning is necessary to diminish what has been called white resistance. An examination of the inadequate models and methods deployed to transform TC thinking about difference and Otherness reveals how teacher educator's (TE) adherence to traditional paradigms contributes to their refusal to learn and change. The addition of Psychoanalytic insights into subjectivity, thinking and learning, it is argued, can mitigate TC resistance while enhancing student engagement and instructor pedagogy. These insights are then further refined to frame a transitional space (in a small group setting) wherein TC's cognitive and emotional struggles can be attended to ethically. The body of this work draws directly on TC's experience in the highly lauded Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program (UD). Using a variant of discourse analysis informed by cultural theory and psychosocially defined ambivalence, TC thinking, and their learning processes are considered within the UD curriculum, TE pedagogy, course work, and the small groups. One year after the initial study, interviews and focus groups with former preservice teachers augment the research data while providing timely reflections on how small group processing impacts social justice teacher education. An analysis of how the particularized learning dynamics in small groups are informed by considerable external and internal forces throughout teacher training follows. This applied research concludes that if a transitional space within small groups is developed with care, white resistance decreases, and overall engagement with equity pedagogy increases. Consequently, UD graduates are more likely to reverse the disappointing outcomes for racialized students that birthed anti-oppressive efforts in their inception.

Acknowledgements

Throughout this dissertation, I have received a great deal of support and assistance from many whom I would like to acknowledge.

First, I would like to express my deep gratitude to the late Professor Patrick Solomon, whose guidance, intelligence, and unwavering support inspired the work of this dissertation.

I would also like to express my great appreciation to Dr. Jacob Bobrowski for his wisdom, counselling, and encouragement over the last 25 years.

In addition, I would like to recognize my mom. Her free (tree) spirit inspired in me a love of life and learning.

Further, I thank Dr. Aparna Mishra-Tarc, a colleague whose wisdom, assistance and understanding have helped bring this dissertation to fruition.

I am also greatly appreciative of the advice and direction provided by Dr. Gillian Parekh and Dr. Vidya Shah.

For inspiration, I thank Professor Sharon Todd and Dr. Martin Aaron Fischer.

Dr. Joy Mannette, Dr. Don Dippo, Dr. Lisa Farley, Dr. Daniel Yon, Professor, Mario Di Paolantonio and Professor Alice Pitt with gratitude for their assistance.

I would like to also recognize my "special" brother Corey, patient sister-in-law Isabel, and my kind-hearted, brilliant, beautiful nieces, Genevieve and Aurora, for their love and support.

For their honesty, sensitivity and wisdom, I would like to thank all the teacher candidates who participated in this project.

Finally, I wholeheartedly thank my partner Stacey Whyne for her patience, love, support, and integrity. You were the missing ingredient needed to fill my life and work with vitality, hope, peace, and love.

Table of Contents

Preface

My commitment to anti-oppressive work emerged from many experiences, including studying theatre, writing plays about identity, being in a Shakespearean company, working as a social worker, an art therapist, a high school teacher and a university course director. I have also worked and volunteered in hospitals, group homes, psychiatric institutions, and senior care facilities. Moreover, my experiences as an ESL instructor and curriculum designer in Canada and China have also figured prominently in developing my thinking about racism, identity, teaching, learning, and change.

Growing up Jewish in a primarily white and Christian neighbourhood taught me that prejudice, racism, and antisemitism were learned. I remember our house being egged on Channukah because we displayed Jewish decorations and being called a Jew Bagel by other children in my elementary school. Sometimes I would be challenged to fight because I was a "dirty Jew." I learned that antisemitism was pervasive. Concurrently, two early traumas forged an enduring interest in understanding and later teaching about prejudice and racism. The first was watching the Holocaust TV mini-series in 1978 at the age of 11. The impact of learning about and trying to process why millions of Jews, in addition to untold numbers of Gypsies, Communists, Poles, Serbs, Jehovah's Witnesses, trade unionists, disabled people and LGBTQ individuals were exterminated, was traumatic. That very night, after I had calmed down a little, I considered how hatred of others' differences (in its extreme form) had resulted in premeditated genocide. I decided that I would dedicate myself to making sure that this never happened again.

The second trauma I recall occurred soon after learning about the Holocaust. I became aware of the cold war and how nuclear weapons could destroy the world. It was 1978, and I was in grade six. On Halloween, as I entered the class first thing in the morning, I dramatically threw

myself to the floor and landed splayed out as though I had just been blown up. I distinctly recall my teacher asking me what I was dressed up as. I told her, "A nuclear war survivor." Looking down at me judgmentally, she said, "Why would you worry about such a thing?" To which I replied, "Because we will all be vaporized. Don't you care?" She then told me that Nuclear War would never happen and that I should not worry. Her response to my costume and concerns about dying were dismissive, although in her mind, most likely, caring. Perhaps my teacher felt, as many educators caught in the thrall of developmental, educational precepts, that I was incapable of processing such mature information or that it was her duty as a teacher to protect the other children and me from troubling ideas and emotional displays. Maybe, she was protecting herself from disturbing thoughts. As neither she nor my mother deemed my concerns about the world outside of the classroom as worthy of serious attention, my attentiveness in class was reshaped by anxiety about what I believed was the inevitable war with the U.S.S.R, the destruction of the world, and everyone I cared about.

My awareness of other forms of intolerance based on Nationality, class, gender identity, and sexuality grew from doing plays such as *Free to Be You and Me*, *Hair, Spoon River Anthology,* and *Runaways* before the age of 12. At about this time, I decided to no longer tolerate any racist comments made by anyone. Shortly thereafter, I recall my father using a derogatory term for someone born in Pakistan. I responded to his slur by exclaiming, "who are you to talk? Aren't you a kike!" Without question, the method I used in this instance to correct my father's behaviour demonstrates just how much I needed to learn about teaching tolerance and how to point out the irrationality of prejudice or racism. At the time, I thought my method was a clever way to force my father to reflect upon the absurdity of his using racist language, especially considering the historical suffering of Jews. He contemplated nothing. Instead, he became explosively angry,

fuming, "don't you ever say that to me again!" I told him that he was wrong to denigrate others based on their colour and place of birth and that I was right to point out the error of his thinking and behaviour. He only became angrier. My attempts to stop his racist jokes were consistently met with resistance, fury, and dismissal. It took years to understand that I could not teach my father nor change his thinking by patronizingly implying that he was ignorant.

In retrospect, I know that the only thing my father gleaned from my pronouncements about racism was that I was attacking him. More importantly, through conversations about racism and racist slurs with friends, I realized that the best way to impact a person's thinking was to inspire them to question what they had been taught, learned, or believed. In the first instance, I allowed my emotions to structure what I thought was a rational response to my father's irrational racist comments. In the second, I was more thoughtful, and my response to intolerance was decidedly more dialogic and empathic, taking account of my friends' thoughts and feelings, realizing that changing their thinking could take time.

By the start of high school, I understood that:

a) Most people do not think through the origin or rational grounds of their prejudicial or racist attitudes.
b) Many are irrationally attached to ideas and perspectives learned from parents and their own social, religious, and cultural communities.
c) Changing attitudes and actions about others often cannot be accomplished through rational dialogue alone.
d) Something deeply irrational impedes many individuals from changing their perspectives (and possibly actions) about others who are different from themselves.

Ten years after graduating high school, I had earned a humanities degree and entered psychoanalysis as part of the requirements of earning an Art Therapy degree. I then worked for a social work agency for a couple of years doing a variety of casework. In 1997, I decided to return to school and study to become a teacher. Fortuitously, based on my previous experience, I was

accepted to a small experimental teacher education program committed to equity, diversity, and social justice called The Urban Diversity Initiative at York University.

After graduating in 1998, I returned a couple of years later to complete a master's degree at Dr. Patrick Solomon's behest. While taking classes, Patrick hired me to help put together the first Canada-wide study of educator's perspectives and practices concerning antiracist and multicultural education. Both he and Dr. Cynthia Levine-Rasky, the other author, deemed my contribution worthy of an assistant author's notation. This recognition was emblematic of Patrick's great generosity as a mentor. I began work on a thesis that attempted to mitigate some methodological and disciplinary shortcomings in the program that I had noticed while an undergraduate. After clarifying how the program could be improved in my thesis, I designed an intricately/unique pedagogical space that I believed would dramatically impact the effectiveness of the already world-renowned Urban Diversity Initiative.

After completing the master's, I taught in public elementary school, private school, and overseas in China. Once again, Patrick called and successfully encouraged me to write a Ph.D., aware that my work was controversial. Nevertheless, he was open-minded enough to explore ideas that could help antiracist and anti-oppressive education change preservice teachers' attitudes and actions regarding race, difference, ability, and Otherness. Despite Patrick's early misgivings, our work together on several books and my involvement with UD in various roles lead him to trust my intentions and abilities. True to his generous nature, he completely supported and encouraged my work.

Furthermore, in 2007/2008, after having witnessed intense emotional upheaval and intellectual intransigence every year in response to discussions of race and social privilege, Patrick allowed me to implement the small group environment that I had developed in my

masters as a pedagogical intervention. Tragically, Patrick passed away in 2008. His loss was devastating. A year and a half later, I temporarily withdrew from the program due to personal and professional circumstances.

After leaving in good standing, I fulfilled a promise to Patrick, ensuring that the final book about the challenges and successes of Urban Diversity graduates, *Brave New Teachers: Doing Social Justice in a Neo-Liberal Age* (2011), was completed. Since that time, the dissertation has never left my thoughts, nor have I ever stopped improving the work. Indeed, every project that I have undertaken since 2010 grew and matured from my experience in the Urban Diversity Program and the unique approach to teaching and learning detailed in the dissertation which follows. To illustrate, I won a contract to teach 800 Chinese professionals for a joint venture between the Ministry of Culture and Immigration and the Toronto Cross-Cultural Community Services Association. I helped these adults improve their speaking skills and taught them important social, historical, and psychological information about Canadian culture, sharing cultural capital, enabling them to retain their own culture while thriving in one different from their own. To accomplish this, I trained 24 teachers, 12 native English speakers and 12 native Mandarin speakers, using a unique cross-race dyad teaching approach gleaned from the Urban Diversity Initiative at York University. Following this work, I designed and delivered a unique "enrichment" curriculum framed through a critical anti-oppressive lens, comprised of lessons combining philosophy, sociology, science, anthropology, art, and psychology, all interwoven in historic and contemporarily based thematic units.

Over the last five years, I have watched in dismay as hate crimes against Blacks, Aboriginals, First Nations, and Chinese have risen dramatically. I have watched while Antisemitic and Islamophobic incidents in Canada and the United States have reached record-breaking levels. I

have watched as immigrants across Europe are being attacked and murdered in ever-increasing numbers as many of them flee persecution based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender identity and sexuality.

More recently, the video-taped murder of Trevon Martin ignited the mobilization of millions around the world in support of Black Lives Matter. Nevertheless, while I view this movement as hopeful, and a conviction in this criminal case as imperative, I cannot assume that this moment of public outrage over the systemic police violence against black bodies will last, nor I believe strongly should any of us take this (seeming) proverbial watershed moment for granted. We only need to remember how quickly past moments of raised consciousness such as the Rodney King beating and the riots which ensued have receded in the public's memory, leaving the racist status quo intact in fading memories wake. We also only need now to bear witness to the undeniable facts that show us all how racialized and marginalized citizens as well as those in poverty have suffered and died in larger numbers than the remainder of the population, to realize that much needs to be done to secure a more egalitarian future.

The visionary anti-oppressive work accomplished with over a thousand preservice teachers in the Urban Diversity Program began with the assumption that systemic racism and many other forms of intolerance and prejudice exist in Canadian society both at the micro and macro levels. Further, the philosophy driving this work held that the best way to transform these detrimental attitudes is through the education of teachers who will, in turn, teach multitudes of students. My contribution to this work is to point out that anti-oppressive educators and theorists need to admit that racism is shaped by irrational unconscious forces to which we must attend ethically for lasting change to occur. We can no longer deny the inner life of racism as it has been laid bare for all to see. Consequently, it is clear to me that the methodological modifications that I have

envisioned are even more significant now than when this dissertation initially began. I can think of no more appropriate time for this work to be applied across various educational domains.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Sociology, in particular, has an extraordinary mandate… to conjure up social life. Conjuring is a particular form of calling up and calling out the forces that make things what they are to fix and transform a troubling situation. As a mode of apprehension and reformation, conjuring merges the analytical, the procedural, the imaginative and the effervescent" (Gordon, 1997, p. 22).

This research arose when I was a TA in the Urban Diversity Program 15 years ago. In the program I was privy to theoretical and methodological inadequacies in anti-oppressive research and practice in the context of culturally relevant teaching aimed at transforming teacher candidates' (TC's) thinking of racialized and marginalized Others[1]. The transformation of primarily white teacher subjectivity to which most of this work refers, it is believed, will result in diminished prejudice and racism in schools. Transformation of racist ideologies, researchers argue, will improve the academic performance and future success of racialized and marginalized students. This dissertation departs from these long-established understandings of anti-racism teacher education. It proposes an additional and alternative conceptual framework for Teacher Education programs to build upon and interpret the learning dynamics that arise in the context of anti-Black racism education modified. At its core, the dissertation explores how we can better understand the dynamics of teacher candidates' learning about and from discussions of racism, which mitigate the intended outcomes of progressive pedagogy and curricular reforms that call for deep self/other reflection.

---

[1] The term "Others" indicates those whose identities have been oppressed and marginalized socially and politically in and by mainstream society. In concert with Kevin Kumashiro (2000), "Other" is used "to refer to those groups that are traditionally marginalized in society, i.e., that are other than the norm, such as students of color, students from under- or unemployed families, students who are female, or male but not stereotypically "masculine," and students who are, or are perceived to be, queer" (p. 26). Additionally, all LGBTQ2+ are considered when this term is used. Further included as "marginalized others" are disabled students. Moreover, while the word "other" used loosely can reinforce a dominant subordinate postcolonial us and them trope, its usage in this work refers to racialized, marginalized, stigmatized persons external to the self. I take Cheryl Matias's (2016) concern that referring to 'the other' can be a sly form of racial abuse used as an avoidance tactic "denying an understanding of the white self" (196), ostensibly a method of obfuscation to avoid discussing whiteness.

The dissertation conducts a historical investigation, research of the anti-oppressive and social justice-oriented fields, including multiculturalism, Antiracism, Critical Whiteness Studies, and Critical Race Theory (CRT), to propose a psychosocial intervention into teacher education. The research took place at York University in the Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program. This program, oriented towards diversity and making more demographically representative, the teaching profession in Ontario is identified as one of only three which exemplified social justice teacher education, embodying the best practices at that time (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009, p. 301). Consequentially, the investigation was and remains extremely important because it was one of the few to foreground TC's processes and resistances to learning within a highly lauded and equity-informed teacher education program. Moreover, this study concerns a common, foreseeable, and significant challenge that has plagued progressive teacher education efforts for 40 years, resistance to learning from and about racism in schools and on the part of teachers.

Antioppressive Teacher Education Context

Over the last four decades, social justice-oriented teacher educators have endeavoured to counteract schooling inequities by unsettling teacher candidates' attitudes and actions towards social difference through a critical examination of identity, culture, politics, and racism. These efforts are undertaken in response to a large body of scholarship that identifies a substantial number of teachers as having prejudicial beliefs about racialized and minoritized students. Many theorists find that these beliefs are not only ill-informed but are, in no small way, responsible for low student achievement among these populations (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Rist, 2000; Gay, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Portelli, 2007; Hynds, 2010; Solomon et al., 2010; Gorski, P. C. 2012; Matias, 2016; Glock, Kovacs and Pit-ten Cate, 2019).

To alter these pervasively problematic and educationally corrosive dispositions, teacher education programs have drawn theoretically on a variety of academic disciplines, such as

philosophy, sociology, psychology, and cultural studies. Anti-racist teacher education melds intersecting approaches and curricular modifications to achieve the educational and frequently political aims of transforming teacher candidates' perspectives and actions. A central tenet in most of this work, which arises from the sub-fields of multiculturalism, antiracism, critical race theory (CRT), and cognitive-developmental psychology, is the belief that social justice commitments can be achieved by altering teacher candidates' ontological experience through specific epistemological approaches to learning and knowledge.[2] These scholars hypothesize that proper anti-racism education training for teacher candidates will lead to 1) development of the skills necessary to work with diverse students; 2) a transformation in their beliefs about students from different ethno-racial and cultural backgrounds, and; 3) an improvement in the academic and life outcomes for racialized and minoritized students (Gay, 1977; Banks, 1995, 2006; Nieto, 2000; Dei, 2000; Solomon, 2007a; Sleeter, 1991; Ladson Billings, 1994, 2001; Zeichner, 2009). The sentiments of these researchers are summarized in Sonia Nieto's, (2000) influential paper entitled "Placing Equity Front and Center: Some Thoughts on Transforming Teacher Education for a New Century."

> What they learn in their teacher education programs can have an enormous impact on the attitudes and practices that teachers bring with them to the schools where they work. If teachers and prospective teachers learn to challenge societal inequities that place some students at a disadvantage over others, if they learn to question unjust institutional policies and practices, if they learn about and use the talents of students and their families in the curriculum, if they undergo a process of personal transformation based on their own identities

---

[2] Several notable researchers claim that programs should focus on teachers' incoming dispositions by using more selective entrance criteria, rather than on changing teacher attitudes during their teacher education (Haberman, 1991). Additionally, that entrance criteria should be developed which identifies the "attitudes, knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to work effectively with a diverse student population" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 1). To deduce whether incoming TC's have acceptable attitudes (Swartz, 2003), they can be screened for open-minded and informed perspectives regarding those who are different from themselves (Lortie, 1975; Haberman, 1991; Haberman & Post, 1998). They point to Lortie's influential work which concluded that the predispositions of aspiring teacher candidates remain a much more powerful predictor of future attitudes than either the impact of any equity-based education or the ensuing socializing influence of teachers' professional contexts (1975).

and experiences, and, finally, if they are prepared to engage with colleagues in a collaborative and imaginative encounter to transform their own practices to achieve equal and high-quality education for all students, then the outcome is sure to be a more positive one than is currently the case (2000, p. 186).

In search of effective methods to change teacher candidates' thinking, theorists and teacher educators have turned to various approaches designed to redress the presumed and documented knowledge gaps and prejudices ascribed to teacher candidates. The methods to which they have turned hold an implicit assumption that teacher candidates' beliefs will change after having been taught what they do not presently know. Research on whether a change in teacher perspective has occurred and if that alteration will lead to action is still not very well understood.[3] According to Kennedy, "we do not have well-developed ideas about teacher learning, nor about how to help teachers incorporate new ideas into their ongoing systems of practice" (2016, p. 973). Despite the continued paucity of investigations regarding the relationship between thinking, learning and practice, most educational approaches are founded on the enlightenment belief that people can learn and that the content of this knowledge will in some measure influence their actions in the world. More to the point, as Paul Burden (1990) noted, we still need to clarify the nature of teacher change and how it occurs. Further complicating this line of inquiry is our discovery that TC attitudes tend to shift depending on context and situation. One moment, a conceptual or

---

[3] A variety of learning theories linked to teacher socialization attempt to explain the process of how thoughts become actions via the content (curriculum) and dynamics (pedagogy) inherent in teacher education programs. The most frequently applied theories within teacher education are functionalist, interpretive, and critical (Wang, 1994; Zeichner & Gore, 2010), whereas the most common interpretive frameworks that attempt to understand professional content and processes are Functionalism, Conflict Theory, and Symbolic Interactionism. However, as Zeichner and Gore commented back in 1990, "it is rare to find articulation of these paradigms in the teacher socialization literature. Too often, research methods precede research questions, and the questions themselves are narrowly construed" (p. 1). Whether or how pre-service teachers' new learning or transformed perspectives arise and how these ideas become transposed into teaching practice is still not well understood, nor is the relationship amongst pedagogy, knowledge, skills, and dispositions. What is clear is that these paradigms are all rooted in sociology and presume both the possibility of objective inquiry and the subject's placement as a conscious actor as the center of said inquiry.

ideological change may be apparent only to disappear in a new situation (Larkin et al., 2016).

Thankfully, despite the many difficulties in implementing programs aimed at transforming TC

thinking, there is general agreement amongst educators that teacher attitudes, thinking, and

expectations concerning their students have an enormous impact on how they respond to their

students (Grant, 1985; Gay, 1977; Brophy, 1987; Bar-Tal, 1982; Nespor, 1987; Banks, 1995,

2006; Aguilar & Pohan, 2001; Nieto, 2000; Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2001;

McCarthy, 2003; Solomon et al., 2005, 2011; Thompson, McNicholl & Menter, 2016).

The problem of how to change TC's negative attitudes towards others/otherness and the

related query of whether such a philosophical shift will lead to a change in their pedagogy is

situated within and directly influenced by several interrelated domains of teacher education

research in the broader context of anti-oppressive education, antiracism, critical multiculturalism,

equity studies and social justice education. Much of the work in these conceptual frameworks

rest on four broad principles of multicultural education: (a) the theory of cultural pluralism; (b)

ideals of social justice and the end of racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and

discrimination; (c) affirmations of culture in the teaching and learning process; and (d) visions of

educational equity and excellence leading to high levels of academic learning for all children and

youth (Bennett, 2001, p. 173).

This investigation focuses primarily on one foundational aspect of equity pedagogy: the belief

that racial and cultural socialization, in tandem with ethnic/race identity, profoundly influences

the teaching and learning process.[4] A central assumption in many strands of equity pedagogy

---

[4] The meaning of race as both a word and concept is highly contentious and complex. In this dissertation, race is
understood as an ideological and conceptual construction (Goldberg, 1990), often based upon external pigments or
other somatic markers read on the body. Race can also be read discursively (Foucault, 1980), although it cannot be
reduced to an effect of discourse. Concurrently, "race is a concept that signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and
interests by referring to different types of human bodies" and can be ". . .understood as a complex, multivalent,

arising from the domain of multicultural competence is that "The reduction of racial and cultural prejudice is possible and desirable" (Bennett, 2001, p. 172). In fact, "[P]rejudice reduction has been an important goal of multicultural education from the beginning; it remains a pillar of purpose in the discipline today" (Bennett, 2001, p. 199). The leading target group of these programs are teachers who continue to be primarily white, female, and middle class (Ryan et al., 2009) despite the "increased minority representation in schools" (Solomon et al., 2005, p. 149). Research in the field of prejudice reduction often tries to assess any changes in the racial attitudes of pre-service teachers and examine whether the reduction of prejudice is useful (Zeichner, 1996; Giroux, 2002; Milner, 2006). One area where there is relative agreement is that "adding a course or a field experience" (Sleeter, 2001, p. 100) is ineffective in bringing about any lasting change to pre-service teachers' worldviews.

Studies where TC's were provided with a combination of curriculum alterations and targeted field placements with diverse populations have demonstrated changes in TC self/other image (Waddell, 2011, p. 31) as well as a better understanding of the importance of considering a complex sense of diversity as an essential aspect of the teaching and learning process. Still, in the only Canada-wide study exploring how teachers thought about race, diversity, difference, and teaching for equity, Solomon et al., (2003) found that "Teachers resist the conclusion that the way they regard social difference perpetuates racism or may even qualify as racism itself" (p. 28). Frustratingly, many theorists also disagree with many of these investigations' utility and conclusions while also questioning which theoretical and methodological approaches are appropriate in gaining insight into these issues (Sleeter, 2001, Brown, 2004b). Moreover, the

---

shifting construct historically contextually, discursively, and politically informed, modified and transformed" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 123). In other words, race is neither a mere illusion nor a purely ideological construct.

disjuncture and inconsistency between theoretical approaches to anti-oppressive pedagogy and practical classroom applications of these approaches by teachers (Guo et al., 2009; Jupp, Berry & Lensmire, 2016) presents a myriad of difficulties when trying to assess the impact of these ideas and also whether changes in teacher actions or student outcomes can be associated with specific conceptual approaches or methodological strategies.

Methodological Applications of Theory

There is broad agreement amongst progressively oriented researchers and teacher educators that for TC's to change/transform their biases and become competent teachers in a modern classroom, they must first appreciate and respect their students' diverse identities and perspectives. Such changes presume that teacher candidates must come to know themselves and those whose identities differ from their own better than they know now. Accordingly, teacher candidates must begin examining their own identity (Gay, 1977; McAllister and Irvine, 2000; Banks, 2006; Allen, 2011; Jupp, Berry & Lensmire, 2016) to foster critical self-reflection. These theorists advocate that teacher candidates scrutinize the salient aspects as tied to culture—knowledge—and ignorance—about social difference and otherness. As Grant and Sleeter (2007) explain,

> The sense you make of students and the work of teaching is filtered through your cultural lenses: the beliefs, assumptions, and experiences you bring to the classroom. It is impossible to understand other people without first understanding yourself and how your perspective shapes how you interpret others (p. 9).

The inquiries into the self to which Grant and Sleeter are referring are narratively framed in a manner that presents and encourages an understanding of the self as a conscious social actor who occupies a variety of subject positions characterized by skin colour, social class, gender, religion, ethnicity, ability, and sexual orientation. In practice, teacher candidates are encouraged (and instructed) to interrogate their thoughts and interactions with others who are different from

themselves. Some common tactical strategies to enhance an increase in self-awareness include journal writing (Milner, 2003), autobiography (Schmidt, 1997; Fernandez, 2003), examining classroom events (Lin, Lake, & Rice, 2008) and using critical incidents to encourage more in-depth analysis and reflection (Pedersen, 1995). This critical self-analysis work aims to help teacher candidates consider how their own identity, values, goals, professional roles, interpretations of difference, and philosophical orientation to education shape how they approach diverse students and their teaching practice.

Additionally, academics point out that an integral part of the examination of identity is problematizing the power and privilege of white teacher candidates (McIntosh, 1990; Sleeter, 1993; Dei, Karumanchery & Luik, 2004; Banks, 2006; Milner, 2006; Gorsky, 2009; Solomon et al., 2011; Jupp, Berry & Lensmire, 2016; Bartolome and Macedo, 2017) while also introducing marginalized and racialized students to how the "culture of power" (Delpit, 1988, p. 282) operates. Readings, lectures, and articles are assigned, which explore and delineate how social and institutional codes of power inform the relationships between privileged and subordinate groups. The privileged are most often identified as those in the dominant culture (primarily white students).[5] Course readings, discussions and assignments serve the purpose of furthering the theoretical complexity of earlier discussions about identity by "examining how the 'boundaries' of ethnicity, race and power make visible how whiteness functions as a historical and social construction" (Giroux, 1992, p. 117). Teacher candidates are asked to consider how aspects of their identities have become racialized within discourses of power and how whiteness is a "social marker" from which TC's task involves, "a systematic, rigorous, critical

---

[5] The importance of how poverty, privilege, and power work to shape individuals' social and political marginalization and how racial privilege is predicated on skin colour as per Critical Race Theory, Antiracism, Critical Multiculturalism, and Critical Whiteness Studies are also foregrounded in TC's work.

problematization of whiteness as the active participant in systems of domination as distinct from studying racial difference as the effect of such processes (Levine-Rasky, 2000, p. 272).

In practice, often, the experiences of those identified as white teacher candidates are compared with racialized/minoritized teacher candidates to demonstrate how deeply race impacts one's experience of the world (Darling Hammond, 2004). This technique mentioned above reflects the "counter-story telling" method developed in critical race theory (CRT), the application of which theorists' purports may challenge hegemonic narratives of racial dominance (Tate, 1995; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). Richard Milner (2006) also refers to this method as "relational reflection," described as a time when "the pre-service teachers thought intently about their perspectives, beliefs, and life-worlds in conjunction and comparison with, and in contrast to their students' communities" (p. 370).[6] Indeed, after teacher candidates have undertaken the requisite explorations of their identities (using several or many of the methods described above depending on the program), they are often deliberately placed into schools or communities with others whose identities are visibly different from their own. The intent here is to learn about racialized and marginalized others through direct contact and become familiar firsthand with alternate discourses. Through building new embodied experiences and discursive associations for TC's, it is believed that novel cognitive pathways, which will breach pre-service teachers' "cultural encapsulation" (Banks, 1994) and Eurocentric cultural indoctrination (hooks, 1994; Delpit, 1995), will be created enabling a re-inscription of incorrect racial, ethnic, social, linguistic, and economic discourses, discursive signifiers, and meta-narratives.

---

[6] This method reflects a primary goal of Critical Race Theory, which uses narratives to examine race and racism (Parker & Lynn, 2002). Such counter-stories are a critical race methodology intended to challenge racial privilege (Solorzano and Yosso, 2002).

Despite almost 40 years of increasingly complex theory and inventive methods aimed at transforming teacher candidate attitudes, these programs' efforts to transform teacher candidate subjectivity have been consistently conceptualized and depicted as having been plagued by white teacher candidate *resistance* since its inception. Primarily, resistance has been framed as white teacher educators' failure to change their opinions and attitudes concerning race, otherness, and social difference. This resistance has been clearly linked with teacher candidates' difficulty talking about or addressing race, racism, white privilege, and cultural difference in any meaningful way (Solomon et al., 2003; Matias, 2016). Undoubtedly and understandably, refusal to change racist and prejudicial perspectives has been a large area of concern for teacher educators and theorists and is one of the most theorized of anti-oppressive programs (Giroux, 1983; Sleeter, 1992; McIntosh et al., 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Solomon & Daniel, 2007; de Courcy, 2007; Thomas & Vanderhaar, 2008; Larkin et al., 2016).

In Carson and Johnson's cogent formulation, TC resistance occurs because the feelings and emotions that arise are learning conflicts with teacher candidates' belief system (2000). Such conflicts manifest as powerful emotional reactions, including guilt, anger, and shame (Tatum, 1992; Thompson, 2001; Solomon et al., 2005; Rozas & Miller, 2009).[7] The expression of these powerful emotions has also been theorized in some measure as: performative, reflecting power relations, forging affective political bonds (Zembylas, 2007), which through particularized expressions can further oppress already marginalized and racialized groups, (Wanzo, 2015). Taken together, teacher candidate resistance theories explain these maneuvers and powerful emotional expressions as auguring both an interruption in learning about selves and others a well as a retrenchment of teacher candidates' distorted frames of reference. In contradistinction, a

---

[7] Also, see Sleeter, (1992), Bennett, (1993) and Thompson (2001).

growing field of scholars enlisting psychoanalytic insights to matters of teaching and learning,

including Deborah Britzman, Alice Pitt, Sharon Todd, Aparna Mishra-Tarc, Collette Granger,

Sara Matthews, Lisa Farley, J.M. Shim and Karen Lowenstein, believe that resistance, rather than

being an indication that learning has ceased, is a sign of learning being processed.

   Despite some important attention to the psychosocial dimensions of anti-oppressive teaching

and learning as emotional conflict (Zembylas, 2007; Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2008; Chubbuck,

2010; Grosland, 2019), an implicit presumption operating in the preponderance of literature

describing primarily white resistance continues to presume that if we change the external

circumstances within which students work, the persons with whom the students work, and the

content of the curriculum, then they will presumably transform their thinking (Banks, 2004;

Ladson- Billings, 1995a; Dei, 1996; Sheets and Gay, 1996; Sleeter 2001; Gay, 2002; McCaskell,

2005, Solomon et al., 2011). The right knowledge alongside the right experiences with the right

people will "cure" the de-facto cause of their prejudice or racism. Contrary to these framings, the

dissertation proceeds from the presumption that resistance to learning is, in addition to

sociologically influenced, psychodynamically rooted. Additionally, resistance to knowledge is

multifaceted and dynamically located somewhere between hegemonic social discourses and

psycho-dynamically defined unconscious conflict.

   If TC's refuse to learn or change their thinking in accordance with the aims and desires of

TE's and researchers, then the primary goal of transforming teacher attitudes, inherent in anti-

oppressive and social justice-oriented work, remains a longed-for ideal, yet to be realized.

Moreover, while understanding the complexity and power of emotions on the learning and

processing of ideas is essential, most of this work emanates from developmental and cognitivist

psychological theories. What makes this dissertation's approach to understanding TC responses

novel is a) the focus on psychoanalytic learning dynamics and b) the method through which intellectual and emotional support to learners is provided. The purpose of this assistance is not just an ethical responsibility to protect people from harm, but pedagogical. The presupposition of this dissertation, based in part on 30 years of direct experience working as a therapist and in education, is that if teacher candidates are given additional emotional support within a uniquely designed and psychodynamically informed environment, they can move beyond the emotional dams stifling their intellectual growth and openness to seemingly threatening ideas. We cannot get beneath the surface of TC resistance to explore the source of their mistaken, ignorant, racist, or intolerant ideas unless emotions linked to resistance are challenged. The problem in moving beyond present teacher candidate perceptions about difference is that in the past, the stimulation of their emotions has most often led to a blocking of their ability to think beyond present intellectual frameworks. The question remains, can we safely and ethically release the damning up of emotion through our pedagogical ministrations and encourage critical thinking without ignoring the socially performative aspects of emotional expression and their implication as an effect of the culture of power and dominance?

In thinking about pre-service teachers' positions towards anti-oppressive education and their implication in othering, this dissertation's central and interrelated questions arise 1) How can we alternatively understand the dynamics of teacher candidates' learning that mitigate the intended outcomes of social justice programs? 2) What can be done pedagogically to intervene in this interruption of intended learning? 3) What might be altered or shifted programmatically to address this break? 4) What are the conceptual underpinnings and pedagogic practices which must be examined and shifted to increase the likelihood that anti-oppressive approaches are engaged as intended by teacher candidates and provisionally 5) How can we understand the

dispositions and actions of professors who teach in social justice programs and their interactions with teacher candidates as a feature in the intended learning? These queries concern TC learning and the nature and location of learning dynamics in teaching and learning about social difference.

Multiculturalism & Antiracism: Education in Ontario

Teacher education programs in Ontario have since 1971 been substantively built upon Canada's official multicultural posture. In particular, the Multiculturalism Policy of 1971 led to the founding of the Heritage Language program and the establishment at both the Toronto and North York School Boards "of working groups on multicultural education" (Harper, 1997, p. 199). In 1975, the Ontario Ministry of Education released a new curriculum to help ensure that all children have both the opportunity to develop and maintain their identity as well as understand and appreciate other ethnic and cultural groups. New standards for grades one through grade six were established for children to explore and preserve their historical, cultural, and communal identities. The belief was that children would learn to appreciate and understand other ethnic and cultural groups while developing a greater understanding and appreciation of their own. Significantly, the 1970 federal Multicultural Act's language conceptualized multiculturalism as "voluntary marginal differentiation." That is, newcomers could choose to retain and celebrate their cultures of origin while fully integrating into a Canadian society distinguished by a bi-lingual and bi-cultural framework (English and French). Thus, contrary to popular understandings, multiculturalism as policy, ideology and practices were never intended to ensure cultural equality (Walcott, 1993).

A significant change in government education policy's focus came in the early 1990s when issues of race and the politics of race began to supplant the traditional focus on culture in Ontario. This shift took place mainly in response to a riot that occurred in early May of 1992.

Responding to this revolt, Premier Bob Rae asked Stephen Lewis to become a temporary advisor to the Premiere on Race Relations. In the summer of 1992, Stephen Lewis completed a report for the Government of Ontario detailing his recommendations for dealing with race issues in Ontario. Mr. Lewis made it clear that for him, the issue of race in Ontario was disproportionately one of anti-Black racism. Regarding the problem of racism in Ontario's education system, Mr. Lewis made the following suggestions:

- The Minister of Education, through his new Assistant- Deputy Minister, establish a strong monitoring mechanism to follow-up the implementation of multicultural and anti- racism policies in the School Boards of Ontario.

- The Parliamentary-Assistant to the Premier, Ms. Zanana Akande, continue to pursue, with unrelenting tenacity, the revision of curriculum at every level of education so that it fully reflects the profound multicultural changes in Ontario society.

- The Minister of Education, in conjunction with the minister of Colleges and Universities, review admission requirements to the Faculties of Education in Ontario, in order to ensure that the faculties make every effort to attract and enroll qualified visible minority candidates. To this end, the proposals of the Teacher Education Council of Ontario should be given serious consideration.

- The Minister of Education must monitor the implementation of Employment Equity in the Schools of Ontario, as closely as he monitors its implementation in his own Ministry.

- The Minister of Colleges and Universities examine carefully the representative nature of Boards which govern both Colleges and Universities so that they reflect the changed society of Ontario.

- The Minister of Colleges and Universities give serious consideration to the race relations policy proposed by the Council of Regents of the Community College system, with a view to using it, with whatever appropriate amendment, as a model for post-secondary institutions (Lewis, 1992).

Soon after the report's release, The Ontario Provincial Government set out to address many recommendations. For example, The Ministry of Education and Training (1993) required all school boards to develop and implement policies on antiracism and ethnocultural equity. This makes an essential shift in State policy and practices on the question of cultural diversity. There was a perceived need for affirmative action initiatives in state and civil society as well as mechanisms for enforcement and accountability (see – Jean Leonard Elliot).

Teacher Education Policy in Ontario

A further study by the Four Level Working Group (1992) was released that linked students' race with poor outcomes in Ontario Schools. In 1994, in response to this study, to Stephen Lewis's recommendations, to the province's Antiracism and Equity policies, and in recognition of the growing diversity in Ontario schools, The Ontario Ministry of Education challenged teacher preparation programs to be more "relevant and responsive to the province's growing racial and ethnocultural diversity" (Solomon, 2007, p. 2). In practice, this would mean dramatically re-designing and re-envisioning existing teacher education programs.

Research Site: York University, Toronto, Canada

In response to The Ontario Ministry of Education's challenge in 1994 to make teacher education more "relevant to the province's growing racial and ethnocultural diversity" (Solomon, 2007: 2), and cognizant of the various recommendations made by the Stephen Lewis report, which detailed racism in Ontario schools, York University supported the development of a progressive teacher education program. The Urban Diversity Teacher Education

Program (formerly The Diversity Initiative) began in 1994 under Professor Patrick Solomon and

Doctor Gary Bunch's aegis. "Rather than designing a program that addressed the Ministry's

concerns in name only, the York faculty set for themselves an ambitious agenda that attends to

the inequities in schooling and society" (Zeichner & Flessner, 2009). Consequently, the program

can be accurately described as activist centred, antiracism framed, social justice teacher

education. UD was a 10-month post-baccalaureate undergraduate program leading to the

Bachelor of Education degree. The program ended in 2011 when Teacher Education in Ontario

changed to a two-year timeframe.

The Urban Diversity Program: Inception & Status

Cognizant of the factors which influenced the challenging request by the Ontario Ministry of

Education, York University supported the development of a unique teacher education program.

The program, which was inspired by the York Faculty of Education's *Academic Framework*

Report of 1994 (Britzman et al., 1995) began that same year and was designed by Dr. Gary

Bunch and subsequently ran under the aegis of Professors Patrick Solomon and Gary Bunch.

What made this program one of the best examples of anti-oppressive theory/method at work is its

integrated and multi-pronged approach to a social justice agenda within which issues of equity,

diversity, and social justice are considered of paramount concern to teacher education. From its

inception, according to Solomon, the initiative was designed to create TC's who would become

leaders and change agents[8] within and beyond the field of education. To encourage teacher

candidate development along these lines, the program was designed to instruct TC's that their

roles as teachers would be, in no small measure, political, and a great part of the work to achieve

---

[8]The description of teacher as "change agent" comes from Michael Fullan's influential article in the Journal of Educational Leadership entitled, "Why Teachers Must Become Change Agents" (1993). The piece argues in a very general way that teachers should be prepared for, and participate in, a perpetually shifting teaching landscape which may involve altering how they have been socialized to think about the purposes of education.

this politicization of teaching and learning would require each teacher candidate to shift their

perspectives concerning Otherness and Social Difference. At the time when this study was

undertaken, the UD program could accurately be described as an activist centered, social justice

oriented, teacher education program which was painstakingly designed to engender a democratic,

egalitarian, social-reconstructionist, educational philosophy amongst its teacher candidates. One

guiding intention of the program is to transform teacher candidate perspectives concerning

racialized and marginalized others.

The program's exemplary status in the field of Social Justice Teacher Education was solidified

by a detailed citation and description in the *International Handbook of Critical Education*,

(Apple, Au & Gandin 2009). In an essay entitled, "Educating Teachers for Critical Education,"

(2009) Kenneth Zeichner and Ryan Flessner identified the UD program as one of three which

exemplified Social Justice Teacher Education. In praising the conceptualization and scope of the

program, they stated that "[t]he faculty designed a program with an extremely ambitious agenda

that aimed to contribute directly to ameliorating inequities in both schooling and society"

(Zeichner & Flessner, 2009: 301).

Urban Diversity Program Overview

The main aim of the program is to integrate equity, diversity, and social justice into all
aspects of the theoretical, experiential, and practical aspects of the program. Our specific
objectives are to: (1) provide an environment in which teacher candidates of various racial
and ethnocultural groups and abilities have extended opportunities to develop teaching
competencies and professional relationships in a collaborative environment; (2) integrate
issues of equity and diversity into the curriculum and pedagogy of the teacher education
program and in the classrooms of practicum schools; (3) prepare teacher candidates to work
in urban environments that reflect society's diversity; and (4) develop collaboration among
practicum school staff, the candidates, and teacher educators from the university in order to
form a community of learners (Solomon et al., 2011).

The Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program (UD) was a ten-month post-baccalaureate

undergraduate course of study leading to the Bachelor of Education degree. Initial entrance into

the program required having previously completed an undergraduate degree with an average deemed acceptable on an annual basis determined by York University and the Faculty of Education. If applicants are deemed eligible, an interview by the Faculty of Education is conducted. After the interview, a small group of teacher educators and graduate students review applicant packages and decide who will be granted entrance into the faculty.

The criteria used by Urban Diversity for granting entrance into the program reflects the ongoing efforts to develop a pre-screening criterion for teacher candidates who will work with students from diverse backgrounds. (Lortie, 1975, Haberman, 1991; Zeichner, 1992; Haberman & Post, 1998; Swartz, 2003).) In deciding who will be accepted, York University's Access Initiative program is one criterion that adjudicators of incoming teacher candidate qualifications are instructed to remain aware of. Access Initiative acts as both a policy and practice designed to attract groups traditionally underrepresented in the teaching profession. These recruits include people of color, Aboriginal/First Nations peoples, refugees, immigrants, and people with disabilities. The initial intake structure of the program required that half of each cohort be representative of these groups. Those who meet the Access Initiative criteria, which includes having self-identified as a member of one of the groups mentioned above, as well as demonstrating through a written narrative or during the interview portion of the Teacher Education Application process, compelling narratives about their experiences and commitments to equity, diversity, and social justice, have their file separated from other potential teacher candidates' applications to receive priority placement.

In general, potential candidate application packages and interviews are also scrutinized for any signs of experience with individuals from diverse social, cultural, racial, or ethnic groups or people with disabilities. Any candidate who clearly communicates insight into how identity and

social difference influence teaching and learning is looked upon favourably for admission. Mention of how social, political, and historical forces affect teaching and learning are also considered positively. Working in racialized or marginalized communities or social justice work involvement are particularly influential factors in this process.

Teacher candidates in the UD Program were exceptionally diverse and came from a range of racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, which reflect the diversity of Toronto's student population. In comparison, the vast majority accepted into teacher education programs continue to be overwhelmingly white (Solomon et al., 2005: 149, Ryan, Pollock & Antonelli, 2010: 592). In contradistinction, during the 2006-2007 academic year, "white students" in the UD Program accounted for about 50% of the teacher candidate population (2007, UD Records).

Various methods have been applied in an explicit effort to transform teacher candidate perspectives regarding students who are different from themselves. The intention to change teacher candidate thinking (Banks, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Dei, 1996; Sheets & Gay, 1996; Sleeter 2001; Gay, 2002; McCaskell, 2005) was a cornerstone of the Urban Diversity Program (Solomon et al., 2011).

The primary goals of the Urban Diversity Program:[9]

1) Provide an environment in which teacher candidates of various racial and ethnocultural groups can develop teaching competencies and professional relationships in a collaborative manner.

2) Integrate multiculturalism, antiracism, and other equity and diversity issues into the curriculum and pedagogy of the teacher education programs and in the classrooms of cooperating schools.

---

[9] The description of the primary goals of the program is taken directly from Brave New Teachers: Social Justice Education in Neo-Liberal Times, Solomon et al. 2011).

3) Develop collaboration and partnership among co-operating school staff, representatives of community organizations, York's teacher candidates and teacher educators, forming a "community of learners."

Minimally the program required:

● a critical examination of teacher candidate cultural and racial identity.

● a problematization of the *power and privilege* inherent in the culture of whiteness.

● an examination of one's cultural and racial biases.

● a critical analysis of curriculum(s), both tacit and hidden that requires a recognition that while the curriculum is designed to teach something specific, it simultaneously also denies and silences particular frames of reference and knowledge bases.

● an explicit treatment of how the factors above influence one's teaching practice (Solomon et al., 2011).

The linkages between the engagements above with pedagogical practice are essential as the program's social re-constructionist philosophy aims to develop "conscientization" (Freire, 1973) amongst its graduates. Conscientization refers to eliciting a moral and ethical perception that reveals social and political contradictions that motivate one to take action to alleviate the suffering and oppression of others (Freire, 1973: 35). Conscientization itself is akin to an awakened consciousness reflecting Marx's theories of class consciousness. The process of awakening is often referred to as a transformation that requires problem posing and humanizing dialogue. Through the dialogic process, individuals (TC's) become aware of their responsibility to act against the oppressive elements in their lives or the lives of others which work to subjugate freedom of thought and action (Freire, 1973), thereby creating an environment within which students can acquire, interrogate, and produce knowledge for societal change (Banks & Banks, 1995).

To develop this transformation of consciousness, the UD Program (directly reflecting common anti-oppressive methods) immerses TC's in critical explorations of issues such as race,

ethnocultural identity, class, gender, sexual orientation, and ability. As well, candidates are required to dissect and analyze the explicit and implicit linkages within/between theory and practice concerning the teaching and learning process. This scrutiny includes developing a socio-political, historical, and contextual understanding of schools and the schooling process. As a result of these intellectual and experiential requirements, it is hoped that students will begin to think about and integrate the concept of praxis in their contemplations of what they do in the classroom. In the UD program, following Plato, Karl Marx and Paulo Freire, praxis is understood as "the dialectical union of reflection and action: it is the notion that theory and practice are inseparable" (Finn & Finn, 2007: 141). The inseparability between thinking about the world and changing the world for Freire was central; hence praxis reflects conscientization. In his work, he also explained praxis as "[r]eflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970:51). Transforming both the self (one's thinking) and the world (what one does) reflects the philosophical and political grounds upon which the UD Program was conceived as an integral part of the solution for growing racism in Toronto.

The program ultimately aims to produce culturally relevant teaching (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1996, Villegas & Lucas, 2002) and "culturally responsive teachers" (Ladson- Billings, 1995b; Gay, 2002) who utilize 'community reference pedagogy' (Schecter et al., 2003), which requires an awareness of the value and wealth of cultural capital their diverse students bring into the classroom, along with their complex identities. Learning from their experiences with children, parents and colleagues, these teachers work to transform inequitable reproduction practices by tacitly educating their students to think critically about the moral, ethical and, therefore, socially just implications of what forms of knowledge and experiences are most valued in our society and why. As Gay (2002) articulates, "[c]ulturally responsive teachers help students to understand that

knowledge has moral and political elements and consequences, which obligate them to take social action to promote freedom, equality and justice for everyone" (p. 10).

By utilizing these disparate though interrelated strategies and instructional practices, the Urban Diversity Program aim to produce "transformative intellectuals" (Giroux and McLaren, 1986) who can "adopt a more critical role of challenging the social order to develop and advocate its democratic imperatives" (p. 224). Transformative teachers are aware of societal inequities, and they see schools as sites of political struggle. They focus on the relationship between knowledge and power and the link between students' knowledge and political agency (Finn & Finn, 2007, p. 51). Specifically, these teachers "create spaces where parents, students, community members, and teachers can become collective actors with the ultimate goal of building powerful social movements that change policy and consciousness" (Finn & Finn, 2007, p. 51). Of great note here is how the program is foundationally inspired by the notion that theory, method, and political activism are inseparable.

We can easily identify several major assumptions at the UD site regarding subjectivity, identity, and learning frameworks that mirror anti-oppressive theorizing:

1. A belief that a subject is in conscious control of their thinking and actions.
2. An understanding of the subject as capable of representation[10], despite the influence of some post-structural and postcolonial theories that posit a more fluid self that is informed by a multiplicity of discourses, and identity positions.
3. A cognitivist conceptual orientation to learning theory.
4. A particular framing of white subjectivity.
5. An assumption that resistance (in its many guises) indicates intellectually based intransigence or dysconscious racism.

---

[10] I use the term representation because the theoretical depictions of the subject in most Anti-oppressive theory is capable of being thematized as conscious, stable, and psychologically knowable in some measure.

From its inception until its demise, the entire UD team, including seconded teachers, professors, and graduate assistants, has documented, analyzed, and revised course content and curricular practices. In 2006, the UD team addressed ways of taking up and possibly mitigating the racial animosity, emotional upheavals and intellectual intransigence that ensued each year in response to explicit discussions of race and social privilege. At my behest (see methodology for more detail), the UD team decided that the formation of demographically and socially engineered small groups the following year may mitigate or dampen these corrosive dynamics. Thus, the UD program at York University gave rise to the small groups and innovative pedagogy within them as a pedagogical intervention. At the end of 2006, the groups were deemed useful based upon the feedback of teacher candidates and the UD team. This dissertation examines the context, dynamics, and impact of these small groups on TC learning during the 2008/2009 school year. Accordingly, this dissertation will explore how small group processing influenced the learning process and apprehension of anti-oppressive pedagogy to explore the relationships among interpersonal dynamics, difficult learning, and change, providing a more complex understanding of how the dynamics, understandings of, and responses to interruptions in the process of learning can work in uniquely framed small group contexts. Furthermore, how oppositional stances shape teacher candidates' learning will be explored in detail. Dr. Patrick Solomon, who died Oct 4, 2008, was the Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program Director and had been my supervisor. He supported the proposed work and provided me with full access to the program records.

Several factors make my exploration of this program unique. I have co-authored two books about Urban Diversity's theoretical underpinnings (Solomon et al., 2003) and its real struggles and successes (Solomon et al., 2011). Additionally, for 14 years, from 1997 to 2010, I was a student, a Teaching Associate, Research Assistant, Graduate Assistant and Course Director in the

program. Moreover, I will utilize alternative theoretical lenses (outlined below) to understand and contribute to the long-standing tradition of examining and contributing to social justice-oriented teacher education programs, such as UD.

The dissertation phenomenologically brackets traditional sociological understanding of "white resistance" as denoting selfish expressions of guilt, anger, and defensiveness. It foregrounds resistance as potentially arising out of an ethically and metaphysically oriented susceptibility to the Other (Todd, 2001, p. 606) and as indicative of an essential part of the learning process that reflects our original disposition to learning (Britzman, 1997). Whereas past approaches to understand and respond to TC resistance have overwhelmingly claimed that TC's are suffering from a type of cognitive dissonance indicative of simple consciously mediated psychological defences (reflecting dysconscious racism), this dissertation presupposes that the effect of difficult knowledge on individuals is a substantial aspect of TC opposition to learning about others, reflecting both complex and more primitive psychological defences triggered when individuals perceive a threat (Britzman, 1998; Simon, 1992; Todd, 2001; Pitt, 2003).

To summarize, the relationships between educators' theoretical adherence, pedagogical methods, essentialized conceptualizations of "white student resistance," and past studies' findings may be skewed by preconceived expectations. (Lowenstein, 2009). Also, identifying which methods are best to productively engage with "white resistance" to anti-oppressive teacher education remains a fertile area of exploration. Eliciting alternative descriptions of what is occurring within learners differing from how traditionally progressive educational theorists and practitioners have framed what is going on calls for an investigation into what is occurring during the process of learning within the mind of teacher candidates, according to teacher candidates themselves. As Kenneth Zeichner concluded back in (1999), this is a crucial research area that

needs to be pursued. Specifically, he wondered how pre-service educators within teacher education programs derive meaning. Ten years after this statement, just before this dissertation study, Karen Lowenstein (2009) opined that what is still missing from Multicultural education research are "systematic studies of teacher candidates' perceptions of their learning about issues of diversity" (p. 164). Later, she adds that there is extraordinarily little dialogue on white teacher candidates as learners in Multicultural teacher education (p. 164).

Revising Antioppressive Teacher Education

Toward the end of my master's thesis, which explored "Ambivalence as a Major Aspect of Resistance to Antiracist Pedagogy" (2003), I began to think seriously about designing a pedagogical space where educators and our students could learn from our mutually constituted resistances when faced with difficult knowledge. I also pondered if making teacher candidates aware of psychoanalytic theory and, in particular, the tendency to react emotionally to difficult knowledge, in tandem with alternatively designed pedagogical environments, could in some measure mitigate interruptions to thinking, making the shutting down of critical thinking less likely. I wondered if assisting students in the process of working through these moments was possible. I felt that it was best to begin by reflecting on those critical moments where conflict arose most profoundly and where teacher educators could respond ethically to students' perturbations. These moments, which I have witnessed countless times, often reflected indelicate responses to TC's struggles with difficult knowledge, provoking teacher candidates' vital vulnerability. Perhaps, I wondered, could we build an environment attentive to everyone's vulnerability in learning to encourage more critical thinking? Might it be possible to create a time and space that can sensitize and shift how teacher educators listen to teacher candidates, minding not so much what they say or do, know, or do not know but instead, ponder what else (besides) rational thought informs their being, their ability to attend to what is being taught in the

classroom? In this way, attending to teacher candidates, I hoped, could help them work through disturbances that threaten new (and old) thoughts (and affects) from becoming clear thinking.

I ruminated as to how classroom pedagogy would need to be re-oriented to learn from students' struggles more conducive to working through resistances rather than antagonizing further intransigence or pain. Finally, I proposed a reconfiguration of antiracist pedagogy that considers how psychoanalytically informed definitions of ambivalence structure resistance. Toward the end of my thesis, following Deborah Britzman (1998), Shoshana Felman (1997) and Alice Pitt's (1998) lead, I began to outline an alternative pedagogical approach that utilized some of Donald Winnicott's concepts (1947;, 1958;, 1963;, 1971;, 1992a: 1992b) to frame an environment where students and teachers can safely explore the meaning of resistances, interruptions and affect in their learning and thereby gain insight into their initial dispositions to learning and Others. In sum, my master's thesis began the work of theorizing a pedagogical approach sensitive to teacher candidates' "resistance" to antiracist education in a manner that does not diminish the simultaneous goal of understanding how power works through social structures and how these hegemonic systems can be transformed. While sharing the same political and theoretical underpinnings, this dissertation, in contrast, examines the processing dynamics of teaching and learning about social differences in a specially designed environment.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Over the last four decades, debates concerning the preparedness of teachers to work equitably within schools and communities characterized by racial, ethnic, cultural and socio-economic difference and diversity have been well documented in critical multicultural, antiracist, and social justice-oriented research (Delpit, 1988, 1995; Zeichner, 1996; Thompson, 1997; Ladson Billings, 1999; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Gay, 2002; Solomon et al., 2003; hooks, 2003; Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Carter, 2008; Young, 2010; Villegas, Strom & Lucas, 2012; Garrett & Segall, 2013). These studies' findings strongly suggest that white middle-class TC's familiarity with races, ethnicities, cultures, and classes that differ from their own are both inadequate and laden with prejudice. More specifically, research has uncovered that many white teacher candidates and practicing teachers demonstrate explicit racial bias (Henry et al., 1995; James 1998), maintain derogatory stereotypes about *urban* children (Schultz, Neyhart, & Reck, 1996; Sleeter, 2001; Burns, Grande & Marable, 2008), lack knowledge of cultural diversity (Sleeter, 2008), and believe that *urban* children by definition are linguistically and academically deficient (Sleeter, 2001; Czop, Battle & Garza, 2010). Additionally, they have a substantial amount of internalized bias against the working class (Curtis, Livingstone & Smaller, 1992; List, 2000), hold low expectations of racialized students (Berlak, 2008), often ascribe the achievement gap to student's home environment and parents (Sleeter, 1992; Marx, 2008), and expect them to perform poorly (Taylor, 1979; Ferguson, 1998; Sperling, 2007). [11]

---

[11] The research cited is indicative of the literature when this study was undertaken.

Addressing Prejudice and Racism

In response to the wealth of data depicting the negative perceptions of white teacher candidate views of racialized and minoritized students and the belief that their thinking is, in no small way, responsible for poor student achievement (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Rist, 2000; Gay, 2000; Sleeter, 2001; Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Hynds, 2010; Solomon et al., 2003; Solomon, et al., 2011) calls by researchers and practitioners to design effective teacher education programs in order to change teacher candidate attitudes and actions have become commonplace (Banks, 1994; Ladson- Billings, 1995a; Dei, 1996; Sheets & Gay, 1996; Sleeter 2001; Gay, 2002; McCaskell, 2005; Spinthourakis et al., 2009; Gorski & Dalton, 2020). Countering theorists who envision that TC change during teacher education is possible, other notable investigators have stated that changing teacher candidate perspectives is beside the point and ineffective. They claim that multicultural education or equity pedagogy can do little or nothing to change pre-eminently powerful predispositions (e.g. Lortie, 1975; Haberman & Post, 1998). Therefore, attempts to change schools and teachers' predominantly socially reproductive stance should focus on more selective entrance criteria for teacher candidates (Haberman, 1991). Instead, they suggest that teacher education programs should focus on teachers' incoming dispositions by using more selective entrance criteria, rather than changing teacher attitudes during their teacher education (Haberman, 1991). Additionally, entrance criteria should be developed that identifies the "attitudes, knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to work effectively with a diverse student population" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 1) in order to deduce whether or not incoming teacher candidates have acceptable attitudes (Swartz, 2003).[12] In particular, criteria should be developed

---

[12] The description "acceptable attitudes" is generally understood under the larger schematic umbrella of "dispositions". See Nieto, 2000; Irvine, 2003; Banks et al., 2005; Delpit, 2008. A recent literature review of the

so that teacher candidates can be screened for open-minded and informed perspectives regarding those who are different from themselves (Haberman, 1991; Haberman & Post, 1998). To support their position, they point to Lortie's (1975) influential work that concluded the predispositions of aspiring teacher candidates remain a much more powerful predictor of future attitudes towards students who are different from themselves than either the impact of any equity-based education or the ensuing socializing influence of teachers' professional contexts.

Other notable researchers advocate increasing and expediting entrance for minoritized and racialized teacher candidates, as studies have shown that their racial, ethnic and cultural identities make them both more likely to be effective educators of diverse students and committed to social justice aims (Ladson-Billings, 1991; Carr & Klassen, 1997; Dei, 2000; Solomon, 2007).[13] Nevertheless, most academics and TE's committed to anti-oppressive approaches continue to believe that teacher candidate attitudes can be developed during teacher education programs (Zeichner, 1992, p. 1; Banks et al., 2005; Solomon et al., 2011). These supporters, coupled with countless others, contend that proper teacher education training will help TC's to 1) develop the skills necessary to work with diverse students; 2) transform their beliefs about students from diverse cultural backgrounds and; 3) improve the academic and life outcomes for racialized and minoritized students (Gay, 1977; Banks, 1995, 2006; Nieto, 2000; Dei, 2000; Solomon, 2007; Sleeter, 1991; Ladson Billings, 1994, 2001; Carter, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 2009).

---

dispositions necessary for multicultural teaching (Jenson et al., 2018) identified empathy, meekness, social awareness, inclusion, and advocacy as the most common multicultural dispositions of teachers.

[13] The data that emerges in this study brings this rather large claim into question and is more in agreement with Kleinfeld (1995). Sleeter (2001), Friesen and Friesen (2002), Kanu (2007), and Hogan (2008). They found that instructional styles of teachers may be more influential than ethnic membership in improving diverse learners' academic performance and retention rates.

Pedagogy, Identity & Subjectivity

Where the preceding section discussed how past inquiries have framed, in a general way, the relationship between teachers' attitudes towards racialized and minoritized students and how their negative attitudes can predestine student's academic failure or success, there is still the question of how pedagogy in anti-oppressive teacher education programs takes up the work on identity and subjectivity. Understanding how this work informs pedagogical approaches to changing teacher candidate beliefs is pivotal because how we think and learn about ourselves, others, and the state of the world - past, present, and future - is precisely what these programs aim to alter. Also, revealing how the field has framed identity and subjectivity will allow us to view the implicit and explicit assumptions about learning and the knowledge construction process embedded in these complex attempts to understand and alter an individual's subjectivity. Moreover, examining how the field has theorized subjectivity, learning and knowledge can help scrutinize more precisely to what extent these conceptual frameworks have become inscribed in anti-oppressive theoretical assumptions and methodological attempts to alter teacher candidate thinking. We begin with an overview of some key theoretical tenets from sociology, psychology, and cultural studies, which have informed anti-oppressive based hypotheses about identity, subjectivity, change and learning.

Since the 1980s, a sizable body of work in the social sciences, including major contributions from philosophy, sociology, and cultural studies, has concentrated upon how identity and subjectivity are constructed. Work from the 1980s to the mid to late 1990s posited that identity resulted from the socially mediated intersections of interdependent dynamic relations between culture, race, ethnicity, gender, and class (Omi and Winant, 1994; James, 1999). This work's main trajectory and focal point were to delineate how the social, historical, and political reproduction of racism worked and how these forces could be mitigated, interrupted, or

eliminated. Stuart Hall (1992) summarizes, "[o]ur understanding of race has a new richness and complexity when it is informed by an analysis in which class, race, and genders are constitutive of the material relations of production and reproduction" (p. 282). Hall's concise analysis of the field's theoretical state is informed by Critical Theory and Neo-Marxism, as framed by The Frankfurt School. For education, these scholars are crucial as they identified schools and the schooling process as the primary site where inequitable social and material relations were reproduced through the curriculum (Apple, 1979, 1993; Hall, 1980; Giroux, 1983; Bowls and Gintis, 1986; Simon, 1992; McClaren, 1994). Likewise, this school of thought also purported that schools were a site for the production and reproduction of hegemonic discourse and places where one could contest or resist these forces. As Michael Apple comments,

> Education itself is an arena in which ideological conflicts work themselves out. It is one of the major sites in which different groups with distinct political, economic, and cultural visions attempt to define the socially legitimate means and ends of a society (Apple, 1993, p. 26).

As subjects in these primarily theoretical studies, students were first and foremost situated within the interactions and intersections between class and capital (Hall, 1992). A major criticism of this work was that the categories of race, class and gender were depicted as relatively fixed entities, which failed to indicate their relational, dynamic, and context-specific properties (Ng, 1993; McCarthy, 1997, pp. 61-62; Frankenberg, 1993, p. 236; Yon, 2000). The emerging fields of Antiracism and Critical Multiculturalism[14] grew out of, in large part, this theoretical groundwork. In this work, the sociological subject was slowly replacing the centred and fully aware enlightenment subject. In the words of one of the preeminent cultural theorist Stuart Hall,

> The notion of the sociological subject reflected the growing complexity of the modern world and the awareness that this inner core of the subject was not autonomous and self-sufficient

---

[14] American and Australian studies that refer to Critical Multiculturalism are theoretically similar to Canadian and British Antiracism, as detailed in this study.

but was formed in relation to 'significant others,' who mediated to the subject the values, meanings and symbols—the culture—of the worlds he/she inhabited … According to this view, identity is formed in the 'interaction' between self and society. The subject still has an inner core or essence that is 'the real me,' but this is formed and modified in a continuous dialogue with the cultural world 'outside' and the identities they offer (1992, p. 275).

While theoretical approaches to identity were becoming increasingly complex, the self, while not autonomous, was still considered a stable amalgam influenced by external forces. The interactions between the self and the social world, according to this framework, lead to the development of identity constructs, such as race, ethnicity, class, and gender, which work through time to restructure and change the core self. Thus, the modifications to the "real core self" are primarily influenced by the identities discovered and reflected by the social world. In the next section, I explore these assumptions and arguments in more depth as they have taken shape in the well-known debate between multiculturalism and antiracism. I do so to elucidate how this debate continues to shape the arguments, aims and approaches of Anti-Oppressive education's attempts to alter teacher subjectivity.

Multicultural and Antiracist Theoretical Frames

In the education domain, antiracist education has been characterized as an outgrowth and re-configuration of multicultural education.[15] In Canada, it was argued that multiculturalism's ideology diminished the relevance and complexity of race as a social force and thus demanded little of teachers who were asked to implement its ideology of "*difference as pluralism*" (Roman, 1993, p 72). Also, politically, Canadian multiculturalism's focus on diversity worked to homogenize differences, reductively conflating culture and difference -- a benign pluralism. Ultimately, these attempts at "celebrating" de-politicized difference(s), while continuing to use

---

[15] See Ministry of Education and Training, *Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards*, 1993; Toronto District School Board, *Equity Implementation Documents*, 1999; Durham District School Board, *Curriculum for Anti-Racist Education*, 2000.

the dominant culture as the norm, essentialize the "Other" and construct visible minority cultures as "a matter of degrees from the norm" of mainstream or white culture, which is not racialized (Popkewitz, 1992). In this way, the multicultural paradigm, even informed by antiracism, did not adequately address the complexity of race, as it was *essentially* characterized as relatively fixed and stable. At that time, such characterizations also did not account for how class and gender-informed race constructs (Gilroy, 1992; Rizvi, 1993; McCarthy, 1995).

In contradistinction, antiracism, which is to be distinguished from multiculturalism, borrowed some aspects of multiculturalism theory, and did not reduce difference to a benign pluralism. Instead, antiracism viewed race as an essential and perhaps essentialist, though socially constructed, category informed by class and gender. As George Dei explains, antiracism attempted to answer earlier criticisms aimed at educationally based applications of critical theory and those of multiculturalism: "From an integrative antiracist perspective it is recognized that all social oppressions intersect with each other and that a discussion of one such oppression-racism-necessarily entails a discussion of class, gender and sexual inequality in schooling as well" (Dei, 1996: 16). Nevertheless, according to antiracist theory, race is the pre-eminent aspect of identity that needs to be recognized, understood, and then de-constructed. A necessary part of understanding the construction of race itself, antiracism contends, is the recognition that racism permeates not only our social structures but also is reproduced at the level of individual racist beliefs, actions, and discourse (Troyna & Williams, 1986; Omi & Winant, 1994; Henry et al., 1995).

Consequently, changing these social structures and the echoes of these structural dynamics within the individual necessitated decidedly less politically reformist strategies than the more explicitly political and Social Reconstructionist inspired approaches of antiracism. Accordingly,

antiracist education is framed as a form of emancipatory education (Solomon et al., 2003), which promotes "an educational agenda for social change" (Dei & Calliste, 2000, p. 35). This emancipatory education actively cultivates political agency through its critical analysis of race and racism (Massey, 1991). Thus, the structure and meaning of race and the reality of racism were envisioned in the antiracist paradigm as moving from social, institutional, and political structure into the subject. Hence social, political, and ideological beliefs structured the thinking and actions of the subject. Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1994) clarify that "ideological beliefs have structural consequences, and social structures give rise to beliefs" (p. 138).

Ultimately, antiracism aimed to challenge unearned privilege, primarily by focusing on a critical deconstruction of whiteness to destabilize whiteness as normative. Dei describes the sought-after results of this destabilization: "When whiteness is destabilized, both the claim to own, possess and be privileged, and the claim to normalcy are challenged and resisted, and the right to have a larger share of societal resources is made suspect" (2000, p. 29). Consequently, antiracism aims towards social and political reconstruction as well as an ideological shift in students. The presupposition here is that ideological shifts can occur through learning and that this shift may very well lead to action in the real world. Accordingly, the success of antiracism and antiracist education is often predicated upon catalyzing a fundamental change in the belief systems of white teachers (Sleeter, 1992; Haymes, 1995; James, 1999; Schick, 2000).

The change to which critical multicultural, antiracist and most anti-oppressive and social justice-oriented theories refer is a cognitively oriented psychological change. This psychological orientation is evidenced by the prevalence of the concept of "dysconscious racism" (King, 1991) in the literature most often used to describe the psychological dynamic of white racism (Parak, 1992; Henry et al., 1995; Dei, 2000; McIntyre, 2002; Swartz, 2003; Solomon et al., 2007;

Baszille, 2009; Milner & Laughter, 2015; Broderick & Lalvani, 2017). Joyce King (1991) defines dysconscious racism as "the uncritical habit of mind (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs) that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given" (p. 113). These uncritical habits of mind, she later admonishes, act as a justification to accept dominant white norms and privileges. King further purports that dysconscious racism is not a lack of consciousness but a distorted form of consciousness, in that it is *not* entirely conscious (1991). The psychological orientation signified here is that un-thought racism can be made conscious with appropriate experiences if one learns or wants to think critically. Not surprisingly, this concept largely parallels the Marxist notion of "false consciousness." Unfortunately, what this understanding of the relationship between identity, subjectivity, psychology, thinking and change has done is akin to labelling a refusal to learn about counter-hegemonic knowledge (whether identity politics or the politics of identity) as a type of false consciousness.

Consequently, teachers' struggles to decode and think about "colonial" and other hegemonic discourses of racism and inequity become framed within *critical* thought habits. Critical thinking, as signified here, is primarily indicative of conscious processes. By utilizing *critically* oriented conscious thought, the idea is that through intentional, sustained effort, one can ultimately bring to the forefront of consciousness both one's implication in the racist social order and one's responsibility to struggle against this reality. Another theoretical difficulty with antiracist theory is that it tends to re-essentialize the category of race by its propensity to solidify the social categories of race as immutable. Also, antiracism theorizing before 2010 rarely accounted for racial identifications outside of the black/white binary and the effects of other *dynamic* individual and culturally constructed identity markers and categories upon race.

The influence of post-structuralism, postmodernism, postcolonialism and semiotics in the early 1990s propelled some scholarship toward elucidating the relational and context-specific properties of essentialist identity constructs, such as culture and race (McCarthy, 1997, pp. 61-62). Identity, in post-parlance subjectivity, was now referred to in terms of mutually interdependent and intersecting categories. Each of these categories was regarded as being affected by the inter-subjective and semiotic interplay between perpetually reconstituting social discourses, such as community and culture. Michel Foucault (believed that an understanding of subjectivity could only be attempted by examining the discourses that constructed the core illusion of subjectivity itself -- the core illusion of the subject identified as a self. From this perspective, the self is structured by a multiplicity of discourses beyond and outside the core subject's reach. Eleanor MacDonald, a noted scholar on subjectivity, identity politics and the political implications of postmodern and poststructuralist theory, summarizes:

> Overwhelmingly, the direction of poststructuralist thought has been to emphasize the "constituted" nature of the subject - not merely of aspects of the subject (e.g., its location at the individual level, its supposed autonomy, integrity, or rationality), but the very constitution of subjectivity per se (1991, p. 49).

Ultimately, despite their core emptiness, postmodern conceptualizations of the subject are distinct from some antiracist essentialist depictions of identity. Poststructural multiple identifications are fluidly forged with representations made within/by the subject informed through the social world (Walcott, 1994; Yon, 2000). Nevertheless, the subject is framed as a constituent of social, cultural, and political forces or dynamics that work towards constructing and reconstructing subjectivity in tandem with discursive and experiential influences. What remains unchanged is that these various, diverse, and complex machinations bear down on the individual subject.

Theory develops into Method becoming Practice

To gain a deeper understanding of the racialization process on the construction of race/power and privilege informed by discourse, as well as to assist in a change of teacher candidates' ideological commitments and, presumably, embedded practices, a significant number of anti-oppressive educators who identified as multicultural, progressive, antiracist or critical multiculturalists turned to "whiteness studies," often drawing from "critical race theory" (See Giroux, 1997; Lopez, 1995; Ladson-Billings,, 1998; Tate, 1997; McCarthy, 2003; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Mosley, 2010). This signals a conceptual and strategic shift from the binary of "us" and "them" to a critical problematization of whiteness itself as a colour and not at all other to the racial identities as social and political dynamics that circulate in discourse and internalized belief systems.

With this shift of the field, whiteness has been theorized as a set of unearned privileges bestowed on white people and that the study of whiteness generally concerns how the sensibilities of whiteness become internalized and thus, institutionalized within all members of society regardless of whether they are marked by normative pigmentation (Ignatiev and Garvey, 1996; Winant, 1997). The privileges of whiteness are intrinsically connected with social and institutional power (Ignatiev & Garvey, 1996; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; Roediger, 1991; Winant, 1997). Whiteness is also considered a constructed category, consistent with the belief that all racial demarcations are socially and politically based constructions, rather than biological givens. The discursive structure of whiteness has been theorized as informing a split in the white subject. Robyn Wiegman (1999) explains,

> This split in the white subject-between disaffiliation from white supremacist practices and disavowal of the ongoing reformation of white power and one's benefit from it-is constitutive of contemporary white racial formation underlying what Howard Winant calls "white racial dualism" (p. 120).

Following this logic would imply that the discursive splits become embedded constitutionally in the white subject's psyche as the white subject's perceptions of subjectness (of whiteness) are informed by political, cultural, economic, and psychological forces (Kincheloe, 1999). These forces coalesce into an ontological reality that often becomes expressed as an ideology of whiteness (McLaren, 1997) that we witness as a complex system of beliefs and practices. This ideology of whiteness perpetuates racial hegemony through social, political, and institutional culture.

The educational aim, or hope, informing the usage of some useful aspects of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Whiteness Studies in Anti-oppressive teacher education is that if white students recognize the racial production of their white privilege, and how this privilege is accrued at the expense of others, it will change how they think about, and respond to, systemic social inequity built on the base of racial difference. Again, while Whiteness is conceived of as a process that inheres in social institutions, circulates as a discursive regime of power, and works to internalize subjective investments, one can still become cognizant of this process by being presented with knowledge about how this process and dynamic work. In other words, by being presented with the appropriate knowledge, the subjective investments in Whiteness that one has made and is influenced by, and the ideological commitments that one adheres to, can be psychologically changed.[16] The potential problems with Whiteness theory are too numerous to mention. One major concern is that defining whiteness has proven difficult because it constantly mutates into new conceptual forms and constructions. Whiteness often moves between numerous

---

[16] The belief that whites have internalized particular subjective investments and ideologies substantially mirrors the antiracist conception of "dysconscious racism" (King, 1991) explained above.

definitions (Rasmussen, Klineberg, Nexica & Ray, 2001) and morphs into new forms, depending on time and context (Duster, 2001).

Another major concern is that Whiteness theory/studies had become institutionalized knowledge rather than insurgent theory (Lensmire, 2013), resulting in essentialized representations "that group all teacher candidates into a kind of monolithic category" (Lowenstein, 2009:168). More recent second wave whiteness theory has responded to this tendency to essentialize whiteness and attempted to take account of how historically nuanced and complex understandings of potentially paradoxical renderings of race, ethnicity, class, gender and nationality influence identity (McCarthy, 2003; Asher, 2007; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Berry, 2012, 2014; Hughes & Berry, 2012; Appelbaum, 2013, Berry & Candis, 2013; Berry & Stovall, 2013; Jupp, Berry & Lensmire, 2016). Finally, another area of promising study and analysis, intersectionality, has grown in part out of the critiques of Critical Race Theory and Whiteness Studies. Brah and Phoenix (2004) characterize intersectionality "as signifying the complex, irreducible, varied, and variable effects which ensue when multiple axis of differentiation—economic, political, cultural, psychic, subjective and experiential—intersect in historically specific contexts. Different dimensions of social life cannot be separated out into discrete and pure strands" (p. 76). Building on this more complex and less constrictive foundation, Anti-oppressive educators such as (Lund & Carr, 2014) have proposed (and utilized) an intersectional approach to identity construction as a method through which to deconstruct and problematize Whiteness (p. 5). This approach, in particular, contributes to a more complex rendering of TC's subjectivity and can help elucidate how white subjectivity as it is lived calls for Whiteness studies to take account of the inward and outward fractures of Whiteness (Levine-Rasky, 2014). Levin-Rasky, clarifies, "Outward fractures of Whiteness are produced by its

intersectionality with mutually constituted moments in power relations. Inward fractures are visible by peering through a psychoanalytic lens" (p.175).

Each theoretical addition to the conceptual frameworks of anti-oppressive theory has a common element: an assumption that individuals can be educated out of ignorance. That what was unknown can be known if one is provided with the proper knowledge and is *willing* to learn. Taken together, the theoretical shortcomings outlined above, and the inherent framings of identity or subjectivity cannot help but translate into the framing of learning and knowledge concerning the self and the other in particular ways. As we shall see, there is a one-to-one assumption here that presumes that what theorists have come to know and believe about the formation of identity and subjectivity is equivalent to how we learn about ourselves, others, and the world.

Revising Antioppressive Theory & Method

Now that we have looked at how theory has been applied differently over time into a developing method primarily just before the timeline of this investigation, we can surmise that many of these theoretical "subject" framings had also become embedded methodological approaches to changing the subject. At this point, we must ask if anti-oppressive ideas and methods been effective, and if not, what needs to change? Kevin Kumashiro, founding director of the Center for Anti-Oppressive Education (CAOE) and president of The National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME), 2012-2014, clarifies the importance of problematizing the theory and practices undergirding anti-oppressive work to discover either new possibilities or embedded limitations in doing anti-oppressive work.

> For decades, educators and researchers have suggested a range of theories of oppression and practices to challenge it, and these theories and practices all have their strengths and weaknesses. The field of anti-oppressive education draws on these traditions, crafting links between feminist, critical, multicultural, queer, postcolonial, and other movements toward social justice. As it moves forward, the field of anti-oppressive education constantly

problematizes its perspectives and practices by seeking new insights, recognizing that any approach to education--even its own--can make certain changes possible but others impossible (2006).

What Kumashiro clarifies is that part of analyzing past anti-oppressive practices requires an examination of common problems that have plagued the field, such as theory and practice inconsistencies (Gorski, 2006; Jackson, 2003; Guo et al.,2009), how to change the thinking of teacher candidates (Haberman & Post 1992; Boyle-Baise & Grant 1992; Banks & Banks, 1997; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Swartz 2003; Brown, 2004a; Solomon et al., 2011) and why they resist change (Giroux, 1983; Alcoff, 1988; McLaren et al., 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Solomon & Daniel, 2007; de Courcy, 2007; Thomas & Vanderhaar, 2008).

Two major theoretical assumptions have informed much anti-oppressive theory and method; the first is epistemological in nature and a holdover from antiracism's embrace of the Foucauldian notion of discourse as a method to read the category of race (or whiteness) as a discursive construct. The notion purports that the body can be read as a discursive text and, in turn, can be practically engaged, strategically decoded, and deconstructed to achieve anti-hegemonic ends (Dei & Calliste, 2000). Despite this commonly held belief, another immensely influential study by Haberman and Post found that reading bodies as text presupposes that new knowledge (decoded as text) can reframe how we have previously viewed and therefore interpreted the relationship between others physiognomy and their actions (p. 30). Conversely, they found that we have a psychological tendency to read the body of the other - as an essentialist, racialized text based on prejudgments, regardless of what we witness and experience. Unfortunately, such prejudgments persist despite exposure to persons signified as other, meant to inform our beliefs regarding those who are different from us. The study exposed teacher candidates to over 100 hours with low-income minority children. Haberman and Post (1992)

observed: "the remarkable phenomenon of students generally using these direct experiences to selectively perceive and reinforce their initial preconceptions" (30). These findings were echoed in Christine Sleeter's well-noted study of 1993, where white teachers were exposed to the marginalized discourses and "voices" of racialized and minoritized others in class discussions and literature in tandem with the tools to deconstruct the hegemonic reproduction of race in social discourse. Afterwards, they were placed within real-world experiences. The operative presumption in this staged experiment was that teachers would "abandon racist ideas and behaviours and (presumably) work to eliminate racism" (Sleeter, 1993: 158). However, they did not. Reflecting on this study, several years later, Boyle-Baise and Sleeter (1996) warned that the experiences of teacher candidates with diverse others might work to reinforce their stereotypical thinking. They cautioned that:

> Without help in processing what they see, preservice students may leave the field experience with more or stronger stereotypes than when they entered the field. For example, if one has heard that Asians are quiet or Mexican Americans are lazy, seeing a few students who fit the stereotype can confirm such beliefs (p. 377).

The danger of doing more harm than good is echoed again over a decade later by Sperling (2007), who worries that short term multicultural service learning without proper preparation before and after exposure to minoritized groups will reinforce or exacerbate "cultural deficit thinking, lowered expectations, devaluation of language differences, and old-fashioned racial prejudice" (p. 311).[17] These studies and suggestions clarify that intensive preparation for and a debriefing of experiences with others is crucial to avoid candidates selectively perceiving what they have encountered during these placements.

---

[17] In practice, candidates are often placed directly into community, field-based experiences where they have genuine interactions with people unlike themselves (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2001; James, 2004; Solomon et al., 2011). Ideally, these environments are embedded within and directed by communities of colour (e.g., Sleeter & Montecinos, 1998). "Authentic encounters" across race (Greene, 1992), help TC's recognize the value of students' differences, using this new knowledge in pedagogical practice (McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001).

An assumption about learning implicit in these approaches concerns what happens to learners, psychologically, when we attempt to engineer experiences with others who are different from ourselves. The belief derived from personality psychology and trait theory is that *knowledge* of the other can enhance one's cultural understanding of the other and diminish intra and intergroup hostility while simultaneously decreasing prejudice. Stated another way, with increased familiarity and knowledge comes tolerance. This work's specific origins can be traced to Gordon Allport's 1954 book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, which is still the chief authority in the complementary fields of ethnic identity development and multicultural competence (Bennett, 2001).[18] Allport writes:

> Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the individual's character structure) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., by law, custom, or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups (p. 281).

Allport's conclusions hold that cross-cultural and cross-racial experiences will: 1) decrease prejudice; 2) improve intercultural relations, and 3) increase empathy for the other (McAllister and Irvine, 2002). In an attempt to counter and thus refocus these cognitivist approaches to eliciting empathy and tolerance through familiarity and knowledge, Sharon Todd (2001, 2003) draws our attention to the presumptions about learning, ethics and subjectivity that these social justice approaches, and parallel pedagogical methods make. She asks us to consider the ethical and conceptual implications of stabilizing representations of Otherness, which are lost in these attempts which coax teacher candidates to learn about the other. In her words,

---

[18] The foundations of many anti-oppressive oriented teacher education programs are built substantially on Banks' (1994a) conceptualization of the prejudice reduction pillar of multicultural theory (Zirkel, 2008), built largely on Allport's findings.

> Antiracist projects … seek to make transparent the discourses that marginalize people through their positioning of certain and racial-ethnic groups as "Other." Curricular and pedagogical initiatives frequently focus on the untold stories, narratives of self-identification, and demands for recognition of the "Other" to disassemble the structures of power that distort, if not outright destroy, certain individuals and communities. Framing our ethical attention to difference as a question of knowledge implies that the more we know about others, the better we can understand how to respond to them, be responsible, and de- "Other" them (2003, p. 8).

Todd's comments and subsequent writings make it clear that an ethically oriented pedagogy requires us to reframe our pedagogical gaze away from learning about or gaining knowledge about others as a political project of remaking the world, and the self, to an examination of what this type of practise means (and feels like) when applied to real human beings. She begins by questioning the theoretical assumption that we can learn about and know the other through knowledge and takes issue with our misguided attempts to direct students into taking on the attitudes that educators' desire them to inculcate. Such methods she believes may not only be unethical but may also be unnecessarily aggressive. Taking a cue from Levinasian theory, she suggests shifting our thinking away from an approach that aims to learn *about* and hence *know* the other to contemplations that orient our thinking towards learning *from* the other. The distinction signals the first concomitant philosophical and psychological shift that educators need to make, from the belief that we can know an-other to one where the other is conceptually, linguistically, and symbolically non-reducible, consequently infinitely unknowable.

Reframing our thinking about learning and Otherness, not as a product of identification but rather as being sustained by irreducible difference and not identity (Britzman, 1997: 32), reconsiders the stakes for the subject (both teacher and learner) when external pedagogical forces (such as anti-oppressive education) attempt to change the learner through knowledge of the other, ostensibly turning us inside out. In *Learning from the Other,* (2003) Todd draws on Levinas, delineating a psycho-logistic interpretation of how anti-oppressive methods instruct teacher

candidates to address the other. She explains how this method enacts real and symbolic violence, demonstrating why it is necessary to shift our conceptual framework. Todd concludes,

> [w]hen I think I know when I think I understand the Other, I am exercising *my* knowledge over the Other, shrouding the Other in *my* totality. The Other becomes an object of *my* comprehension, *my* world, *my* narrative, reducing the Other to me. What is at stake is my ego (p. 15).

This arguably unethical approach is likely to encourage a reductive understanding of the Other, as their difference (what we perceive and decode as our understanding of their Otherness) inevitably become projections of the self, eliding difference. Fundamentally then, anti-oppressive methods encourage the Other to become subsumed by self-centred psychological projections, which are then further reinforced by the type of relations and identity positions offered/stabilized through these politically inflected attempts to know others. She strongly suggests an alternative approach whereby we can ethically address the other without doing more violence to the Other.

Rather than attempting to change the learner by what we learn about others, in unnatural situations staged to catalyze change, Todd advocates beginning to focus on how what resides within us sets the ethical grounds to learn from an-other as well as learning writ large. The alternative learning process/framework that she envisages moves outwards from within the subject to outside of the subject in a dynamic influenced and informed by inter-subjective relations (between subjects). What is vital in this shift is that Todd looks inside the subject to locate the possibility for remaking the subject, for the possibility to change rather than inducing the social/historical sphere (through curriculum or experience) or readings of Otherness, to install a kind of prefabricated and artificially stabilized knowledge to induce change. Unfortunately, rather than focus on ethical stakes, the susceptibility of subjects to one another or re-envisaging our assumptions about how a subject learns, anti-oppressive theorizing (and practice) often frames the failure to learn about the other, the failure to shift one's belief structure with the

failure to become a caring and competent teacher. In truth, the onus of failure or breakdowns in meaning-making in anti-oppressive engagements has, for the most part, been interpreted as a consequence of teacher candidates' refusal to engage with the knowledge offered in class. These refusals have most often been referred to as resistance. Traditionally, resistance has been theorized through a sociologically based framework as an expression of negatively denoted guilt, anger, or powerlessness (Tatum, 1992; Thompson, 2001; Solomon et al., 2005), and its multiple forms of expression in discourse and demeanour by TC's has been depicted as both a "dysconscious"[19] indication of ideological and theoretical adherence, as well as a sign that their learning has ceased because of a refusal to learn. Contrary to traditional sociological framings of the meaning of resistance, I believe that resistance is multifaceted and dynamically located somewhere between hegemonic social discourses and unconscious conflict.

Outside In to the Inside Out: Resistance as a Psychical Problem

    Research from anti-oppressive and antiracist approaches to teacher education has conceptualized progressive educational approaches such as equity pedagogy as having been plagued by resistance practices since their inception. Primarily, resistance has been framed as the conscious and willing failure of white teacher educators to contemplate or change their limited, ignorant, prejudicial, deficit-ridden, or racist opinions and attitudes concerning social difference and Otherness. (King, 1991; Solomon et al, 2003, Delpit, 2008; Singer, 2011). Resistance and resistance practices are almost always directly linked with primarily white teacher candidates' struggles to meaningfully address racism, white privilege, and cultural difference (McIntyre,

---

[19] Dysconscious according to Joyce King, (1991) describes an *uncritical* habit of mind (including perceptions, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs) that justifies and accepts dominant white norms and privileges (p. 133). Not surprisingly, this concept largely parallels the Marxist notion of "false consciousness." Specifically, being *dys*conscious represents a mental state, which King contends, can be transformed into a state of *consciousness* employing education involving *critical* habits of mind, i.e., critical thinking.

1997; Levine-Rasky, 2000; McCarthy, 2003; Solomon et al., 2005; Matias, 2016). Undoubtedly and understandably, refusal to change has been a large area of concern for theorists and teacher educators, becoming one of the most theorized aspects of anti-oppressive programs (Giroux, 1983; Alcoff, 1988; McLaren et al., 2000; Schick & St. Denis, 2005; Case & Hemmings, 2005; Solomon & Daniel, 2007; de Courcy, 2007; Thomas & Vanderhaar, 2008). Explanations abound regarding the many ways in which 'resistance' presents itself and plays out. However, in most of these accounts, the common denominator is that teacher candidates themselves are responsible for breakdowns in learning.

Resistance to learning about difference, for some, is manifest through a recognizable repertoire of discursive strategies such as "white talk" (McIntyre, 1997), adherence to the "colourblind" paradigm (Roman, 1993) or that we live in a meritocracy (Frankenberg, 2004; Brayboy, Castagno, & Maughan, 2007). The fallacy of meritocracy assumes that individual success is attributable to hard work and effort. Inherent in this assumption is that no external aid, forces, or dynamics contribute to one's success, or it follows another's lack of success. The mistaken assumption that our society rewards individuals equally for hard work regardless of identity, background, or ability fails to account for the increasingly evident systemic and individual dynamics of racism, intolerance and prejudice towards difference, otherness, and disabled people. Indeed, the belief that we live in a 'contains not only a faulty assumption but is a dangerous fallacy often used to shut down any real discussion about racism, intolerance, prejudice, equity, or social justice. Taken together, all the avoidance tactics mentioned above are theorized to "reflect, displace and disavow racial privilege" (McCarthy, 2003: 130). Others perceive racism as individual and attitudinal, and therefore any contemplation about the systemic

nature of racism is dismissed (McIntyre, 1997). As noted already, the focus here is on interventions designed to change the individual mind.

Cognitive psychological frameworks remind us that changed minds are never far away from the resistance to such change. These frameworks primarily draw from the theories of Festinger (1957), Bandura (1982), Piaget (1926), Vygotsky (1978) and the social psychological theories of Deutsch (1949), Lewin (1935) and Allport (1954). They surmise that resistance arises from "cognitive dissonance" (Helms, 1994; McIntyre, 1997; Carson & Johnson, 2000; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts 2001; Rozas & Miller, 2009), "a period of cognitive disarray" (Risko, Peter, & McAllister, 1996), or disequilibrium (Shaw, 1993; Carson & Johnson, 2000), which causes unsettling and disturbing (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992), threatening (Sleeter, 1994) or necessary tensions (Deckman et al., 2000) in the process of learning something new which contradicts old perceptions or beliefs. In Carson and Johnson's, (2000) formulation, the feelings and emotions arise as they are: learning conflicts with teacher candidates' belief system. This conflict manifests powerful emotional reactions, including guilt, anger and shame (Tatum, 1992; Thompson, 2001; Solomon et al., 2005; Rozas & Miller, 2009). Notably, theorists believe that much of this resistance can be overcome through careful attention to our pedagogical practice (Thomas & Vanderhaar, 2008).

Shift to Psychoanalytic Frameworks

To sum up, regarding anti-oppressive teacher education programs, several assumptions arise from the paradigmatic adherence outlined above, which are of consequence for this conceptual framework. One is that the intellectual intransigence of 'primarily' white teacher candidates towards racial and social differences can be transformed into respect and tolerance by providing the right knowledge and curriculum, genuine experiences with Others, and appropriately scaffolded (Vygotsky, 1978) concepts. A crucial political valence of this canonical adherence

(which figures prominently in this study) reflects the social reconstructionist and transformational inspiration for anti-oppressive projects, which are the beliefs that sociological forces are tantamount and that too much focus on individual subjects:

1. cannot achieve the aims of social transformation,

2. neglect anti-oppressive education's primary purpose of improving the school and life outcomes for racialized and minoritized students, and

3. does not recognize that sociological forces are determinant in structuring individual racism, prejudice, ignorance, and an unwillingness to learn.

At this point, the shortcomings of anti-oppressive theoretical and ontological constructions of subjectivity and learning (substantial building blocks of pedagogical practice) should be clear. To be precise, they do not adequately consider the power of subjective or unconscious forces in constructing subjectivity and how subjectivity and the learning process are foundationally intermingled. Anti-oppressive approaches also reveal their continuing adherence to the enlightenment notion of learning - knowledge as the cure for ignorance. Countering such unquestioning fidelity to this paradigm, Deborah Britzman, drawing on psychoanalytic theory, identifies this belief as a myth:

> The myth is that *information* neutralizes ignorance and those learners, and their teachers will rationally accept new and sometimes problematic thoughts without having to grapple with unlearning the old ones (p. 88).

The difficulty of learning something new or disturbing, Britzman speculates, is made difficult not only because of our rational or cognitive abilities but also because learning involves unlearning. Our ignorance contains something unknown (the unconscious), which instigates an internal struggle over whether to accept what is being learned. From a psychoanalytic standpoint, ignorance, counter to traditional educational theory and narrative, "is not a passive state of

absence-a simple lack of information: it is an active dynamic of negation, an active refusal of information" (Felman, 1987, p. 29- 30). Viewed this way, ignorance is not a lack of information, but an unconscious resistance to knowing that contains and signifies something we do not wish to lose, something we do not wish to replace, or perhaps something we do not wish to perceive at all. Both Shoshana Felman and Deborah Britzman view learning as a struggle and ignorance as a type of resistance that enacts a refusal of self-implication in learning. Following Freud, they identify a particularly powerful force lurking within a desire to refuse certain learning and knowing types. As Jacques Lacan frames it, there is a type of "knowledge that cannot tolerate one's knowing that one knows" (cited in Felman, 1987, p.77) because to know would shatter the self in some meaningful measure.[20] Teaching, Felman therefore concludes, should be more concerned with engaging resistance than correcting what we believe students do not know (Felman, 1987, p. 150).

Considering these insights, we can consider ignorance/resistance as a complex sign or, if you will, a symptom of something hidden within the subject. The emergence and expression then of resistances to learning and knowing about persons, in writing, in speech and affect, may not signify a refusal of the manifest content of new information, but rather an indication of the subject's latent inability to supplant what already existed in the unconscious in some form. Reframing our thoughts in this manner suggests, amongst many possibilities, that

1. we may know something (in latent form) that we do not wish to know (consciously),

2. the implications within new knowledge may dislodge or reconnect something that has been repressed which we cannot tolerate, and

---

[20] The psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan (1975) referred to this universal defensive mechanism against knowing as a "passion for ignorance" (110), driven by a desire "not to know" (Felman, 1987; Britzman, 1995).

    3. new knowledge may threaten old ideas to which we are intimately attached.

Suppose we transpose these simplified, hypothetical examples into a scenario where certain information or experience would cause psychological trauma. In such a case, we can readily understand why one might passionately refuse to acknowledge what is happening, cleaving unremittingly to what already exists consciously and unconsciously or attempting to block new thoughts from penetrating consciousness or becoming caught in between, ambivalently suspended between internal and external attachments. Suppose these examples express real psychological machinations (and I believe that they do). In that case, we cannot emotionally and cognitively tolerate learning or coming to know some things at certain times. Moreover, if what we are witnessing and labelling as resistance is a natural protective reaction to the pain required in learning something that one does not want to learn, then our conceptual approaches and interpretations of those efforts have been (in fraught contexts) partially misguided. Consequently, to pursue the unconscious dynamics of resistance in learning and what ignorance may indicate concerning the subject, learning, and knowing (endeavours beyond the reach of rationalist frameworks), I turn to a theoretical system that attempts to explain unconscious dynamics.

    Psychoanalytic insights speak directly to our quest of gaining a more considerate appreciation of the dynamics at play in anti-oppressive classrooms when teacher candidates powerfully appear to resist learning. Their passionate expressions have led me to query outside of traditional learning frameworks to attempt questions that would have seemed imponderable through other structures, such as how is ignorance related to learning and not learning, knowing, and not knowing? How do subjects experience and gain insight into themselves, the external world and change, especially if unlearning what we have learned is made more difficult by learning itself? Moreover, if this is so, how do we begin to learn, and how did we come to learn? If knowledge is

not a cure for ignorance, then what possible side-effects and *affects* might a bad pedagogical prescription trigger? Is part of what we see in student struggles their attempts to expel bad medicine?

A growing number of other theorists utilizing psychoanalytic frameworks also believe that the relationships between ignorance, affects, and resistances are not to be ignored or dispensed with but instead are active dynamics of the learning and knowledge acquisition process, needing careful attention (e.g., Felman, 1987; Jay, 1987; Pitt, 1997, 2003; Britzman, 2000, 2006, 2013; Logue, 2008; Lowenstein, 2009; Farley, 2009, 2013; Alcorn, 2010; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Shim, 2014, 2017; Mishra-Tarc, 2018). Following their lead, I believe that ignorance and resistance are integral affective expressions and signs of learning in process. To discover what may be happening inside our student subjects (and within us), I have reconsidered how I theorize, react, and interpret teacher candidates' struggles in response to emotionally laden topics that call upon an unstable subjectivity. Also, and this complicates the project even further, despite the difficulty, I propose that teacher educators examine how aspects of their past enter the learning environment and shape their responses to students while reinforcing the frameworks they are attached to (Lowenstein, 2009).

In the past, teacher candidate reactions have been instantiated in the literature as an indictment of their (willful) ignorance, lack of knowledge and racism (Lowenstein, 2009; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010). Moving forward, we need to recognize first and foremost that attempting to re-educate, re-contextualize, challenge or de-colonize a real person's thinking is a painful emotional process (Jordan, 1995). Additionally, asking white students to consider issues of oppression and their implication in others' suffering is far from a simple demand and may even be experienced as traumatic (Ellsworth, 1997; Felman, 1995; Luhmann, 1998; Pitt, 1998). Also, and this is an area

that deserves greater attention, we need to remain aware of how this work impacts racialized and minoritized teacher candidates and teacher educators who may be forced to unearth or call upon very personal trauma (i.e., the experiences of racism and oppression) for pedagogical ends, inciting even more pain. In response, we need to consider how to call upon and elucidate suffering, trauma, and oppression in our classes without increasing or inciting secondary traumas in our students (Hartman, 1996). Next, we need to expand our approaches beyond sociological theory, not because the sociological or political project of anti-oppressive education is unclear, but because rationalized teacher educator expectations (no matter how detailed their theoretical construction) cannot match psychic nature. Additionally, it is important for Anti-oppressive educators to contemplate that philosophical projects undertaken to restructure the social-political economy, which justify the means and methods of change by asserting utilitarian and idealized rational ends, remain morally problematic. Of course, the question of what is being learned and what is being resisted remains. Nevertheless, if we begin by assuming that how the subject (a person) learns and resists learning is fundamentally and foundationally tied to their psychical functioning, we open new possibilities for rethinking resistance as a psychical event while substantially shifting the ethical stakes of teaching and learning for all actors in a classroom, not just teacher candidates.

Subjectivity and Psychoanalysis

To my mind, the focus on a subject birthed in conflict and subsequently informed by its relation to the other is central to reorient the focus of post-structural theories of language and subjectivity "that invert the relationship between language and the subject, insisting that experience be viewed as an artifact of language, power and discourses of knowledge rather than their source" (Pitt, 2003 p. 5). Alternatively, psychoanalytic theories of a conflicted subject view the source of language, and orientation to language, to discourse and power as being the very

substance of the subject itself. This reorientation can allow for a much more considered, detailed, and nuanced exploration of what is happening inside students as they engage in the inter-subjective dynamic of learning about difficult knowledge.

What makes the psychoanalytic definition of subjectivity both novel and perplexing is that the subject is always split or caught up within and between the illusive binaries of "conscious and unconscious processes, between the self and the not-self, between Culture and Nature" (Sey, 1998, pp. 3-4). These splits are structured through the ongoing relationships among instincts, affects, and objects, which are informed through dynamics such as repression, ambivalence, and narcissism, all of which are concerned with protecting the ego and discharging aggression. Together, they make up the core dimensions of the dislocated subject of psychoanalysis. For our purposes, this dissertation will read psychoanalytic theories of subjectivity in tandem with post-structural, sociological, and anti-oppressive theory enabling a more dynamic depiction of the interplay between the teacher and student as their interpretations of the curriculum either coalesce or break down along unconscious fault-lines (Field, 1989, p. 974) while engaging with difficult knowledge.

Addressing Psychoanalytic Critiques

Before proceeding, it is critical to note that psychoanalysis has often been criticized as being foundationally racist and culturally reductive, its tenets being a product of the time and place of its origins, Victorian Europe. Critics have also noted that Freud's own German/Jewish racial and ethnic identity, as well as his sexual dysfunction (and seeming hatred of women), heavily influenced psychoanalytic theory (Frosh, 2005). Furthermore, these theorists point to how Freud has drawn on images of primitiveness to depict African and Indigenous populations as culturally and intellectually inferior (Gordon, 2001). In sum, Freud's contention that the theoretical core of

psychoanalysis can be applied universally has caused many to discount his voluminous writings and major contributions to psychology, philosophy and the humanities; arguing that the Oedipal configuration of personality, depictions of woman as inferior, and of the primitive Other (often used as a metaphor for the irrational or unconscious) re-instantiates the sexist, oppressive and colonial attitude of Western science whenever psychoanalytic theory is applied. While psychoanalysis is grounded in a milieu of whiteness it does not understand whiteness as real but rather as fantasy. Moreover, Psychoanalytic applications of whiteness are metaphoric and do not necessarily position whiteness as desirable; although it has in the past depicted blackness as pathological, the imagery it conjured of the depressive state, for example, is one of darkness, danger and the unknown. With these criticisms in mind, it is important to note that much of new psychoanalytic theory has dismissed most Freud's more controversial ideas.[21]

This study applies several modern and post-modern lenses to frame the method of inquiry and analysis in this research, carefully attending to any racist remnants of past theories or applications of theory. Further, I draw on work that attends to the shortcomings of psychoanalysis in pursuit of a theory that can bridge the gaps between the social and the psychical. Specifically, this work combines Semiotics, Psychoanalysis, Cultural Studies, Poststructuralism, Postcolonialism and aspects of Critical Race Theory and Whiteness Studies. Moreover, while many of these theoretical approaches partially build on psychoanalytic foundations, they can be differentiated by their unique approach in situating the social as a vital site for the construction of race and subjectivity (Fanon, 1986, Bhabha, 1994). Similar to Gail Lewis, (2017) I aim to elucidate a "multivalency of presence" (p. 4) in pedagogical encounters by often simultaneously engaging

---

[21] For further readings see Bertold, 1998, Lane, 1998, Zizek, 2001 and Dalal, 2001.

with psychoanalytic theory, postcolonial theory, critical race theory and performativity within moments of pedagogical tension. In this manner, I highlight the multiplicity of ways that individuals are present and not present, embodied, and disembodied, informed by culture, race, and social discourse as well as unconscious splits. I also do this because viewing subjectivity as psychologically, linguistically, and textually constituted as well as socially mediated allows for a re-reading of the relation of the individual to society and one another, presenting the possibility for understanding expressions of ambivalence and resistance in anti-oppressive classrooms as intertwined unconsciously and informed through the social order.

Psychoanalytic Construction of the Subject

The etiology of the dynamics in this process, that is, how a subject comes to be, repeats to varying degrees throughout one's lifetime. What is striking about psychoanalytic notions of subjectivity is that embedded within the process of becoming a subject are the grounds for one's disposition to learning, relations with the self, the other and the beginning of one's initiation into the symbolic order of language.

How precisely the relationship with one's mother (more recently conceptualized as the primary caregiver) are related to frustrations and our introduction to the symbolic order is one of the key battlegrounds in psychoanalytic theory. However, most theorists agree that it is the conflicted or antagonistic relations and dynamics between the developing self and the m(other), which characterizes the division of the subject. How one answers the question of "what divides the subject?" depends largely on how one conceptualizes the relation between self and other, for, in most psychoanalytic theories, it is the encounter with Otherness that divides. (Layton, 2008, p. p. 61). Furthermore, in most analytic theories, this encounter is figured as antagonistic.

There are disagreements between different schools of psychoanalysis concerning mechanisms, causes and the ramifications of these antagonisms as well, especially in terms of how the processes and dynamics inform the ego's attempts to defend the self against objects in the world that are perceived as threatening and, in turn, how the subject can make reparative attempts to lessen harm or bring this process into awareness. An overview of all the disagreements and theories in the field (which are ostensibly concerned with the making and remaking of the subject) is unfortunately beyond the scope of this investigation. Instead, I will outline the major distinctions upon which the split subject as framed by psychoanalysis is formed to suggest how the concept of a psychoanalytic subject can both trouble and reform traditional anti-oppressive notions of the learning process, transforming subjects and teacher candidate subjectivity.

In Freud's view, humans are born helpless, hungry, naked, and defenceless. Nature has given the newborn instincts that demand satisfaction. The metaphorical agency that serves as the repository from which these instincts emanate would later be referred to by Freud as the Id. In Freud's view, instincts function as representatives of the two primary forces of nature, one being the preservation of the individual, the other being the preservation of the species. Together, they animate and represent nature's drives that the organism is compelled to fulfill and express (Freud, 1991, p. 75-76). The instinctual impulse that becomes known as love or Eros is constituted by unique developmental, experiential, and conceptual manifestations. One of these manifestations is sexual love, which Freud contends "has given us our most intense experience of pleasure and has thus furnished us with a pattern for our search for happiness" (Freud, 1961 p. 32). This type of love also places us in an extremely vulnerable position, as the loss of this love, through unfaithfulness, rejection (real or perceived), or death, places us *affectively* in a world of suffering (Freud, p. 56). The earliest form of love is love for the self, libidinal love. The libido or libidinal

energy is, simply put, the amount of energy available to be invested or reinvested in the self.[22] However, before this psychological architecture of investing in the self matures, particular events and dynamics must first occur in the developing subject.

The metaphoric place, wherein the primitive aspects (both conscious and unconscious) of the libidinal self (which is a developing subject) were located, was later referred to by Freud as the ego. Furthermore, during the beginning of psychical life, it is within this space that everything was contained by what became characterized as the undeveloped ego. During this phase of the development of the psychoanalytic subject, there is no distinction between the internal and external world. For the infant, the experience is one of absolute symbiosis, or as Winnicott describes, there is no distinction between *me* of the child and the *not-me* of the mother. (Winnicott, 1953). The first vital movement of the individual psyche toward the world is ego-libido's movement to object libido. This is a movement where the real objects existing in the outside world are either accepted (introjected) or discarded (projected) from the psyche. It is also where elements originating within the developing subject are either accepted as a part of the self or discarded as not a part of the self. Examining in more detail how this process unfolds will clarify why and how incorporating psychoanalytic, postcolonial and antiracist conceptual frameworks can help gain better insight into its methodology.

Initially, during the "pleasure ego" phase of psychic development, the ego divides the world into a pleasure/un-pleasure binary, an *absolute* either/or categorization. "A tendency arises to separate from the ego everything that can become a source of un-pleasure, to throw it outside and to create a pure pleasure ego which is confronted by a strange and threatening outside" (Freud,

---

[22] In Freud's conceptualization, humans were akin to hydraulic energy systems, wherein energy could be transformed but not destroyed.

1991, p.14). Ostensibly, the ego initially identifies all dystonic experience as belonging to the outside world. Everything that brings about displeasure is rejected to create a purified and ideal internal environment. During this phase, the ego operates under what Freud called the self-preservative instinct, where all external object stimuli are perceived as life-threatening (Freud, 1991, p. 137). Under the influence, the developing subject incorporates the pleasurable aspects while rejecting and projecting the un-pleasurable elements into/onto the externally *perceived* (not necessarily located) hostile world. These projected elements are conjoined with all other aspects of the external, hostile world. In terms of the child's perception (not their *actual*, original location), all that is external is then experienced as hostile to the ego. It is within this dynamic that instinctual elements of the *actual psyche* (as they become cathected with other external objects that are deemed threatening) are rejected as being hostile to the child's very survival, as the initial introjections of external objects into the psyche occurred under the rule of the self-preservative instinct.

What results are feelings of aggression and hatred inside the child. These feelings are inevitable as discomfort is inescapable. The baby's feelings of hatred/aggression are projected toward its mother, yet the still grandiose and reliant child cannot tolerate such violent feelings toward her mother, and she must necessarily repress those feelings of hate/aggression to the unconscious. The feelings of love toward her mother later co-exist unconsciously (and often, simultaneously) with feelings of hate. The existence of these conflicting affects is the prototype of what Freud comes to refer to as ambivalence: "Since it is particularly common to find both these directed simultaneously towards the same object, their coexistence furnishes the most important example of ambivalence of feeling" (1991, p.130). The simultaneous existence of both love and hate toward an object becomes generalized to varying degrees toward the child's

relations with all objects later in life. In other words, this emotional psychodynamic will inhere in the future relations that a subject has with oneself, objects, and others in the world. Relevantly, the curriculum is filled with symbolic objects (and hence these ambivalent dynamics) that reflect directly on several aspects of learning beyond just the teacher and student. Freud also theorized that the very etiology of love with its initial relation of aggression (hate) maintains (after the attainment of the ambivalent position) the unique ability to reverse its instinctual content into hate (ibid.). This reversal of love into hate is predicated on the perceived loss of an object of love or a perceived threat to the ego. This concept becomes pedagogically valuable when considering that this dynamic (the reversal of instinct from love to hate) persists throughout an individual's lifetime. One reason why this reversal occurs, Freud theorized, is if the loss of a loved object (which includes the attachments one has made to objects, people, words, and concepts) is experienced as imminent. If this occurs, the ego can regress to its earlier relation of "hate" towards objects. Freud's theory opens new questions about the meaning and challenges of anti-oppressive efforts to change beliefs, especially when the methods used to engage the self with ideas that challenge one's past conception of oneself and others.

Returning to the psychoanalytic framing of how subjectivity develops, Freud theorized the unique ways that the ego can reverse its instinctual content into hate if faced with the (perceived) loss of a love object. Moreover, Freud describes how the psyche develops and moves towards relations with objects: "The decisive step forward was the concept of Narcissism, that is to say, the discovery that the ego itself is cathected with libido, that the ego, indeed, is the libido's original home, and remains to some extent its headquarters" (Freud, 1991, pp. 76-77). The discovery of this melding dynamic made it possible in Freud's meta-psychological framework to explain how the subject comes to fulfill the needs of ego-libido by turning to the world of

objects, essentially to the mother, to others, and the symbolic order of language. The turning of

the subject towards objects is a process that comprises a dual movement, which also contains a

regressive function. As Freud explains, "the Narcissistic libido turns toward objects and thus

becomes object libido, and it can change back into narcissistic libido once more" (Freud, 1991, p.

77). This turning back can occur again when a threat to the ego is perceived and if there is not

enough love (libidinal energy characterized by Eros) available to libido. This ability for

narcissism to move back and forth between ego-libido and object libido is of special interest

pedagogically, as it is this regressive movement in the critical dynamics of narcissism, where the

ambivalent nature of love can reorient/regress its constituents to hate, that marks most

problematically an individual's relationship with social difference.

　According to Freud, the vigilance, sadism, and strength of the anxiety produced by the ego's

demands both by its instinctual nature and the move toward object-libido (symbols/people/the

outside world) are overwhelming. The nature and origins of the aggression itself are directly

related to both the first instance of aggression that surfaced during the pleasure principle phase of

libidinal development when the infant's primary caretaker did not meet the infant's immediate

needs. This concatenation of aggressive components works in tandem and is experienced initially

due to the frustration of instinctual demands whose aim has been inhibited by the fear of the loss

of love from those responsible for the self's very existence, the primary caregiver(s). However, as

the fear of annihilation and the force of the self-preservative instinct to express this hostility is

overwhelming, the child "[b]y means of identification takes the un-attackable authority into

himself" (Ignatieff, 1998, p. 91). The introject becomes the super-ego, which sets itself up as the

sadistically moral taskmaster of the ego. This aim-inhibition is the first instance of both the

development of the super-ego and the emotional instantiation of guilt. Freud postulates "the

turning inwards of the aggressive instinct is, of course, the counterpart to the turning outward of

libido when it passes over from the ego to objects" (Freud, 1991, p. 8). As Deborah Britzman

(2001) encapsulates,

> It is the tension between the ego and the super-ego that produces guilt. In early development, there is social anxiety or fear of loss of love. This is not yet the super-ego, only its grounds. Introjecting this anxiety moving from fear of external authority that demands the renunciation of instinct to fear of internal authority, or the desire for punishment allows the super-ego its usefulness. For Freud, the desire for punishment is guilt. Here is the curious equation. "Every renunciation of instinct becomes a dynamic source of conscience, and every fresh renunciation increases the latter's severity and intolerance" (p. 3).

The aggression denied expression is "introjected, internalized; it is sent back to where it came

from-that is, it is directed toward his/*her* ego" (Freud, 1991, p. 84; italics added). This repetition

mimics the growth and birth of the conscience to the agency of the super-ego. As was alluded to

earlier, this agency was born within a portion of the ego that had served as the receptacle of the

ego's manifest aggression. This portion of the ego, after an overly aggressive

development, *affectively* becomes the sentinel against the expression of aggression. The

conscience is formed to watch and punish the ego for both its real and imagined transgressions.

The conscience, now in the form of a super-ego, "is ready to put into action against the ego the

same harsh aggressiveness that the ego would have liked to satisfy upon other, extraneous

individuals" (Freud, 1991, p. 84; italics added). The question becomes: What then happens to all

this aggression? Surely, it cannot all be directed at the ego. According to Freud, aggression is

also expressed externally in outward aggression, hatred, and war. These expressions Freud

stressed should counter those who continue to hold a naive belief in the gentility and loving

nature of human beings. He comments:

> They are, on the contrary creatures among whose instinctual endowments are to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness. As a result, their neighbor is for them not *only* a potential helper or sexual object, but also someone who tempts them to satisfy their aggressiveness on him, to exploit his capacity for work without compensation, to use him sexually without his

consent, to seize his possessions, to humiliate him, to cause him pain, to torture and to kill him (pp. 68-69).

Earlier in this study, we discovered that the affective construct of love is embedded in its history and what this means that as Freud elaborated in *Civilization and Its Discontents,* (1961) the history of psychological positions and dynamics are ever-present in the mind. The previous libidinal positions (the old versions of the self) and the psychological experiences in a structurally intact mind are always available, always existent in the psyche. Thus, past and present are often dynamically and economically negotiable or indistinguishable within the temporality of the unconscious. This framework poses a particular problem because this hostility (often experienced as hatred) is expressed as aggression, which may be activated for various reasons. One major source of its activation may occur because of fear. In Winnicott's words, aggression "may be a symptom of fear" (1992a, p 84); a dread which may be experienced as a fear of another's difference perhaps, or any other danger to our ego, which always strives towards a conflict-free, homeostatic state. One of these dangers to the ego occurs when the super-ego machinations induce a sense of guilt. Additionally, Britzman (2001) adds, "[a]lso, at bottom a sense of guilt is a fear of one's super-ego (p. 4). Therefore, guilt, fear, and aggression would sometimes seem almost indistinguishable for students and teacher educators. These hyper-sensitive dynamics dramatically complicate any attempt to change a students' thinking when these attempts instigate the ego to reframe its borders and boundaries.

Conceptual Framework

If we take seriously even some of the dynamics theorized in the split subject of psychoanalytic theory; it is incumbent upon us as educators, our ethical duty to formulate an alternate vision of what is happening to the subject while being presented with ideas that may be experienced unconsciously as hostile. A psychoanalytically informed consideration of subjectivity allows us

to rethink what an apparent refusal to learn might indicate in terms of unconscious processes and whom such a refusal might implicate in terms of ethical responsibility. Furthermore, taking these alternative constructions of the subject and the learning process into consideration can help us formulating pedagogy more likely to engender addressing another's difference rather than their similarity while simultaneously enabling students to gain insight from their psychological processes.

The psychoanalytic dynamics of a subjects' unconscious help us think about how subjects cope with the demand to encounter difference. Doing this requires a shift in how we frame subjectivity, from one where false consciousness, a cognitively based unconscious or multiply positioned selves can be overcome, taught, and made stable through appropriating and accommodating the right knowledge, to one where an admission that there may something going on inside of learners that exceeds not only the limits of the subject's knowledge but also our ability as investigators to represent what is happening. Such a reframing can also enable us to consider what happens if teacher candidates' resistance ". . .speaks from a place of prior history rather than present relation" (Pitt, 1998, p. 539). Additionally, we can also explore if a teacher educator's belief in a particular reading of resistance is informed by his/her desires (p. 540). Accounting for all the complex circulations of ambivalence (arising from the teacher and student) and circulating in curricular texts would be unrealistic; however, tracing out how some of the pivotal aggressive aspects and dynamics of ambivalence shape what is being resisted by teacher candidates would be beneficial in forging more effective anti-oppressive teaching methodologies.

If informed by psychoanalysis, we think about learning as being both a reflection and repetition of the grounds of our initial and continuing struggles with learning to become a

subject, then the meaning of resistance "refers to the processes of managing psychic conflict" (Pitt, 1998:536), which can be regarded as the grounds through which learning is inaugurated and upon which it repeats. In psychoanalysis, learning is constituted "with the curious ways in which ideas and affect organize and reorganize each other and attach themselves to new experiences" (Pitt, 1998, p. 541). Viewed in this manner, our analysis of what conflict (also read as resistance or ignorance) in learning indicates and whom it implicates must also shift. The alteration entails viewing these interruptions in learning as indicators of the process of learning getting caught up in *itself* as it is caught up *in the self*; as Deborah Britzman (1997) phrases it, learning is a relearning of one's history, and if this is so then it is affected by one's history, of memory, desire and frustration. Moreover, if we suppose that this description illuminates a significant part of what is happening inside learners, then, we must admit that attempts to change teacher candidate beliefs, especially when they run counter to past attachments drawn between themselves and the world through love or psychic struggle, are much more dislocating than most of us have historically conceived. We might also admit that "resistance as well can indicate the resistance to the limit of self-knowledge" (Britzman, 1997, p. 28) because there are places that we cannot go or take students to without overwhelming discomfort and pain. Part of this reformulation also calls for the admission that conflict itself may be a necessary dynamic in the process of acquiring new knowledge (Felman, 1995). These shifts place the onus for failure away from teacher candidates and instead focus upon how our pedagogy may incite learners. Such a shift can also help to explain in some measure the relative intensity of student reactions to certain types of information, which lead them to accept some ideas un-problematically and reject or resist others passionately. These re-framings work to formulate the conceptual shift of this dissertation, and,

as Britzman has commented, "[r]esistance to learning and its defences against learning are just the necessary beginning" (1998b, p. 54).

Psychoanalytic Theories of Education

Psychoanalytic theories of education (mirroring psychoanalytic theories of development) begin with Anna Freud's definition of education as being all types of interference with development. According to Anna Freud, development refers to "new editions of very old conflicts" (Freud: 1974, p. 88). This psychoanalytic orientation to educational theory and its inimitable relation with psychoanalytically defined development centers *conflict* as a necessary dynamic in the process of acquiring new knowledge (see Felman, 1995).

We can readily observe internal conflict in the resistance that appears in anti-oppressive, antiracist and multicultural classrooms for our present purposes. Also, what occurs between the teacher and student in a classroom is informed by many other socio-political factors and dynamics, which need to be accounted for in some measure, which is why this conceptual framework is attuned to the shortcomings of both psychoanalytic and anti-oppressive theory. In sum, psychoanalytic theories tend to view prejudice and racism as an *effect*, the cause of which is internal psychological dynamics (Dalal, 2001, p. 63), while anti-oppressive approaches view social and political dynamics as the cause, and individual racism the effect. In privileging the psychical over the social, psychoanalysis tends to depoliticize the social, leaving unaddressed the formidable effects of institutionally inscribed and discursively embedded inequities. Conversely, in privileging the social above the psychological, anti-oppressive approaches often dismiss the importance of how psychodynamics work to shape socially and politically embedded racism(s). Also, by not examining how difference resides within individuals, anti-oppressive theory often overlooks the importance of the differences that reside within communities themselves (Yon, 1999, p. 623), again downplaying socially demarcated difference within seemingly homogeneous

groups. To bridge these seemingly unbribable paradigms, I draw on two complementary, though distinct, conceptual framings of ambivalence; the first is derived from psychoanalytic theory and is concerned with the origins of ambivalence as a dynamic. The second is from Homi Bhabha's (1994) postcolonial critique and is concerned with how the demands of the social environment also structure ambivalence.[23]

Ambivalence can be understood as the "simultaneous existence of contradictory tendencies, attitudes or feelings in the relationship to a single object, especially the coexistence of love and hate" (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1983, p. 2). Basically, ambivalence is the existence of irreconcilable affects of love and hate simultaneously present in an individual to any object (or an objectified subject). The coexistence of the opposing feelings originates within a child's conflicted feelings toward their mother and, after that, mediated by society's demands. I will quickly review these dynamics from our earlier discussion.

Ambivalence consists of an admixture of both love and hates toward the same object. "Hate, as a relation to objects, is older than love" (Freud, 1991, p.137). Hate arises from overwhelming feelings of "un-pleasure" during a child's early ego development. It is ruled by the self-preservative instinct (p. 136), when/where anything experienced as unpleasurable "[t]he ego hates, abhors and pursues with intent to destroy all objects which are a source of unpleasurable feelings for it..." (p. 136). The ego projects all objects outward felt as unpleasurable. The experience of un-pleasure occurs when a child's immediate needs are not instantly met. As discomfort for a child is inevitable, the resulting feelings of hatred and aggression are projected

---

[23] Ambivalence is a dynamic whose structure becomes both modified and defined by its relationships to desire, identification, narcissism, recognition, transference, and depression. Each of these interrelated dynamic forms necessitates specific analysis. I am presenting the general trajectory and structure of its birth as a dynamic and how it continues to be refined both psychically and with the social environment.

toward its mother. Nevertheless, the still reliant and grandiose child cannot tolerate such aggressive feelings toward her mother and must repress those feelings of hate/aggression to the unconscious. The feelings of love toward her mother later co-exist unconsciously (and often, simultaneously) with feelings of hate. "Since it is particularly common to find both these directed simultaneously towards the same object, their coexistence furnishes the most important example of ambivalence of feeling" (Freud, 1991, p. 130). The existence of both love and hate toward an object becomes generalized to varying degrees toward the child's relations with all objects. The very etiology of love with its initial relation of aggression (hate) preserves the unique ability to reverse its instinctual content into hate (p.130). This reversal of ego contents from love to hate occurs when an object of love is felt to be lost, or there is a perceived threat to the ego.

Pedagogically, understanding this dynamic is valuable because the reversal of an instinct from love to hate (and back again from hate to love) persists throughout a lifetime. Consequently, if a loved object is experienced as lost, an imminent threat to the ego experienced, and in response, the ego can regress to its earlier relation of "hate" towards objects. Using this dynamic for analytic purposes, we can view resistance in the classroom as a symptom of the dynamic of ambivalence in action.

There also exists a great tension between the individual and society as the expectations of civilization, and those of other subjects are not equivalent to the demands made instinctually within the individual. This establishes the second aspect of ambivalence. Freud explains, "On the one hand love comes in opposition to the interests of civilization, on the other civilization threatens love with substantial restriction" (Freud, 1961, p. 58). The battle between our need for love and society's need to restrict love forms the building blocks of guilt, conscience, the super-ego and our experience of others. In this way, ambivalence contributes to how we engage with

others and how their Otherness is processed, experienced, judged, accepted, or rejected. Our engagements with and rejection of our Otherness, as we shall see, is also mediated by ambivalence.

Both aspects of ambivalence that we have examined are separate though intimately interrelated—the libidinal history of the individual mirrors in many facets the development of society. In Freud's words, "we cannot fail to be struck by the similarity between the process of civilization and the libidinal development of the individual" (Freud, p. 51). Consequently, the development of ambivalence structures how the individual functions psychically as well as how they relate to society and conversely, "sociological ambivalence is one major source of psychological ambivalence" (Merton & Barber 1976, p. 7). Both planes of ambivalence intersect and interact, though it is the psychical dynamics that remain dominant, sociological factors contribute but are subsumed by psychodynamic forces.

Theorizing resistance as to an extent grounded in the dynamic of psychoanalytically defined and sociologically informed ambivalence means encountering certain theoretical challenges. Specifically, the focus in psychoanalytic theory upon the individual becomes an immense problem if one wishes to maintain a political focus on racism's *social* reality. An imperative of this study is to recognize the tendency in psychoanalysis to downplay the role of the social, political, and historical forces that impact an individual (Dalal, 2001, p. 63). Given this disciplinary tendency, we can understand the dynamics of ambivalence, as outlined above, as restricted by dynamically positioning the internal dynamics of the self as primary and external effects as always secondary. However, what if the social forces of racism are considered as "being a cause rather than an effect, and so of actually structuring the internal dynamics?" (Dalal, 2001, p. 63). Answering this question in the affirmative helps to strike a balance between, on the

one hand, too much stress on psychoanalytic theory and, on the other, too much stress on sociological theory. It also attends to antiracism's suspicions concerning too large a focus on the individual.

Chapter 3: Methodology

On November 21, 2008, I held a lecture and seminar for the TC's describing the purpose of the small group's addition to the Urban Diversity Program. During this class, I also explained how the study of small groups fit into my dissertation research. In addition to being the sole researcher, I informed the TC's that I would be a facilitator in a small group and oversee the other five small groups. At this time, a description of the intention of the small groups was also distributed in class to each student and by e-mail. Students were informed that as a part of the Urban Diversity Program, they would attend six one-hour sessions that would begin the fourth week of November 2008. After that, sessions were held every 3 or 4 weeks when possible. Five full regular sessions were completed, and one additional emergency session was added in response to a racial incident at the university. In addition to these six full sessions, a final shortened session was added in the third week of March to provide closure and (as the TC's requested) a space for celebration. After the final 45-minute session, the full class reconvened to reflect on the year and revel in their accomplishments.

Subjects, Tools & Procedures

All teacher candidates in the Urban Diversity Program were informed at the start of the school year that the specialized teacher education program they had been selected for was designed to be an active research site and a space for learning exemplary practice. Furthermore, as noted earlier, the vast majority of TC's in this program were recruited because they:

1. self-identified as a member of a minority or stigmatized population,

2. described themselves as having experience with, and some commitment to issues of equity, diversity, and social justice.

Whether TC's had met these criteria was decided by adjudicators chosen by Professor Solomon, comprised of professors in the faculty, seconded faculty, and former Urban Diversity students through an analysis of the written narratives and interviews that were part of the general York Teacher Education Application Process. One expectation of TC's, which was made clear on the first day of class, was that their co-operation in ongoing research investigations or any new studies that may arise was expected as part of their commitment to the program. If, as is the case with this research, a new study was being undertaken, individual TC's would be asked if they wished to participate directly.

Several weeks before the end of classes, during the fifth meeting of the small groups, I asked the entire UD cohort if anyone would like to participate personally in my dissertation research. I explained that this would involve attending an interview or a focus group or possibly handing in further written submissions at least one year after the end of Teacher's College. The purpose of these meetings and further data gathering would be to explore small group dynamics (and the efficacy of the small group component) in the context of the entire UD Program. A group of 12 individuals (two from each separate small group) were chosen from the pool of 20 students who agreed to participate. I utilized the same method (outlined immediately below for forming small groups) to choose TC's for follow-up studies, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. I distributed the approved Faculty of Graduate Studies Ethics forms which described the study and the expectations of participants in the study, and had each participant sign the forms.

During orientation week, all TC's (who had not already done so) were asked by Professor Patrick Solomon to fill out a form called the "Information Form" that contained general questions about how TC's identify themselves in terms of race, class, gender, and socio-economic status. These forms were used indirectly in this study as Professor Solomon gave me the data gleaned

from the "Information Form" that identified each student of the 2008/2009 cohort according to the four demographic categories of race, ethnicity, gender, and nationality. Professor Patrick Solomon passed this data to me to help design a follow-up questionnaire that I would eventually distribute to the entire class four weeks later, entitled "Urban Diversity Questionnaire" (see Appendix B). To be clear, Professor Patrick Solomon oversaw the process of my honing the Urban Diversity Questionnaire to make sure the queries therein were as qualitatively open-ended as possible while also being capable of gathering quantitative data that would augment or clarify the general information already; gathered on the "Information Form."

The UD Questionnaire contained nine questions that asked the TC's to speak at some length about what equitable teaching practice might look like and the role that they believe aspects of their/and their student's identity such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and physical or psychological (dis)ability, has on the teaching and learning process. Finally, there were two questions regarding the strength of individual commitments to social justice and a query about TC's hypothetical personal and professional growth in the coming year.

When I distributed the UD Questionnaire to the TC's, I explained that I would be using the information from the answers to inform my Doctoral research on the Urban Diversity Program, and further that the information they provided on the questionnaire would also be used as *one part* of a process to help me to design the small groups. I would personally design, direct, and monitor all six small groups while facilitating one group. I also informed the entire cohort that the UD Questionnaires would be revisited for data gathering purposes and could be accessed by themselves if they wished. Additionally, I told the TC's that the purpose of the small groups was to provide a space for the ongoing and productive discussions of issues that arise throughout the

program. The UD Questionnaires were distributed four weeks after the commencement of the school year.

Tools to place Teacher Candidates in Small Groups

During orientation week, an "Information Sheet" designed by Professor Patrick Solomon was distributed to all students in the UD program. The completed form was to be returned to Professor Solomon before starting classes. Each year, Professor Solomon handed out similar forms for the TC's to fill out as part of the program's official demographic data gathering process. In addition, about four weeks after classes commenced, the researcher handed out the UD Questionnaire designed to gauge students' awareness and commitment to social justice issues regarding equity, diversity, racism, teaching, learning, and TC self-insight (See Appendix B). After gathering this data, I, with the support of the UD team, assessed where each TC fit into a 4-point scale rubric (See Appendix A) developed by Angela Paccione (2009) designed to identify the themes/Stages in the Process of Developing a Commitment to Multiculturalism (p. 989).

Facilitators

I chose six Facilitators from the Department of Education, York University, Urban Diversity Teacher Education Program. The team included two professors, one seconded faculty, and two Ph.D. students, which included me (the lead researcher). In addition, each small group was assigned a random facilitator.

Procedure

All students in the class were asked to complete the demographic Information Form distributed by the program head, Dr. Patrick Solomon, at the year's outset. Then, after a plenary lecture on the purpose of the small groups, I asked all students, with the stated support of the program head, Dr. Patrick Solomon, to fill out the UD Questionnaire which I designed. I then

collated the initial demographic data provided to me by Patrick and the UD Questionnaire with input from the UD team during formal and informal discussions. At my behest, qualitative factors such as leadership, introversion and extraversion were discussed as important variables in the formation of small groups.

After gathering all this data, I analyzed it all through the categorical demarcations provided by a 4-point scale rubric developed by Angela Paccione designed to identify the themes/Stages in the Process of Developing a Commitment to Multiculturalism (Paccione, 2000, p. 989). TC's were assigned either a 1, 2 or a 3. The 4 stage/point rubric scale identified a stage of commitment that best fit each student: the major plot-points along the continuum included 1) Contextual Awareness, 2) Emergent Awareness, 3) Transformational Awareness and 4) Committed Action. None of the students were given a 4 coding as I and the team agreed that we did not have enough information at the time when the small groups were formed to conclude that a TC was committed to taking action to fight against inequity in its multitude of forms. If I was unsure of where to place a TC on the rubric, I asked the UD team for input.

To clarify, figuring out which group was best for each TC was a decision discussed among Ph.D. students, seconded faculty, and professors on the UD team, but I was given final authority. During discussions about individual TC's, we utilized demographic information such as race, class, and gender from the first handout, and the answers from the UD Questionnaire. These discussions were further informed by observations made by members of the team gathered from TC's practicum placements and courses.

Following the placement of each TC on Paccione's rubric (2009, p. 989), I formed the small groups to be representative of an even demographic distribution, an even balance of experience, and a mix of extraverted and introverted students while also engendering balance and sensitivity

regarding issues of equity, identity, diversity, and social justice. From the Urban

Diversity Program, in November of 2008, 70 students were separated into 5 small groups of 14

students.

Participant Details

All participant names are pseudonyms

Facilitator – Galina - White, Female, Russia
Neil - White, Male, England
Deandre - Black, Male, Nigeria

Facilitator - Seth – White, Jewish, Male, Canada
Aviva – White, Female, Algeria
Emily - White, Female, Canada
Isaiah - Black, Male, Jamaica

Facilitator - Audrey - White, Female, Canada
Riyanshi - Brown, Female, South India (only one quote)
Peter - White, Male, Canada

Facilitator - Tiyanna – Black, Female, Jamaica
Julie - White, Female, South Africa
Andrea - White, Female, Canada

Facilitator - Tim - White, Male, Canada
Chris - Black, Male, Zimbabwe
Camilla - White, Female, Italy

Sidra - Brown, Female, India – Professor.
Facilitated a small group for the first week and was then present for the UD focus group (see page 87) one year after completing the academic year.

Cindi - White, Female, New Zealand – Graduate Student
Present for some small group sessions and attended the UD focus group (see page 87) one year after completing the academic year.

As this dissertation contends that complex psychological defenses are a significant mitigating

factor in changing teacher candidates' subjectivity, I have chosen to identify each TC initially by

race, sex, and nationality rather than provide a detailed history of their lives, multiple subject

positions or describe any intersectional identity dynamics. A more thorough sociological analysis

of the context within which TC's are embedded and how these factors may impact psychological

dynamics unfolds in Chapter 4. Further analysis of how some common intrapsychic dynamics

such impact TC's learning about others is explored in Chapter 5.

Small Group Methodology

The ongoing efforts to bring together elements of psychoanalysis with education need to, as

Deborah Britzman (1998a) suggests, look more critically at the dynamics that have profoundly

contributed to education's own historical conceptualizations of learning, which are "located on

the frontier between the individual and the social" (p. 40). By implication, this dynamic frontier

is also where a more detailed understanding of the process of learning from resistance can begin

to be theorized. I propose that because ambivalence reveals itself in the manifestation of

resistance to "difficult knowledge" and that its expression and etiology are positioned along the

frontier of the psychical and the social that its study can bridge this turbulent borderland while

also providing us more insight into "resistance" than the vast majority of past approaches. From

this foundation, we can conceptualize learning as a dynamic that back and forth between the

subject and the external environment. Learning is structured through this dynamic, and in

consequence, the learner's experiences with "difficult knowledge" repeats and/or break down

along these often conflicted and contested fault lines.

Shoshana Felman (1987) provides us with a useful pedagogical conception of a

psychoanalytically inflected theory of learning. Pedagogy, she maintains, can be conceived as an

endeavour to create new knowledge, and create an original learning disposition. If we think about

resistance as indicative of both a reflection and repetition of the grounds of our initial and

continuing struggles with "difficult knowledge" then resistance represents an illustration (and

repetition) of the conflict in/through which one comes to form an initial disposition toward

learning. Focussing on how one learns how to learn and how that experience shapes our

disposition to education and knowledge diverges dramatically from the normatively inspired belief that primarily conscious dynamics govern education. Such a shift places the onus upon how our initiations with learning become internalized as the structural dynamics through which we come to learn and approach learning itself. These dynamics then are seen to be at work in our reactions to certain types of information; they inform our ability to accept some ideas unproblematically and reject and/or resist others.

Thinking about resistance as part of learning how to learn, part of the ongoing residual process of the dynamics of learning reconfigures the time and place of learning. It admits in the words of Felman and Laub, (1992) that perhaps "if teaching does not hit upon some sort of crisis, if it does not encounter either the vulnerability or the explosiveness of (an explicit or implicit) critical and unpredictable dimension, it has perhaps not truly taught" (1992, p. 53). Felman and Laub seem to be pointing us toward the conclusion that effective learning must instigate the process of conflict (that inaugurates learning to begin with) and through which the "new editions of very old conflicts" (Freud: 1974, p. 88) are brought into the pedagogical realm. Therefore, as resistance is constituted by conflict, its expression represents both a pedagogical moment where learners resist learning and a *pedagogical opportunity that demands protracted critical attention*. These resistance expressions demarcate the possibility for educators to help students make meaning out of their resistance and gain insight from aggression. This work of making meaning from opposition and gaining insight into their learning dispositions can also help learners to potentially exceed the aggressive repetitions that make up a crucial aspect of their resistance as "[l]earners must become theorists of their own learning dispositions before they can count upon understanding" (Britzman, 1998a, p. 142). To help TC's pursue this often-fraught process, TE's

need to question, "How can we help learners become aware of their learning dispositions, and what are the difficulties and dangers inherent in such a project?"

Anti-oppressive classrooms provide educators, learners, and theorists many opportunities to explore those moments when learning is affected by interruptions in excess of the here and now, the subject (as teacher or learner), and the learning objects (the curriculum). Pursuing these moments requires placing ethical considerations at the forefront of socially conscious pedagogical design. We must ask ourselves; how do we follow these moments without foreclosing or imposing the meanings of these moments of resistance? Also, relatedly, how do we think about other people's traumatic pasts (i.e., the experiences of trauma, oppression, and racism) without increasing or inciting secondary traumas in our students (Hartman, 1996)? How do we present knowledge that implicates teacher trainees in these traumatic pasts without inducing intransigent resistance to this knowledge? If learning from resistance is necessary, how do we work with resistance, how can we engage with it given the above concerns?

This brings me to an important personal, academic, pedagogical, ethical, and interdisciplinary goal of this dissertation, which aims to reconfigure psychoanalytic theory's depoliticization of the social. To do this, I will insist that social and political discourse, that is, the real-world expression of racism, *actively re-structures* internal psychical dynamics and is also causal. I believe that blending psychodynamic sociological theory will allow for new insights into teacher candidates' learning about difference in social justice education, such as the Urban Diversity Program. Thus, my methodology is commensurate with this dissertation's theoretical stance that the dynamics among identities, subjectivity, culture, learning, change and the circulation of power can be understood as being located within and among hegemonic social discourses and unconscious processes.

Facilitation of Small Groups

Faculty, Seconded Faculty and Ph.D. students who facilitated the groups formally discussed the small groups' purpose during a two-hour meeting that was led by the lead investigator. Prior to this meeting, an explanation of the reason for the small groups was summarised in an email to all participants. During the meeting, the lead investigator described in detail what the small groups aimed to accomplish, and how to facilitate each small group. Facilitators were instructed to provide TC's with more flexibility and sensitivity in terms of letting them express their "developing" thoughts and feelings in the small groups as compared with the larger class setting.

These instructions included familiarizing facilitators with Donald Winnicott's concepts of a "transitional space" (1992b) and "holding environment" (1992b). According to Winnicott, a "holding environment" enables the powerful emotions often expressed by young children and toddlers to be safely contained by their mother. For our purposes, I explained, building such an environment would enable TC's aggressive-resistant sentiments to be safely and productively contained by a facilitator. If the holding environment is successful, children, or in this case, TC's would feel secure and safe enough to express potentially contentious thoughts and feelings without fear of reprisals or recriminations. Once this trust dynamic is established, the child or TC will be more likely to cross the permeable border between thinking and feeling to gain insight into their learning process (for more detail, see below).

The one-hour sessions were scheduled during the Foundations of Education class's final hour. Facilitators were asked to encourage students to discuss any ideas/issues they felt did not get enough attention in class or had problems accepting or understanding. In addition, one impromptu emergency small group session (as mentioned above) was held after an anti-racism rally to process disturbing experiences that transpired at the rally.

After the first two sessions, one group had to change the facilitator due to unforeseen circumstances unrelated to the small group. The group discussion topics were designed to be flexible and responsive to teacher candidate concerns and any critical incidents that arose. To illustrate, if a racial incident occurred at the University or a sensitive classroom conversation was ended hastily due to time constraints, guiding questions based on these incidents or suggestions for continuing the discussion were potentially provided by the facilitator.

Interviews and Focus Groups with Teacher Candidates

One year after the classes ended, starting in May of 2010, I held one interview and three focus groups inspired by a document I wrote entitled Guiding Questions: Interviews and Focus Groups (See Appendix C). Additionally, two TC's submitted written responses to this document, which was sent by email to each participant prior to the interviews and focus groups. More specifically, three separate sessions were held with two, three and three participants respectively in attendance. Also, I interviewed one student who could not attend any of the focus groups. Additionally, two former TC's submitted their answers to the document by email. Unfortunately, one student who was chosen for this dissertation research phase was unable to participate. The primary basis for choosing who would attend these focus groups and interviews was to ensure that every one of the six small groups was represented. In this way, I planned to identify common dynamics when analyzing TC responses between/among the small groups. Secondarily, after examining the TC's who volunteered, I aimed to choose a group of students who together represented an accurate cross-section of the UD cohort's demographics. Thanks to many volunteers, I was able to achieve this aim.

Focus Group with UD Team

Shortly after holding these interviews and focus groups, a single focus group with all the Urban Diversity small group facilitators was held. All the facilitators were informed early in the

research of this expectation of the study and agreed to participate. One year and a couple of months after the end of the 2008/2009 school year, I invited every member of the UD team to attend a focus group to discuss the small group addition to the UD program. Every facilitator and one Ph.D. student, who was a member of the UD team 2008/2009, attended. Before this session, I sent the document "Guiding Questions: Interviews and Focus Groups" to each participant (see Appendix C).

Data Sources for Small Groups

The initial inspiration for the development of the UD small groups came from equity-based researchers' and UD practitioners' calls for a time/place/space where teachers/professors facilitate students' examination of difficult emotional/cognitive issues, experiences, and ideas (Giroux, 1992; Chizhik 2003; Boyle Baise, 2005). Underpinning an examination of the efficacy of these small groups in a progressive teacher education context was a) predictable, emotional and intellectual responses each year, which dates back to my own experience as an Urban Diversity student in 1997, b) student requests for more open (less directed) discussion, c) my own positive experience in facilitating these types of groups in different contexts and, d) my familiarity with how insight into how emotions impact thinking can transform thinking and learning.

Small Groups as Transitional Space: Holding and Containing Aggression

Drawing on psychoanalytic theory, I propose that creating a pedagogical space attuned to processing resistance requires, at minimum, the holding or containing of ambivalence and other disturbingly powerful affects by the teacher educator. "The teacher, as container, allows the student to experience the frustrations of learning, and to exhibit his or her ignorance and resistance, and then engages the student in ways that help the student re-coordinate and reconsider it" (Garrett & Segall, 2013, p. 301). To clarify, when a TC expresses confusion, frustration, or hostility, a TE helps the TC examine the possible emotional and historical origins

of their response and, through such an examination, helps a TC process and revise their initial reaction/response, potentially altering their thinking. This is the intervention I wish to make as I believe that anti-oppressive education needs to enlist psychoanalytic dynamics to meet the unique ethical responsibilities that arise from the ego's intentional provocation in pursuit of transforming TC subjectivity.

My hypothesis is that a holding environment is much more conducive to the type of thinking required to tolerate the paradoxical shifts between the subject and the object, the self and the other, that anti-oppressive, equity and social justice-oriented education demands. Also, by creating this environment, we can:

1. Attend to our ethical responsibility not to harm students.

2. Assist students in making meaning from their resistance.

3. Perhaps exceed the type of identificatory thinking that reinforces previous reference frames regarding the self and the other.

Accomplishing any one of these three possibilities by any measure would contribute to achieving the fundamental aims of anti-oppressive projects. My hope is, if successful, this intervention will also help students (now or in the future) symbolize and make meaning from learning experiences to which they have been subjected.

Moreover, the small group space is also intended as a place to reflect upon how structurally based social science and educational theory informs teacher candidate attitudes, responses, and feelings concerning anti-oppressive issues. While the small group space differs in terms of its focus on how individual psychodynamics inform racism and intolerance, the facilitation of students working through their feelings of discomfort will inevitably call upon teacher educators to discuss and process the social and structural determinants of racism and prejudice that make

up the preponderance of the anti-oppressive curriculum. Indeed, what provokes and inspires much of the small group discussions responds to the structurally based theory taught in the larger classroom.

To build this pedagogical environment within a small group, I enlist several of Donald Winnicott's ideas concerning establishing a "holding environment" (1971) to attend to teacher candidate's emotional affect. To explain the type of thinking, insight and embodied knowing that this environment can engender, I will also enlist his ideas of the "transitional object/space" and "play" (1971). I am turning to the central concept of the holding environment because I believe it is pedagogically valuable as it depicts a conceptual/experiential dynamic that moves between the psychical and the social and addresses the aggressive aspects of ambivalence that we have seen play out in learners' expressions of resistance.[24] Also, as the type of work which will be done in this space focuses on "immediate experience" and "group relations" (Miller, 1990), there is a significant parallel between this work and the work done within a psychoanalytic space (French, 1997, p. 485).

The "holding environment" is constituted interpersonally and psychoanalytically and can speak to both the interpersonal engagements between teacher and student, among students and the complex intermingling of effect. Winnicott's conceptual framework demonstrates how remnants of the social imaginary are found at the intersection(s) of social discourse/culture and individual experiences of reality and fantasy. These intersections are a "transitional space" that mitigate and mediate our understanding of losing and finding objects, creating, making,

---

[24] As psychoanalytic concepts inform the design of this pedagogical environment, so too does a psychoanalytic orientation to educational theory. The hostile/conflictive expressions of ambivalence are most readily identified within the anti-oppressive oriented classroom as "resistance." Therefore, understanding the etiology and dynamics of ambivalence can help understand and possibly mitigate its most powerful expressions.

examining, and relating to the world, remaking relations within the self and between the self and the world. Essentially, Winnicott's theoretical base takes account of how learning and subjectivity are inaugurated by good enough relations with our primary caregiver and focus upon the optimal environmental qualities therein where we are most apt to make meaning, substantially accounting for individual psychological dynamics, social dynamics, and the inter-subjective space between subjects.

For our purposes as well, Winnicott's "transitional space," sometimes referred to as a "potential" or "third space," is required because it is where/when the subject's ability to play with meaning, tolerate paradox and ambivalence, makes possible the developmental enterprises of language, learning, culture and creativity. These fundamental creative aspects of healthy human experiences, according to Winnicott, provide individuals with the means to gain insight into the self and allow for a broader consideration of others' inherent differences. In this way, Winnicott's concepts resonate with the importance of considering both how resistance plays itself out in textually mediated sites as well as the way it plays out interpersonally. Ultimately, his theories can greatly assist teachers and students in learning from and engaging productively with resistance and conflict. I will now briefly explain Winnicott's framework and then outline what pedagogical qualities must be present to "attune" an environment to fit our purpose.

Recalling Freud's movements of a developing subjectivity, Winnicott focuses on how the child becomes "embodied" or separate from the mother. This separation occurs when a "good enough mother" through her timely ministrations (attunement) to the child, creates a sense of emotional strength and stability, protecting the child from the ensuing anxiety, which occurs as she realizes that the world is not entirely of her own making. Alice Pitt summarizes this dynamic:

Attunement moves back and forth, potentially exactly as required, from, on the one hand, providing the infant with the illusion of herself as omnipotent, thus containing the terrors of dependence, too, on the other hand, the gradual disillusionment of omnipotence that allows the infant to tolerate and exceed support, to recognize and enjoy the other, and to take pleasure in discovery (2003, p. 176).

The mother's attunement constructs what Winnicott called the "holding function" (1971), which protects the child from physical and psychological harm. An indispensable aspect of creating a holding environment entails allowing the child to express hostility without the fear of retaliation. If the mother retaliates to her child's aggression, accentuated feelings of disintegration for the child and a break in the holding environment arise. To maintain a holding space, the mother acts as a container (Klein, 1946, Bion, 1959) for the child's aggressive projections. As the child begins to emerge as a separate subject from their mother, s/he uses objects to mitigate disintegration feelings. These objects assist the child in the "transition from a state of being merged with the mother to a state of being in relation to the mother as something outside and separate" (Winnicott, 1971, p. 14). The use of these "transitional objects" (1992b) opens up a transitional or potential space, which signifies the third area of experience and marks the child's first use of symbols. This "transitional space," wherein a transitional object exists, is located between the space of internal fantasy and external reality (Pitt, 2000, p. 68).

The use of a transitional object marks an imperative emotional achievement and the child's first experience with play. For Winnicott, play is necessary for creative living and "constitutes the matrix of self-experience throughout life. ...only through playing can the self be discovered and strengthened (Abram, 1997, p. 219). The nature of play in this potential space later becomes elaborated as the grounds for the child's interactions with the social world. Winnicott elaborates,

This intermediate area of experience, unchallenged in respect of its belonging to inner or external (shared) reality, constitutes the greater part of the infant's experience and throughout life is retained in the intense experiencing that belongs to the arts and to religion and to imaginative living, and to creative scientific work (Winnicott, 1971, p. 14).

To sum up, the holding environment is supported through attunement to the child's needs. Attunement begets trust that frees the child to either express or sublimate their hostility and anxiety using transitional objects, thus opening "potential space." Entering this potential space is necessary for an individual to negotiate symbolically between the internal and external, the subject and the object, or the object, as it is subjectively perceived. Returning to the classroom, I can now outline the qualities needed to be present to maintain a holding environment, allowing students to enter potential space, play with ideas and experience disturbing affects without fear of reprisal.

Transforming a Pedagogical Environment into Potential Space

First and foremost, creating a holding environment in a small group entail building an atmosphere of trust where students can feel safe to enter potential space (Levy & Campbell, 2000, p. 323). The teacher educator must outline their commitment to creating a safe environment where students can feel free to explore difficult ideas. This would include outlining the academic and behavioural expectations for teacher trainees. In this regard, the teacher educator should explain that the emotional nature of some of the knowledge that will be engaged might result in expressions, opinions and ideas that are unpopular and even emotionally disturbing. Freedom to express these ideas, however, is not absolute. Boundaries should be drawn around clear-cut expressions of racism, hatred, and intolerance directed at individuals because such expressions would dramatically impinge upon other students' sense of safety. This type of impingement would work to breakdown a sense of trust and therefore mitigate the ability to play creatively in the potential space; the holding environment would suffer a breach. This does not mean that teacher candidates will not or can never make remarks that are or appear intolerant, as some of these expressions may indeed indicate a type of ignorance indicative of

struggles born of conflicting affects. Mediating these moments (deciding how much is too much for the group or an individual to tolerate) will be the teacher educator's job who facilitates these groups.

Discerning what is beyond toleration for a group is an exceedingly difficult judgment to make, and the group's health and functionality may well depend on these judgments. To help groups share in these types of decisions, facilitators should be mindful (to the best of their ability) of taking into account how members in the group are processing, reacting and responding to what is going on and what is being said in the group and in written reflections where the expression of anxious feelings and difficult thoughts are to be encouraged. So that group members are aware of the group's aims and responsibilities, clarification of the small groups' purpose and member roles was made clear from the small groups' inception. More precisely, candidates were informed that an integral part of "group work" entails that each member tries to explain what they think and how they feel about the statements and affects circulating in discussions. Also, candidates were informed that part of the group's work is to allow others, which may make offensive statements, to explore (either alone or with the group's help) where those sentiments may be coming from. In other words, politically incorrect and ethically disturbing remarks can present an opportunity to explore their affective and cognitive origins, or at least come to appreciate those irrational dynamics are at play and why others in the group find such comments offensive. In this way,

> The group serves as a container for various projections of group members and takes on a life of its own due to these processes. As a result, individual group members act not only on their own behalf but also on behalf of the larger group or system (Wallach, 2012, p. 86).

If the level of anger moves beyond a point where the facilitator feels that it can be tolerated, she should move the conversation or exploration away from a particular topic or focus,

explaining that the discussion had moved beyond the point at which they felt it was productive or safe.

Another quality of teaching required to construct the holding environment is the facilitator's willingness to put on hold their political or ideological agenda, paying attention instead to the student's background, past experiences, and emotional needs. The teacher must consider that the student's resistance speaks from a place that marks their own needs and experiences. This includes ambivalent relations to race, ethnicity, culture, class, sexuality, gender, (dis)ability and so on, and that these dynamic relations may not only become caught up in feeling and thinking but in discourse which (attempts) to symbolize that thinking. This means that teacher educators must parenthetically accept the teacher candidate's present exclamations regarding their own identity without immediate expressing judgment of their thinking (unless such claims are violent in nature). What needs to be kept in mind here is that despite the facilitator's often correct judgement that students may be ignorant of all the attendant complexities of their identity claims, at that moment, the facilitators should put their corrective comments on hold. *Of course, this does not preclude questioning student claims or exploring their claims critically through the frameworks and texts that have been presented throughout the Urban Diversity Program,* but facilitators should, whenever possible, avoid issuing *exclamatory* directions to teacher candidates about what they should be thinking. Facilitators should allow students "to explore without the threat of being judged, humiliated, and ridiculed forms of emotional impingement that inhibit thought risk-taking, and playfulness" (Levy & Campbell, 2000, p. 324). This means that when the facilitator is confronted with resistance or aggression, they must explore the aggression or give students the freedom to express these feelings/thoughts themselves (even aggressively at times) without labelling or interpreting the meaning of their expressions as necessarily indicative

of intolerance in some form. Doing so would foreclose the possibility of further insight into potential pedagogical and/or personal purpose – unless such exclamations appear, in the teacher educator/facilitator's judgment, to have exceeded what the group can tolerate.

One essential aspect of the creation of the holding environment is the mother's (read here as the teacher educators/facilitators) ability to "contain" (Bion, 1959) the anxiety, ambivalence and/or outright hostility of a TC (or group of candidates).[25] This necessitates the ability (on the part of a facilitator) to sustain (perceived) hostile attacks without corrective retribution, mindful that the transitional space can be brought into play for challenge and experimentation but must also be a place of refuge from aggression (Szollosy, 1998, p. 4). The failure to contain this hostility would lead to a break in the holding environment. The student(s) would withdraw from exploration out of disillusionment, and further investigation into what had constructed the resistance/hostility would cease. Also, if a teacher educator fails to act as a "container" for the projections, the return of this aggression will be experienced (by a student or students) with added virulence, thus creating more hostility at the individual and group level. As we have just seen, the activation of these projections would shut down the space of play.

Five years after shaping the contours of a pedagogical space attuned to affect, aggression, resistance, and ignorance, I had the opportunity to build the space as an experimental adjunct to the Urban Diversity Program. At a meeting in 2006, the UD team dedicated the second half of a two-hour session specifically to address ways of taking up and possibly mitigating teacher candidates' "resistance" practices. The subsequent creation of small groups in the Urban Diversity (UD) program was a project suggested by the lead investigator and accepted by the

---

[25] As the context here is education and not an orthodox therapeutic environment, responsibility for containment efforts ultimately rests with the group facilitator. However, a healthy group will also assist this function.

Urban Diversity instructional team in October of 2007 after some vigorous discussions regarding its design and purpose. The groups commenced in November 2008.

I set out to explain the details of how this space could be constructed and what our roles as teacher educators/facilitators would be. In such a designed space, I reiterated that teacher candidates could work more constructively and process their thinking and feeling, whether positive or negative, concerning their experiences throughout the entire Urban Diversity Program in a more conducive environment. Thus, the application of this environment and the small groups were undertaken by the researcher as a form of proactive pedagogical intervention (based on foreseeable difficulties in learning about and from difficult knowledge that had occurred since the inception of the program). An important note concerning the inception of the small groups' addition to the program is that as a TC of the second ever UD cohort in 1996/1997, I witnessed firsthand how many white teacher candidates and other demographic groups struggled intellectually and emotionally to accept what was being taught. Moreover, at this early juncture, I began to formulate how to overcome their resistant responses. In sum, it has taken the better part of 25 years to amass enough experience in the field, including many years as an instructor in the program, to acquire the theoretical tools necessary to elucidate a realistic method that could help teacher candidates through this challenging process.

The unique environment I proposed was built from a conceptual framework that I designed in earnest within my master's thesis. Throughout several meetings and through handouts, I explained to the UD team how we could learn from resistance. I shared my belief that contrary to how opposition had been framed in the past in antiracist and critical multicultural literature, I believed that we could learn more from resistance. To do this, I made it clear that rather than quickly dismiss any resistance that we see as indicative of just ignorance, prejudice, or racism,

we try and explore this phenomenon. During these meetings, as in the past, most of the team surmised that teacher candidate responses of resistance were occurring in reaction to some aspects of the UD program, most commonly discussions about race and sexuality (Solomon & Levine-Rasky, 1996; Solomon et al., (2003); Allen & Campbell, 2007). Teacher candidates were informed about the small groups on the first day of their initiation. During the third week of their Foundations of Education class, I explained the small groups' purpose during a seminar.

Data Sources

1. The first data source is textual and includes ethnographic documentation, public descriptions of the program, theoretical literature informing the program, writing about the program's philosophical inspiration by its designers and participants. Also considered are assessment rubrics, assignments completed by TC's during the school year and official UD curriculum documents. Finally, course reading materials are also included.

2. The small groups' data source includes the pedagogic field notes I made during and after each small group session. Additionally, the short reports about small group sessions submitted to me periodically by the facilitators are included.

3. The third data source comes from focus groups and interviews with the former TC's and one large focus group with the UD team. From these sources, the groups' transposed text and researcher observations during the communications therein are also included. All interviews and focus group conversations were transcribed by the author.

The first data source provides the theoretical, programmatic, and situational context that informs the small groups' sessions. The second data source include small groups field notes by group facilitators, will provide reports on weekly thematic discussions inside each of the five separate small groups. The third data source arises from focus groups, interviews and e-mail responses that were conducted 1 year after teacher candidates had graduated from the Urban

Diversity Teacher Education Program. These interviews and focus groups provide the opportunity for UD team members and former UD teacher candidates to remember and talk about their experiences, thoughts and feelings concerning the program and the small groups. Furthermore, the focus groups provide another opportunity to document educators' dynamics engaging with the same questions and problems that informed this dissertation from its inception.

Data Analysis

The first data source will first be examined to identify any thematic elements that appear (or do not appear) in the research questions and past iterations of the UD progressive teacher education program. Data source two includes professors, secondees, and Ph.D. Students field notes. These notes, which were sent after each session, will be coded alongside data source 1; this sequence will inform the discursive facilitation in the focus groups. After transcription and analysis of data source 3, the focus groups will be coded again, looking for central themes. All three sources will then be placed alongside one another for a final coding/re-coding. The purpose of sequential coding, comparison, and re-coding is to increase the possibility that previously unforeseeable issues, ideas and phenomena can be discovered through the process of inquiry (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This method also decreases the likelihood that findings arise from researcher expectation rather than from the data itself.

Post-Critical Ethnography

The choice of a post-critical ethnographic approach to dialogue and narrative reflects the dissertation's theoretical position, which views the communication that transpires within groups and between the researcher and the research as a process of non-reducible subjectivities in dialogue. "Only when such a position is adopted can meaningful dialogue between researcher and respondents follow" (Roberts, 2001). The "post" critical ethnography designation refers to

the self-reflexive nature of the investigation design as well as to the study's philosophical and historical situatedness within a post-positivist framework. Additionally, the usage of narratives and dialogue can add more ". . .contextual contours to the seeming objectivity of positivist perspectives (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 22).

Post-Critical ethnography is highly influenced by postmodern approaches, which means that it is culturalist-centred and can help identify the distinctive contextual character of teacher candidates' particular identities and cultural realities. Post-Critical ethnography also allows for notions of the relational and fluid nature of identity, which can help interrogate essentialism. It can utilize poststructuralist and postcolonial constructs of identity, which often incorporate psychodynamic theory to foreground meaning-making as a relational and fluid process.

Ethics

In practice, the choice of post-critical ethnography positions the researcher as accountable to those they are studying. Post-positivist work also indicates an acknowledgement of the contingent status of truth claims and the importance of critiquing both objectivity and subjectivity (Madison, 2005). This research project explores how identity or subjectivity is shaped by the object of knowledge and how these forces interrelate and coalesce within the individual and social spheres, utilizing an approach that retains a healthy skepticism to any foreclosure on the nature of these polarities is ideal. This refusal to foreclose meaning also reflects a central ethical concern of this project, which seeks to mitigate essentialist identifications of any form and upon any body. In particular, the investigation aims to be (a)ware of essentialisms that arise when interpreting what an individual has said, is reduced to the identity which has been read upon that person's body, or through incomplete assumptions about their identifications related to culture and history. Moreover, I intend to retain a meta-awareness that will be tracked in my research field notes regarding how my subjectivity in relation to the

Other informs and is informed by my engagement and representation of the Other (Madison, 2005, p. 9). In the field notes, the form this would take would be to list the assumptions, stereotypes, and essentialist framings, which are often linked to the particular subjects I am thinking and writing. Besides, how I understand my own subjectivity in relation to these framings of the Other will be noted. These notes will be placed alongside my thoughts, assessments, questions, and analysis as a constant reminder of the awareness I must maintain regarding how these past framings and relationships may be affecting my present understandings of what is and has occurred in the process of this explorative dissertation.

Textual & Discourse Analysis

Data source 1, UD program materials, will be subjected to critical textual analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) to examine how past iterations of the UD progressive teacher education program have taken up the research questions of the dissertation, which are: 1) How can we understand the dynamics of teacher candidates' learning which mitigate the intended outcomes of social justice programs? 2) What can be done pedagogically to intervene in this interruption of intended learning? This analysis will also begin the process of identifying both common and un-common thematic aspects regarding the relationship among identity, knowledge, pedagogy and change in the context of learning.

I plan to use a variant of discourse analysis informed by Foucault (1980) and Homi Bhabha (1994) to frame my investigation of data sources two and three, small groups' field notes, interviews, surveys, and focus groups. Discourse analysis will illuminate the ambivalent movements and dynamics between individual psychodynamic processes and the social/cultural sphere. I will examine *how* aspects of identity are constituted and implicated in students' and professors' discursive practices; that is, within conversations about their pre-service experience in the Urban Diversity Program in a small group setting and the focus groups (after the completion

of their degrees) where issues of racism and pedagogy are discussed. I am particularly interested in how respondents seek to encode meaning symbolically through language.

Homi Bhabha's work can help unpack how racial demarcations such as black and white become co-mingled through the social, cultural, and historic discourses of whiteness. In particular, he illuminates how the dynamics of colonial ambivalence contribute to structuring identity. In the Location of Culture (1994), Bhabha examines how colonial discourse is conveyed and reproduced in our everyday discursive practices. Building on psychoanalyst Franz Fanon's work, Bhabha contemplates how being colonized by a language changes consciousness. From this vantage, the content of language is understood as an essential facet of colonization and a site where a distinct culture or civilization is adopted and produced. Moreover, in accordance with Fanon, (1986), Bhabha agrees that "To speak ... means above all to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilization" (p. 17-18). Ostensibly Bhabha argues that one's consciousness is structured through the connotations and denotations of colonial discourse as it is carried through language.[26] Racial identifications such as black and white are revealed to be semiotic constructions, which Fanon contends, have, since the instant of colonial subjugation become mutually inter-dependent through a process of negation. Neither black nor white racial constructs exist without the other, Poulos summarizes,

> Thus, Fanon locates the historical point at which certain psychological formations became possible. In addition, he provides an important analysis of how historically bound cultural systems, such as the Orientalist discourse Edward Said describes, can perpetuate themselves as psychology (Poulos, 1996: Paragraph 5).

---

[26] The theoretical structures proposed by Bhabha will be used in terms of understanding the dynamics of how language "colonizes" the mind and shapes subjectivity and not necessarily how the impact of *colonial discourse* per se affects the subjectivities of the learners in this study in particular.

In Bhabha's formulation, what is understood as other is refuted, rejected, or repressed (if aspects of the other are unconsciously found within the self). White identity can only be constituted by recognizing its other, black identity, and black identity through white identity.

Consequently, affirming white identity through a dismissal of black identity simultaneously strengthens and diminishes the self and dismissal of white identity has the same consequence for black identity. Bhabha's ideas can be reasonably extended to include identities that fall outside of the black and white binary through the application of what he called "a liminal space." Such a space he hypothesized could be located within and between dualistic constructions of subjectivity. Once this space is located/created, a critical analysis could, he surmised, help to transcend binary thinking, withstand interdisciplinarity and contribute to a practical method of political engagement and subversion while also enabling a more malleable and permeable conceptualization of subjectivity. In a 1995 interview, Bhabha summarizes his project.

> I have always felt that while I was trying to work out a theory of the *resistance* to authority, and the subversion of hegemony, on certain colonial and postcolonial grounds, I was in fact also addressing problems relating to other moments and locations of authority (Bhabha, cited in Mitchell, 1995: 2, italics added).

Resistance to colonial authority or hegemony was, according to Bhabha, situated within the ambivalence of colonial discourse where false projections of fantasy co-existed and vacillated with the desire to dominate the other while simultaneously maintaining a wish for the other to be the same as the self. Bhabha insists that deconstructing the discourse alone is insufficient if one wishes to transgress colonial discourse's ambivalent limits/boundaries. Instead, he instructs that an examination of the *ambivalence* "of the object of colonial discourse - that otherness - which is at once an object of desire and derision, an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity" (Bhabha, 1994: 67) must be undertaken. Once this ambivalence has been

located and identified, the discourse can be re-read and re-presented or re-represented as a counter-narrative.

Through the identification of colonial ambivalence, Bhabha maintains, a "third space" (1994, 1996) is opened wherein the hybrid subject can be re-placed, enabling the possibility to reconstruct both language and consciousness with a "mutual and mutable" (Bhabha, 1994) representation of racial, ethnic, and cultural difference, positioned *in-between* the colonizer and colonized (Lindsay, 1997). This third space, re-placement, is read "performatively" and is when/where a transgression of otherness can be read/internalized as something "other" than the other. By inserting a re-defined subject/self into the third space, the structures through which one was initially perceived or perceived the "other" could be reinscribed. As Bhabha explains,

> The representation of difference must not be hastily read as the reflection of pre-given ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition. The social articulation of this difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, ongoing negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation (Bhabha, 1994: 2).

In sum, the performativity of individuals in contact with one another embody psychologically modulated representations of difference in addition to the discourses that carry these differences linguistically. Fundamentally, psychological ambivalence has been in-formed through discursive practice.

Bhabha's conceptualization of "ambivalence" related to the performative elements of pedagogical encounters will be applied to re-conceptualize these encounters as relational. Further, the contributing dynamics of meaning-making in these small groups and focus groups exists somewhere among the subjects involved in the construction of discourse and the socially, historically, politically, and discursively informed objects or texts of learning and knowledge which tell the space/time/place of dialogue. Essentially, the performative talk of persons in

contact with others/Others carries within it both the psychically inflected representations of difference and the social discourse that reproduces and assumes these differences discursively and linguistically. Thus, ambivalence exists psychically, as it has been in-formed through discursive practice. Bhabha's framing of ambivalence implies that the very nature of our engagements with a racialized other/Other also calls forth a textually situated ambivalence. Therefore, this other/Other's presence does not always occur in the flesh, so to speak, but is often carried, produced, and deeply rooted within discursively oriented texts. The psychological and social effects of these embeddings of the other/Other in discourse dramatically affect how othering is brought into relations with subjects. Conversely, these textual/discursive embeddings also affect how subjects are brought into relation with one another. This methodological approach suggests that textual embeddings of the other/Other, from mass media, from course materials, and from a gamut of experiences are brought into the discursive real of small group discussions. In turn, how change is understood among respondents will be framed by examining how the psychological impact of these embeddings of the other/Other as expressed in the discourse, influence how respondents understand the process of (un)consciousness transformation.

Focus Groups

The reasons that I have chosen to use focus groups are multiple. Fundamentally, their format directly gives expression to the interpersonal dynamics of talk essential in understanding pedagogy as a relational activity of meaning-making. This means that instead of the lead investigator *only* asking each person to respond to a question, in turn, people are encouraged to speak to each other, asking questions, exchanging anecdotes, and commenting on each other's experiences and points of view. The method is particularly useful for exploring people's

knowledge and experiences and can be used to examine what people think and how they think and why they think that way (Patton, 1989).

The methodological utility to the proposed research of focus groups is how people's involvement and the disclosures they make are shaped by the encouragements, ambivalences, censures, and silences, which they *receive* or *perceive* in communicating their thoughts and feelings. In this case, a central factor is that shared commitment to UD comprises a primarily nurturing environment. As such, "it taps into human tendencies where attitudes and perceptions are developed through interaction with other people" (Kreuger, 1988, p. 26). The discursive tendencies which reflect how dispositions are formed and how we affect each other are precisely the dynamics under study. Therefore, the focus groups' underlying dynamic simultaneously reflects and constructs both the grounds of the dynamic being studied and the groups' understanding of the dynamic under study itself.

Ethicality in the Research Process

I seek to ensure ethicality in the research process in a variety of ways. I understand my responsibility to examine scrupulously the multiple layers of relationally in the research process, beginning with a deep moral commitment to being honest with myself concerning the reasons for my choice of topic. Additionally, I will examine any bias I may have towards research subjects, chosen materials, theoretical framework, and methodology. Also, I commit to sharing any pertinent insights with my research subjects. Moreover, I will write and transparently communicate with all TC's how I perceive my privileged position of power, hoping to mitigate this power, when possible, throughout the research process.

To attend to these concerns, I intend to explain my potential bias by situating myself transparently to teacher candidates as a researcher (Brodkey, 1996). Specifically, I will state my assumptions about the study and contextualize how I fit into the research (Kirby & McKenna,

1989). Furthermore, I will also explain the genesis of my theoretical framework and how I came to think about the small group's addition to the program. Remaining aware of how my personal and political positioning may impact the research subjects will be assisted by the ongoing documentation of my thinking through notes and recordings. Additionally, I will share with my research subjects how I believe the investigation will be used in the future (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2002) to improve how progressive teacher education programs understand the relations between pedagogy, subjectivity, thinking, learning and identity. Finally, I will share that this work can help overcome emotional blocks to learning about social differences and otherness.

In the case of this dissertation, the investigative questions themselves have arisen from experiences that I had in the UD program. However, how I interpret these experiences is framed through particular theoretical frameworks formed through an amalgam of unique experiences and understood through the filter of my identity over time. By presenting my bias, assumptions, and how I am invested in the study, I intend not to deny others' experience or the theoretical or ideological frameworks they are utilizing, but to fuel the discourse among them (Brodkey, 1996).

Maintaining honesty, ethicality, and transparency require constant examination of oneself, one's relations to the subjects of the research, and the theoretical/methodological choices the researcher makes. One of the best ways to do this is to unpack one's "conceptual baggage" (Kirby & McKenna, 1989). I have used and intend to continue using this strategy as another layer of data. To illustrate, I will record my experiences and reflections throughout the research process, both in writing and on tape. Initially, this meant exploring which theoretical approaches were best suited to pursuing the questions at issue in this dissertation. How other frameworks shaped my (in)-ability to view the phenomenon through alternative paradigms, and whether I was dismissing useful conceptual models due to my own biases. Indeed, I discovered several areas of

my thinking which needed to be altered. Specifically, my own ironic tendency to write, think and often observe individual dynamics in a positivist manner while attempting to employ decidedly non-positivist theoretical and methodological constructs is an example of residual learning, which I had to shift.

During the research process itself, I sought to remain open to listening carefully to what the research subjects say, making sure I don't just hear what I may think fits my own expectations. Also, I will not conclude what the intention or meaning of my research subjects' utterances mean at that moment. Instead, the purpose of their words and my interpretations of the implications of their comments will be provisionally framed. In other words, as lead investigator, I will constantly be "…taking full measure of how and why the terms of our judgments are invoked in the practice of listening, and what this prevents us from hearing" (Simon 2005, p. 100). This is especially pertinent, given that my discourse analysis utilizes some psychoanalytic (Winnicott, 1992b) and culturalist (Bhabha, 1994) constructs, which often ascribe meaning, based not on what is said but upon what has informed the saying. It is also inferred that what has been said implies a sense located well outside and beyond the speaker's conscious intentions.

This brings me to my position, and how the power inherent to this position coalesce in the relationship between the researcher and research subject. In addition to maintaining transparent communication regarding the emotional and moral parameters of the relationship between the researcher and the research subject (Behar-Horenstein & Morgan, 1995), I will do my utmost not to use my power irresponsibly.

My Identity and Interdisciplinarity

I am a fifty-four-year-old Ashkenazi, cisgender, heterosexual, Jewish man, a descendant of numerous victims of the Holocaust, a teacher, a social worker, and an art therapist. I have taught

in public and private schools at the primary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Also, I have been employed as an ESL instructor with a diverse array of students in Canada and China. The experiences that I have had working for over 25 years with Chinese students, including the writing of a book on the TOEFL and Test for Spoken English (TSE) in addition to the development of college-level ESL and ESD programs, have taught me that race, culture, history, education, and nationality figure prominently in how knowledge frameworks can be differentially understood and internalized. Moreover, in the not-too-distant past, I have worked as an actor and playwright, gaining insight into the process of how thinking, intention, emotion, and action are interrelated.

Academically, as a graduate of York's Humanities program, interdisciplinarity characterizes the foundation of my critical thinking approach. After graduating from York, I attended the Toronto Art Therapy Institute. My supervisor and mentor, Dr. Martin Aaron Fisher (who studied directly under Sigmund Freud in Vienna, Austria), trained me in psychoanalytic techniques. During and following my attendance at TATI, my work in hospitals, group homes, psychiatric institutions, and geriatric care facilities provided me with insight into a myriad of psychological challenges and treatment approaches. The preferred psychoanalytic frameworks that I applied to issues of interest shifted profoundly during my time (1997-1998) as a teacher candidate within The Urban Diversity Initiative at York University, completing a master's degree and pursuing a Doctorate. During this period, I became adept at employing sociologically based methods and theory to educational issues. In sum, my life, work, and academic experiences have framed a particular way of knowing myself, others and the world and led directly to my thinking deeply about issues of equity, social difference, and subjectivity.

The frameworks through which I have witnessed and experienced resistance to any sustained examination of how emotional investments contribute to the inter-subjective structuring of student

and teacher approaches to theories of learning, knowledge and pedagogy have undoubtedly been informed by my past. My belief that instructors' past experiences, ideological beliefs, and theoretical adherence figure prominently in their pedagogical ministrations are undoubtedly based in part on my life reflection. All considered I have become profoundly aware of the complex emotional, intellectual, and paradigmatic boundaries within which teachers and learners seek to maintain tenacious, emotional attachments to real or imagined constructions of selves. These constructions, I am convinced, cannot be easily changed, and often respond counter to the desires of social justice educators when presented with information and knowledge thought to "cure" ignorance.

Research Limitations

While the initial intent of this investigation was to encourage more open and honest dialogue and to potentially process some psychodynamics that prevents race cognizance and empathy amongst white students; the lack of attentiveness by some involved in the study (including the lead researcher) to other racialized and minoritized students as they struggle with the pressure of being placed in the position of experts about racism or other forms of oppression and having to re-visit these traumas in the classroom, was regrettable. While I took great care to consider this compounded pressure on racialized students in the class, my expertise and knowledge were limited in this respect.

Additionally, my multiple roles as a lead researcher, facilitator of a small group, and a TA responsible in part for students' marks must have, in some measure, tempered the responses and discussions of students, especially in the small group I led. I attempted to take account of this complex dynamic by regularly holding discussions with other team members about any inconsistencies between what I witnessed in the small group and specific students' thinking as gauged through other TE conversations and course work. Additionally, by including these

dynamics in my analysis, I attempted to transparentize the impact of power dynamics upon student thinking as framed through my analysis. Nevertheless, efforts to account for the impact of my power in real-time in this regard could never be total.

Chapter 4: What Else Interferes with Teacher Candidate Thinking

This chapter begins by looking at the recent historical, social, and political context within which the site for this examination is embedded. We will look closely and critically at how anti-oppressive theory and method have been rendered at the site to illuminate how various external demands influence TC thinking regarding difficult knowledge. Suggestions for mitigating these disruptions to thinking will then be provided.

Teacher Candidates' Experience in The Urban Diversity Program

> We are left with extrapolating impressions of education—the judgments of teachers, the fear of not knowing and being wrong, the competition with others, the worry of failure, the confusion of dependency, and the symbolic equation of authority and love—from new knowledge (Britzman, 2013, p. 99).

According to most TC's the process of becoming a teacher sparked an existential crisis. Candidates identified institutions, bureaucracies, other people, and themselves as the locations of these pressures. Their awareness and perceptions of the origin, construction, and power of these forces, which we will explore in some detail, profoundly inform how they *acknowledge, process, accept or dismiss* what they were taught during the Urban Diversity Program.

Likewise, teacher candidates identified many pressures bearing down on them, but the demands that they perceived most profoundly arise from institutional, disciplinary, and ideologically based intellections of their desire. All expressed a genuine aspiration to train and mentor TC's to be effective and successful educators. TC's definition of success is also constructed by a conscientiousness arising from, in significant measure, institutional pressures and a personal desire to produce a transformation in teacher candidate thinking. Conversely, most TC's stated that their primary goal was to earn good grades for the purpose of securing employment. This chapter will examine the external factors and locations from which teacher

candidates reported interference with their thinking about the issues stridently advocated by the program. How these external forces impacted TC's thinking will also be analyzed.

Almost all of the participants in this study reported very serious disconnections and contradictions between the more theoretically-oriented approach to teaching and learning identified as the UD Program/University and their classroom placements' practical demands.[27] Additionally, candidates claimed that they were not adequately prepared for the intellectual, political and social struggles they had experienced and continue to encounter while attempting to implement anti-oppressive practices. The most significant factor contributing to their frustration was causally related to the social justice orientation of the UD program, which heightened the emotional and intellectual intensity of their experiences (Ellsworth, 1989; Goodwin, Jasper, & Poletta, 2001; Singer, 2003). Their most frustrating challenges included a) the pressure to follow confusing and contradictory paradigms, b) a lack of preparation for the foreseeable social and political struggles that they would encounter in their school placements, and c) their paradoxical positions as both student and teacher, novice, and expert. As a result of these factors, TC's narratives about themselves and the program reveal not only a deep-rooted ambivalence but also point to other unsettling unconscious dynamics provoked by factors external to themselves.

The contradictions uncovered between the university and home school placements echo a common dilemma in teacher education known as the theory/practice divide (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Labaree, 2005; Ball, 2000; Russell et al., 2001; Schulz, 2005; Vick, 2006; Zeichner, 2010; Flessner, 2012; Darling-Hammond, et al.,

---

[27] These frustrations mirror earlier studies of teacher candidates in the Urban Diversity Program (See Solomon et al., 2003, 2011).

2013; Goodwin et al., 2016). The theoretical, ideals-based contemplations taught in universities

are often at odds with (what are framed as) the practical concerns of everyday classroom practice

(Dempster, 2007). Notably, Darling-Hammond (2009, p. 104) has identified this lack of

connection between campus courses and field experiences as the Achilles' Heel of teacher

education. American studies point to poorly guided field experiences (Darling-Hammond, 2006;

Tatto, 1996), which are loosely planned and modelled, while the Canadian situation is not nearly

as dire problems persist.[28] While a discontinuity between "the theoretical work which candidates

are taught and their observations of practices in schools" (Russell et al., 2001) continues to exist,

most programs have made great efforts to bridge this divide. Notwithstanding, TC frustration(s)

and dissonance concerning the theory/practice divide remain a distinct challenge. According to a

2008 report detailing Teacher Education in Canada, prepared for the International Alliance of

Leading Education Institutes:

> The practicum issues arise from a dissonance between knowledge developed in the academic
> program and candidates' experiences in the field placements. If there are not *strong efforts at*
> *building coherence and consistency in concepts* and emphasis between the university and the
> sites of practice, the theory-practice disconnect can be increased, and the development of
> research-informed practice is lessened (Gambihr et al., 2008 – italics added).

In the Canadian-based Urban Diversity Program, a pre-eminent focus on praxis and co-

operative partnerships amongst the university, communities and home schools existed and were a

part of the programs mandate. Additionally, prodigious efforts were undertaken to coordinate and

discuss the philosophical approach(es) amalgamated within the UD mission and by the personnel

(mentor teachers and principals) at the practicum placements.[29] Additionally, teacher candidates

---

[28] See, *Characterizing Initial Teacher Education in Canada* (Gambihr et al., 2008); a study prepared by the Ontario
Institute for Studies in Education for the International Alliance of Leading Educational Institutes.

[29] Interviews and meetings between the program director, course directors, school principals and mentor teachers
were held to make sure that host schools and mentor teachers were "on board" theoretically.

were situated within their communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) to ensure a thorough

understanding of their students' life-worlds. Moreover, strategically positioning teacher

candidates in this manner is meant to encourage culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings,

1994, 1995b, 2005; Irvine & Armento, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Schecter et al., 2003)

culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 1994, 2000, 2010), and culturally relevant pedagogy (Kugler

and West-Burns, 2010), while also ensuring that their teaching apprenticeships were eminently

practical and genuine.

Nevertheless, despite these efforts and the explicit support of both principals and host

classroom teachers, serious problems arose, which teacher candidates attributed to the negative

attitudes held by mentor teachers, administrators, students and parents regarding their anti-

oppressive teaching and philosophy.[30] The opinions of practicing teachers (TC's future

colleagues) and the impediments that they erected to stop UD teacher candidates from carrying

out their mandate had a considerable impact on how they began to think about the UD Program

in general, and more specifically, how they processed, resisted, or dismissed the information

within the program. To get a more detailed picture of how practicing teachers reacted towards

UD's philosophical orientation and to examine the types of obstructions they erected against

TC's, I turn to *Brave New Teachers, Doing Social Justice in Neoliberal Times* (Solomon et al.,

2011), which documented the longitudinal experiences of 1997 UD graduates.

The study revealed that not only colleagues but also principals, students and parents had

consistently erected a complex nexus of impediments and barriers that obstructed progressive

---

[30] Extensive studies of teacher candidates' perspectives on multicultural and antiracism education across Canada (Solomon & Levine-Rasky, 1996; Solomon et al., 2003, 2011) demonstrated that the conservative culture of many teachers often results in the preference for a benevolent and harmonious form of multiculturalism. "Awareness of antiracism is frequently presumed to be unproductive for students, and they (teachers) advise that it not be introduced into their consciousness" (Solomon et al., 2003, p. 37).

teachers (UD graduates) from enacting what they termed social justice work. Most often, this work was characterized by a sizable majority of their colleagues, principles, and parents as an "add on" to the core curricula and a "voluntary" undertaking, which often causes problems for children, adolescents, and teens. These minimizing remarks communicated that the anti-oppressive work that these teachers undertook in their classrooms disturbs what is qualified as "the real learning" in the classroom. Interestingly, derisory comments and oppositional actions regarding UD graduates' work were often aimed directly at these teachers. As professionals passionately committed to doing this decidedly political work, their knowledge that most educational stakeholders in the field perceived their work as unnecessary at best and counterproductive at worst often led to feelings of profound isolation and self-doubt. The intense pressure on TC's and classroom teachers to adhere to the institutional culture of their schools, in addition to the complexities and contradictions to which they must respond in institutional settings (Norquay, 1999; Gluck & Patai, 1991), continues to loom large and counter Anti-oppressive efforts to transform classroom pedagogy.

Another major finding of the (2011) research was that schools' present institutional and political culture and the structure of schooling writ large had created environments increasingly hostile to anti-oppressive teachers and their work.[31] Specifically, "the increasing bureaucratization in the school climate, reflected in increased accountability measures, has further complicated attempts to integrate a diverse and equitable approach to teaching, learning and knowledge in our schools" (Solomon et al., 2011). Granger summarizes how anti-oppressive work, such as that undertaken by UD candidates and practicing teachers, continue to represent

---

[31] While some former UD candidates were being interviewed during (2007) about their experience after becoming teachers, the UD teacher candidates of the present study were engaged in their practicum placements, making this present research study contemporaneous.

the ideals of Paulo Freire, yet the work is often muted by policies that foreground

standardization, accountability and testing:

> Freirean ideals persist, in the work of groups from grassroots organizations to faculties of education on inclusivity discourses and practices, antiracist and antihomophobic education, and, generally, pedagogies directed at social change and democracy—even in the face of varied and contrary ties among governments, industry and schooling. Nevertheless, such transformative discourses, along with those of constructivism, learner autonomy and student-centred learning, while familiar to most teachers, may be overshadowed by the regulatory language of "assessment." and "accountability" (EQAO, 2006) (Granger, 2007: p. 216).

This accountability rhetoric has become ensconced in the preoccupation with outcomes and

the increasingly prevalent high stakes EQAO examinations manifest in mandatory testing for

grades 3, 6, 9 and 10 in Ontario. As Capper and Jamison (1993) have warned, "…outcomes-

based education … fails to challenge the status quo and existing power relations in schools and

society" (p. 43). Without challenge, these power-relations continue to become increasingly

moored. As a result, any attempts to change existing pedagogical and curricular methods are

most often met with incredulity, derision, or outright hostility.[32]

In many instances, UD graduates spoke of colleagues, principals, and some parents pointing to

their "teaching" as responsible for any increased perceptions (and incidents) of intolerance and

racism, not only in their classrooms but also at their respective schools.[33] Consequently, many

teachers described how "equity" teachers would "take the fall" if any race-related incidents arose

at the school, effectively blaming or "scapegoating" anti-oppressive educators as the source of

---

[32] The pressures for standardized instruction and achieving outcomes (at the expense of deep learning) have led to a reinforcement of status quo instructional practices, increasing the belief amongst teachers and administrators that anything interfering with what is deemed important (read - subject knowledge), which contributes to testing success is anathema to good teaching and learning.

[33] When teachers believe that "race consciousness" is an idea placed in students' minds by progressive teachers, it is not surprising that they blame these teachers for any occurrence that can be identified as race-based in some measure.

racial incidents, rather than looking to how and why historic, political and systemic racism continues to thrive in their respective school(s). Generally, this 2011 study found that most colleagues (including principals) within dozens of schools across the city of Toronto still ascribed to the belief (despite clear board policy)[34] that anti-oppressive teaching not only seriously challenges teachers, students, parents, and policymakers but is threatening and counterproductive. In considering these numerous systemic, political, and individually oriented impediments to change and, considering the very real hostility felt by these UD graduates from colleagues, parents and administrators (including principals), it is not surprising that the teacher candidates in this study felt as though they were under attack.

Isolation and Loneliness

Also, in common with the present study, the 2011 investigation found that the unique circumstances of educators who attempted to implement practices that rubbed against the grain (Simon, 1992) of status quo teaching also led to profound feelings of isolation:

> Collegial support for teachers is a necessity. When teachers who are committed to anti-oppressive education first enter a school, they look for like-minded colleagues. If these colleagues cannot be found, the equity practitioner feels physical, socially and intellectually isolated. Responses to this sense of isolation differ. Some transform feelings of further marginalization into a stimulus to continue or begin new initiatives, whereas others may find it necessary to move on and find a more supportive working environment at another school. Regardless of teachers' responses to these feelings, a sense of being alone while among most colleagues persists (Solomon et al., 2011, p. 172).

The feeling of isolation, which is common amongst certified and experienced teachers doing this work, is, in the case of TC's, augmented dramatically. Consider for a moment, the tenuous in-between and relatively powerless position of TC's who are placed within these spaces of contention. Would not their natural and pragmatic desire be to please those responsible for their

---

[34] See, Ontario Ministry of Education and Training, 1993; Toronto District School Board 2008.

marks and eventual entrance into the profession? For the mentor teacher, the pressure to conform

to the curriculum and traditional pedagogy is marked by how hierarchical power circulates in the

teacher and principal's social relations. These pressures and vagaries of power impact how the

mentor teacher relates and communicates with TC's, irrespective of whatever agreements they

have made to the differential agenda of the UD Faculty. For the mentor teacher, this means that

the pressure of implementing the standardized curriculum necessarily structures the nature of the

pedagogical relationship between themselves and the TC's to ensure that the formal curriculum is

given "safe passage" to the students (Solomon & Allen, 2001, p. 228). However simultaneously,

mentor teachers are also aware of the expectation that experimentation is necessary for learning

to teach, leading to the sending of "ambivalent and contradictory messages" to TC's which, on

the one hand, allow experimentation on the part of teacher candidates. On the other hand, foster

the expectation of ultimate adherence "to the prescribed curriculum" (228), which strongly

mitigates against experimentation. Not surprisingly, the lack of direction in this area led to even

further aggravation for teacher candidates. According to Chris,

> . . . there was frustration from students and myself that we were ill prepared for the political and day to day grind, and I think a lot felt that they needed more education or insight or support with what they knew they would be confronted. That's tough!" In, the absence of figuring out how to negotiate these fraught political waters, candidates are left contemplating what they should do, especially if pleasing their mentor teachers runs counter to their practicum instructors' desires or vice versa.[35]

One wonders what the psychological implications might be for teacher candidates who learn,

during the mentorship phase of their practice, to split off in their psyche, how they must respond

---

[35] Planning for the UD program had taken account of Giroux & McLaren's (1986) influential article. *Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling.* What they describe, as recalled by Solomon & Allen (2001), is the shock to teacher candidates when they encounter "the contradictions, ambiguities, and constant struggles for dominance among competing interest groups" (p, 220).

differently to questions about teaching and learning in their placements and the university classroom.

Invariably, according to the TC's, they are left trying to figure out who has more power and control in a particular instance over their future and then modify their practices accordingly, a tough job indeed. Given this, it is not surprising that some decide to shift their thinking and practices toward more traditional perspectives.[36] As Solomon & Allen (2001) comment in an article published twenty years ago,

> For most teacher candidates, it took quite some time before they realized that they had to stick with the stated and unstated expectations and follow established teaching practices. They eventually internalized that surviving the practicum meant imitating the host teacher and adhering to the school ethos. Consequently, the teacher candidates developed a duality in the way they approached both the theoretical and practical components of the program (p. 228).

Returning to the present study of 2007/2008 TC's, half reported that their adherence to UD praxis resulted in alienation at their practice site. Indeed, those who did follow the UD practicum instructor's teaching direction (reflecting the philosophical, ideological, and theoretical vision of the program) in their placements found themselves alone and isolated amongst the staff.[37] Furthermore, while the option to change placements technically existed, the choice to do so was rarely encouraged because to seek a transfer of classrooms and change one's host teacher is fraught with great risk.[38] That is, while the option to transfer to another practicum placement

---

[36] For many, the resolution to obtain a job following graduation meant taking on the beliefs and practices of the mentor teacher even though some of these beliefs and practices may be anathema to the program's philosophical approach.

[37] While teacher candidates in other more traditional teacher education programs may also feel a sense of isolation amongst staff, the perceptions of about half the teachers in this study maintain that the major factor contributing to this isolation was other teachers' discomfort, their mentor teacher's attitude and the administrations sensibilities concerning their pedagogical approach.

[38] This very situation occurred in the lead researchers second placement. During a subsequent job interview, the best friend of the mentor teacher (whose class I had been removed from; interviewed me for a job, which I did not get.

exists, a strong case must be made for a candidate to relocate their placement. For instance, if a teacher candidate's placement is deemed untenable for serious personal or pedagogical reasons, such as conflicting teaching philosophies or a dramatic personality clash, then the changing of their placement would be considered. However, to do this – to move a teacher candidate - invariably reflects on both the host teacher and the teacher candidate; consequently, a move is seldom encouraged. How such a move, if granted, would be interpreted in the future by those considering the employment of a newly graduated teacher is pure guesswork, especially so, given that many principals communicate with each other about new teacher hires. Moreover, recognizing the long memories of slighted teachers is a political parable in teachers' college that candidates are encouraged to take to heart.

Practical and Political Realities of Teaching

   The anxiety and psychological implications of teacher candidates having to split off their thinking and feeling about what they consider to be pedagogically sound are further complicated and exacerbated by the practical and political realities of struggling with the competitive nature of the program itself, not just in terms of marks and evaluations, but also to secure employment. One such reality is the competition amongst candidates to procure a job. Competitiveness became a major issue (as it does every year) around February when the determination to get a job after graduation results in many TC's becoming far less concerned with issues of equity, diversity, and social justice and more on doing whatever is necessary to get a job. Four facilitators reported (in conversations and small group session reports) that several candidates spoke about not being prepared practically, intellectually, and psychologically for the hard choices that needed to be made, not just regarding their philosophical and political stance vis a vis teaching and learning, but how to deal with the competitiveness amongst their cohort. J.M

discusses why the EDSJ (Equity, Diversity, Social Justice) refrain in the program became beside the point at a certain point in the year.

> After a certain point, we got it!. . We have this message hammered home. By February and March, it's getting a little old, and the job situation was horrendous. The student focus was swayed from the UD focus (Chris).

As Chris's comments clarify, the lack of attention to this particular area of preparation (while certainly not unique to the UD program) led to growing frustration, which for some, contributed to their withdrawal of attention from the anti-oppressive focus of the program. Another central and externally identified factor that emerged throughout the research data, which figured prominently in how teacher candidates engaged with the program's difficult knowledge, concerned what they referred to as "black and white issues."

Black and Whiteness: Identity, Identification, and Representation

During focus groups, Isaiah, Peter, Aviva, Chris, Neil, Camilla and Riyanshi all mentioned that many readings, lectures and discussions about race consisted of an overly determined focus upon "whiteness," which resulted in "constant talk about "black and white issues" and "anti-black racism."[39] According to many, the frustration and difficulty experienced learning about and processing the concepts of whiteness and race resulted from the inconsistent and contradictory messages that they received from some TE's.[40] Unpacking how and why these concepts and dynamics were taught will help explain why candidates who supported and resisted EDSJ experienced such high levels of confusion, anxiety, and anger about their instruction.

---

[39] Of note is that these students identify as follows, black (2) white, (2), brown (1) and, North African Jewish/mixed (1). One male also identified himself as homosexual.

[40] Despite these criticisms, most candidates also had many positive things to say about the "eye-opening" (Julie) "very informative," and "extremely important" (Chris) content of UD lectures, articles, discussions and reflections.

The concept of whiteness itself, the reader will recall from Chapter 1, can be a very helpful conceptual tool in thinking about race and identity; however, it is replete with inconsistencies, contradictions, and shortcomings. Hence, the response of candidates to an overdetermined focus on whiteness should not be surprising given that the literature of the field, as well as UD course readings and discussions, often focused on increasing TC's cognizance of "whiteness," the privilege it bestows and the oppression of others it maintains. Specifically, protocols such as Helms' *Racial and Ethnic Identity Development Model* (1994), Carlson Learning Company's *Discovering Diversity Profile* (1996), and the *Multicultural & Antiracism Education Survey* (Solomon, 1994) were discussed in some detail, and TC's were encouraged to locate themselves on a grid indicating their incoming identity status. Additionally, they were asked to consider how identity development status influenced their choice of educational philosophy and teaching style, as well as how they understood learners and the process of learning to teach (McInryre, 1997; Robertson-Baghel, 1998; Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Solomon et al., 2011). TC's were also encouraged to remain cognizant of how their identity informs ideological and conceptual framing of students' character, abilities, and academic performance (Gay, 1977; McAllister and Irvine, 2000; Banks, 2006; Solomon et al., 2011). In practice, students were reminded during lectures, written feedback on course assignments, and practicum planning to search for any prejudicial or uninformed assumptions regarding how they framed students whose social-economic status, race, language, social classes, or cultural backgrounds are different from their own. Another aspect of the process of examining identity, which signifies another major component of the UD program, focuses on helping teacher candidates gain a deeper understanding of how the racialization process works to imbue white persons with social, political, and economic power and privilege.

While some student resistance can be attributed to what has been traditionally called white resistance, other factors, such as its nebulous construction and how it can be inconsistently deployed in anti-oppressive programs, need to be considered in greater detail. As has been previously mentioned, the failure of anti-oppressive conceptualizations of identity to recognize unconscious dynamics once again figures prominently in explaining why some students have such difficulty in learning about or believing that "whiteness" has any personal applicability.[41]

In Chapter 1 and 2, the reader will also recall that theoretical and methodological approaches gleaned from Antiracism, Multiculturalism, CRT and Whiteness Studies frame an amalgam of how whiteness is problematized. UD's pedagogy and curriculum drew directly upon this combined nexus of approaches. Accordingly, the designers of UD subscribed to the hopeful belief that if white students were made aware of how the discourse of whiteness was informed by cultural, economic, political, and psychological forces (Kincheloe, 1999) embedded within the split white subject, that they would gain insight into how whiteness has become ontologically embedded as ideology (McLaren, 1997). Consequently, this realization would contribute to TC's understanding of whiteness (and by extension race) as a complex system of beliefs and practices. If, as the theory purports, white TC's recognize that their *racial* power and privilege are accrued at the expense of others (McIntosh, 1990; Sleeter, 1993; Dei, Karumanchery & Karumanchery-Luik, 2004; Banks, 2006; Gorsky, 2009; Solomon et al., 2011) they will change their thinking and become politically active to ameliorate the oppression evidenced in social inequity built on the base of racial difference. To restate, through the presentation of what has been deemed 'appropriate knowledge' concerning the construction of white TC identity, teacher candidates

---

[41] See Chapter 5 for a more detailed deconstruction of how "whiteness" clashes with a North African Jewish student's identity.

will recognize that their identities are built upon powerfully subjective investments in whiteness.

This realization anti-oppressive theorizing and the design of UD praxis holds can lead to a

transformation of ideological positions and thus thinking and action. Ultimately, white candidates

will recognize their unearned privilege and be more likely to commit to social justice aims

(Chubbuck, 2010, p. 13).

    One obvious problem here, which was raised in the first chapter, is that social justice inspired,

anti-oppressive ideas about "whiteness" are often cobbled together from a combination of

Critical Race Theory, Whiteness Studies, Cultural Theory, as well as particular aspects of Post-

Structural and Post-Colonial theory. Consequently, how the construction(s) of "whiteness" and

"race" are discussed in the classroom can easily become essentialized and imprecise. While some

TE's are very aware of whiteness theory's nuances, others are not, or they may feel that the

theory is good as is. What occurs amongst some white TC's is confusion or dismissal if the

theory's intricacies (and apparent contradictions) are not explained. While there appears to be

some consensus about multicultural education's mission and philosophy, there is still a

"tremendous gap between theory and practice in the field" (Gay, as cited in Banks, 1993, p. 3).

One of the contributing learning dynamics which can explain why this happens can be traced to

how discussions about the imaginary and constructed nature of race are often followed (adhering

to a constructivist model)[42] by the introduction of a concept called whiteness, which almost

inevitably calls forth a white/black dichotomy. When whiteness equals power and privilege

(W=P+P) formulation is added to this binary construction, reductionist thinking will increase as

---

[42] Britzman (1998a) and others have argued that constructivism is a reductionist construct that is Eurocentric and masculinist in orientation (Michelson, 1996). Britzman also points out that by failing to account for the role of desire in learning and the impact of ambivalence, constructivism cannot accurately account for the detours to thinking provoked by the unconscious.

this dualistic formulation equates racialized social and cultural relations with a literal interpretation of race's meaning. The introduction of an identity construct that also represents a powerful social, political, and historically informed dynamic (whiteness) to teacher candidates who have previously considered themselves to be race-less is bound to create both teaching and learning difficulties (McCarthy, 2003).

Another associated problem with deploying the concept of whiteness is the very real confusion about the process of being/becoming white. Some notable theorists have argued that "European immigrants defined their whiteness according to political and class realities" (Hartman, 2004, p. 33). Others have also reasoned quite convincingly that Europeans were not white (Ignatiev, 1995) upon arriving in America (according to their definition and those of Americans) but only became white after their arrival. The process of becoming and being identified as white occurred because, at the time, America was a slaveholding republic and Europeans defined themselves against what they were not, blacks (Roediger, 1991). In time, this change in self-definition also altered how they were perceived. The fact that people view the physical markers of race differently, depending on one's geographic location also complicates adds further complication to how race is understood. For example, how race is perceived in Canada is vastly different than in South Africa, which differs from Cuba and is distinct from Brazil. These dissimilar readings of race clarify that whiteness is not always just a potential visible characteristic of identity but rather a political, social, historical and class demarcation based upon national or regional history. Additionally, race as a subject position is, in part, psychologically oriented and subject to change over time. Other works, such as *How the Irish Became White* (Ignatiev, 1995), articulate the shifting social, political, and historical problems associated with identifying white identity through colour recognition only. In addition to this

psychological process of becoming, historical studies point to the necessity of understanding the construction of Whiteness, Blackness, Indianness, Chineseness or Otherness as, not only as provisionally phylogenetic but also as politically, historically, and geopolitically contextual. If we take this past research seriously, then we must admit that there is a further psychological layer of interference (not accounted for in anti-oppressive theorizing) in TC's thinking about whiteness and racial identity in general that is not immediately accessible to logic or frames of self-reference rooted solely in the present or past.

Suppose unconscious dynamics are ignored, and the concept of "whiteness" and black/white racism is overly deployed in class as the students contend, in that case, there runs a heightened risk that what has been ignored (students unconscious and historically based attachments to racial identifications) will become accentuated through resistance, leading to further anxiety and possibly a withdrawal of attention from learning. Ostensibly, a belaboured focus on whiteness exacerbated the problems that the deployment of this tenuous construct has already initiated.[43] Moreover, the failure to recognize and take proper pedagogical account of the unconsciously embedded layering of racialization in TC's are, as the history of this field has revealed, quite substantial. Focusing on the ambivalent nature of identity constructs, coupled with the incommensurability between theoretical constructions of subjectivity and lived reality, would help a great deal in assisting students with processing this slippery and dense concept.

The theoretical black and white focus and the considerable time spent discussing "whiteness" was, at the time of the program's inception, understandable and completely appropriate, as

---

[43] I am not arguing that the concept of whiteness should not be used. Rather I strongly point out that it be used carefully and deployed thoughtfully, taking note of each class's racial and ethnic context while clarifying and discussing its ambiguous and ambivalent aspects. I also believe that the likelihood of students embracing the more performative, political, and social ramifications inherent in whiteness theory will increase if they are introduced to this concept with greater care and less pointed ethical didacticism.

Aparna Mishra-Tarc (2013) elucidates, "In the beginning years, the UD program supported mainstream dominant society teachers, mainly white and middle class, to relate and respond to students from communities radically unlike their own" (p. 375). Certainly, the focus on black and white issues was, when the program started, both logical and pragmatic, as the Urban Diversity Initiative was predicated on a major shift in government and educational policy that began in the early 1990s when issues of race, racism and the politics of race began to supplant the traditional focus on culture in Ontario. By the time of this study, however, the students' demographic makeup had started shifting dramatically and the gap between theory and lived reality had grown even wider. As Tarc aptly describes:

> Radically different are the life experiences of the current generation of student teachers entering this teacher education program today. Many candidate teachers arrive straight from urban spaces in Toronto. . . rather than the sometimes one dimensional, black-and-white portrayal of urban communities exported from the US and the UK (2013, p. 376).

Indeed, some of the teachers that Tarc describes may come from urban spaces in, or on, the periphery of Toronto, Canada - after having lived most of their lives in suburban/or urban spaces in other countries where racial demarcations and the psycho-social, historical legacies of colonialism have left differentially internalized (and shifting) understanding(s) and experiences of what it means to be black, what it means to be called black, what it feels like to be black and how one thinks that others think about one's Blackness.

Further aggravating these fundamental problems regarding identity construction and the nature of race, according to candidates, was a lack of attention in the UD program regarding alternative depictions of racial, cultural, and ethnic representation(s) in the curriculum. Specifically, the absence of realistic depictions of teacher candidates' lived experiences:

> I felt that way in the larger classroom; it was very black and white- I know that a lot of literature is about white racism - I don't feel that real diversity was recognized. My friends who were black or were not white were uncomfortable --- (Riyanshi).

In addition to the common observation that black and white issues predominated discussions, almost all of the students in this study, representing a stratified demographic of the Urban Diversity class and the candidates chosen for this investigation, made it abundantly clear that a paucity of materials regarding mixed race and more fluid, contradictory, non-synchronous and intersectional narratives of identities in formation were not sufficiently accounted for in lectures, discussions and readings.[44] As Isaiah, recalls, "I remember speaking with Cindy – she is biracial, and she had issues with this." The issue to which Isaiah us referring is that the program had yet to include adequate discussion and depictions of other experiences that fit with the present cohort's lived experiences. To account for this shortcoming, close monitoring of the class's present demographics would influence the current cohort's demographics. At the time, South Asians, Chinese and Blacks were "Combined the three largest visible minority groups in 2001 . . ." (Ontario Government, Ministry of Finance).

We can see the complexity of race-based issues at work in a conversation that unfolded initially between two students in the small group space during the school year and then reflected upon one year later in a focus group. We join the discussion as Isaiah reacts to Aviva's question as to why different black TC's in the program responded in ways that seemed to contradict how other black candidates replied when asked the same direct question about race. While her question can be understood as essentialist in that she is asking Isaiah to speak as a representative of all "blacks", (hooks, 1994) there is something very genuine in her asking. She expressed some

---

[44] Intersectional approaches consider identity as a fluid process that takes account of reproduction practices, negotiation and hybridization (Archer, 2003; Gallagher-Geurtsen, 2009), helping counteract (in some measure), or avoid (Irigaray, 2008) the cognitive tendency for new teachers learning about the processes of identity formation to oversimplify and stereotype complex racial, ethnic, social and cultural identifications. While intersectional approaches may increase intellectual tolerance for contradictions and complexity, which could help prepare the ego for incoming unconscious conflict, complex unconscious dynamics are not accounted for.

anxiety and confusion about what an appropriate way was to address someone who is black, asking, "Is it okay to call you black?" Isaiah responded thoughtfully and without judgment.

> I think it's coming from your individuality, your sensitivity depending on your experience. Let me elaborate on that. Like common folk black, Blacks come from different places like blacks in Canada, blacks from Africa and blacks from the Islands. If you are from the Islands, it's a little different. There was colonization, and there are places where people think that the whiter you are, the better you are, so there are some places where you can't call them black, but they are black people just a little lighter skinned and mixed up with certain other races, but they don't refer to themselves as black as some maybe Indian mixed with black. So when you say black . . . in those countries, the darker you are, the lower you are on the economic scale. So take Trinidad, the lighter-skinned people working in office jobs and working the higher jobs and the darker-skinned people work on the farm, work in the little markets. Even in the government. It's like the Indians vs. the blacks. I think it was even in the government. If you are black, you vote for this guy. If you are Indian, you vote for the Indian person.

Isaiah's response is complex, articulate and leaves space to negotiate how race and individual uniqueness may be constructed and expressed. In his view, the understanding of what the word black implies is framed by the combination of one's cultural-historical origins and how the socializing forces of colonialism enabled class demarcations tied to phenotype and racial hierarchies to be internalized. As a result, he implies that taking offence to be called black is a question with no easy answer and most likely no universally applicable response. At best, any retort would have to be provisionally and contextually framed. This seemingly simple exchange (in the small group) is illuminating. To answer the question, "How should I refer to your racial identity?" for some, would speak directly to the very foundations of their experience and subjectivity, whereas for others, such a question or answer may be perpetually imponderable. How the significance of the question is understood and whether there can be a universally applicable answer may remain forever beyond articulation. Nevertheless, the asking itself remains significant. Invariably I am asked this question every year by white TC's and notably by students whose family hails from almost every continent and who identify across the racial spectrum. In response, I suggest asking someone in the class who is black, perhaps a student and

a TE, for their answer; the TC's rejoinder to my response is invariably similar, responding that asking such a question will lead to being thought racist. Unfortunately, TC's who feel this way have internalized the belief that being ignorant (not knowing) how to refer to a fellow TC's race could be perceived as tantamount to racism.

Given the significant external influences upon thinking that we have discussed and how the dynamics of power and ideology shape TC's thinking, how might, TE's dampen the psychodynamic force of their seemingly eternal yearning for an ideal stabilizing image of an other's identifications be attempted? How (if possible) might we help them frame a more provisional, parenthetical, and phenomenological way of thinking about race, identity or the other, which does not emanate from the desire of the self to know the other to satisfy the self? Of course, attending to thinking patterns alone, as this dissertation has made clear, is not sufficient, so we must find an ethical way to enlist teacher candidates' desire in a manner that shifts how they process the self, other and world. The experiences of TC's and the ever-changing demographics of students in Toronto classrooms necessitates more explicit discussions of alternate ways of living and being encompassing a multiplicity of diverse, diasporic, non-synchronous, (McCarthy, 1988) and hybrid identities while simultaneously sharing with teacher candidates the importance that. Classes should be filled with objects and subjects of inquiry which will assist TC's to think in terms of intersectional analysis, liminality, third spaces (Bhabha, 1994) and performativity (Butler, 1990), rather than (only) the theoretical frameworks that are most familiar to TE's. Not surprisingly, as this study has illuminated, TC's themselves may provide more thorough perspectives and examples of how identity can be lived radically different than can ever be theorized or imagined by teacher educators. I propose that in the same spirit with which we encourage our teacher candidates to use the culturally relevant pedagogy at

their disposal, we too should allow for more open (less theoretically policed) spaces in our curriculum for the teacher candidates to help guide one another through the kaleidoscope of identity, race, culture and representation. The unanswered and perhaps unanswerable question is whether TE's (especially those in the anti-oppressive field) can tolerate not knowing or being in control of where TC's may take their classes. Again, this does not require a complete abdication of influence or opinion, rather an admission that we are not experts on everything and must learn alongside our students. Further, knowing more about teacher candidates' abilities to tolerate ambiguity, ambivalence and contradiction also figure prominently in how these curricular and pedagogical efforts at increasing our capacities to learn from the other may unfold.

A significant danger of over-representing black/white conceptualizations of race and racism is that teacher candidates begin to understand these complex constructions (which exist primarily in symbolic relation), primarily through (and as) a mutually antagonistic dichotomy. A tendency towards thinking in terms of irreconcilable differences such as us and them, black and white, subject and object, is not a manner of thinking restricted to teacher candidates; historically, this has been the preeminent way much of humanity has partitioned and understood the world, described subjectivity as well as the good/evil foundation(s) of religious morality. This is easily found in philosophy, ethics, biology, physics, computer language and politics. If we are concerned with changing teacher candidates' thinking, then we must challenge the templates upon which much of our Western thinking and learning has been built, including the embedded objective rationalism of the modernist project on the one hand and the good/evil dualistic paradigm of the Abrahamic religions on the other. Further embedding dualistic thinking risks reinforcing other forms of dichotomous perception, such as right/left, subject/object, superior/inferior, internal/external, dominant/submissive/ east/west - enlightenment and

religiously influenced tropes that tend to constrict thinking to considerations of either/or when pondering philosophical, political, and educational dilemmas. We cannot hope to assist our students in moving beyond a self/other dichotomy, nor allow them insight into how this has been grafted onto the world as a violent reflection of our psychological alienation from ourselves and others if we do not experiment with ways of thinking that ask, what is otherwise than our being and knowing.

Moreover, a continual, long-term focus on whiteness, despite the awareness that many students in today's classrooms are no longer white, are mixed raced or identify otherwise risks re-centring our social, political, psychological, and pedagogical gaze back upon whiteness as the center of epistemic and ontological reference. Doing this reinstates Orientalist, (Said, 1978) Colonial (Bhabha, 1994) and Hegemonic (Gramsci, 1971) narratives that hierarchically construct the value, worth, meaning and voices of others through a framework primarily conceived by white scholars (Roediger, 2007, pp. 74–5). I mean to point out here is that if too much time is spent focusing on and discussing white privilege and historically based anti-black racism without sufficiently acknowledging other histories, races, racisms, and cultures, then we ignore some candidates' lived realities. To clarify even further, we need to teach about antiblack racism but if we fail to expand our curricular and pedagogical repertoire beyond our frames of reference, then the possibility that TC's might exceed self-referential thinking diminishes substantially.

Another aspect of the program related to race and identity that caused consternation was the issue of representation. The UD program accentuated the importance of integrating physiognomic reflections of, and voices from, various diverse categories of student identity as configured through race, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, ablism and gender. In their essays, reflections, and coursework assignments at the university, strategic deployments of 'others' were

expected to become prominent features in teacher candidates' practicum classrooms. These expectations were made explicit and mirrored the anti-oppressive curriculum utilized in the program. We taught candidates that all students' full recognition involves the thoughtful integration of student identities in classroom materials and their (TC) pedagogical approach. Despite this ideal's constant refrain, TC's complained that the program did not practice what it preached. Subsequently, they were left once again feeling confused about what was expected of them.

One dramatic effect of encouraging TC's to seek out and integrate discourses and representative groups outside the "culture of whiteness" is that a significant number of participants in this study became much more sensitive to ensuring that others (however defined) were represented in their work/teaching and that self-reflections (deemed representative of their identities) were also evident. Habitually, many aspects of TC emergent identities and the identifications engendered by old and new relationships with ideas (objects) and people (subjects) are informed by how others have identified or judged them. Whether or not those particular identifications/representations/narratives are mirrored in the curriculum and pedagogy and how others view them, in some recognizable measure, is what they are driven to discover or confirm. This awareness is a double-edged sword, sharpened with the new awareness (for some) of the importance of recognition. On the one hand, this attentiveness alerts teacher candidates to the paucity of representative bodies, narratives, and voices of the racialized and marginalized. On the other hand, some become hyper-vigilant, searching for equally calibrated depictions of themselves and *everyone* else. They believe that equal representation translates into equitable representation. Besides the (cognitive) confusion concerning equating equity with equality (which it is not), this underlying logic alloys itself alongside a passionate desire to be recognized

or see others recognized. Candidates wish to see equity, antiracist and culturally relevant pedagogy enacted in the program's machinations, most especially in the practices of its proponents. They passionately search for recognition in the objects (and subjects of discourse) utilized within the program's educational objects, such as films, pictures, examples, and narratives. When they do not see or hear what they desire (themselves or others as they envision them), disappointment, disillusionment, anger, and disengagement can result.

If not disengagement, then a risk exists where arousal of narcissistic anger fueled by conceptual confusion and ambiguity or a sense of distrust in TE authority will arise from perceived (both real and imagined) inconsistent pedagogy. To restate, in response to how TC's perceive TE's as not having perfectly (and perhaps inequitably) modeled racial, ethnic, national, cultural, sexual, and gendered identities, candidates' intolerance for the knowledge offered concerning anti-oppressive pedagogy increases.

Many will reasonably argue that an expectation of perfection from TE's is unreasonable and not possible. Such an argument, however, misses two points. 1) The deconstruction of race, identity, and racialization is the overarching meta-method used to instill a type of critical thinking in teacher candidates and figures prominently throughout the program as a central tool to assist in candidates' transformation of thinking and practice. As such, TC's thinking on these issues and dynamics are foundational. Hence, if how and what they are taught recapitulates essentialism (in their minds), then in addition to the effects of the inherently slippery concepts with which they must already engage, students will naturally focus on the inconsistencies and contradictions that we have taught them to recognize, often interpreting the coalescence of confusion as hypocrisy born of identity politics on the part of instructors. Moreover, the splitting of TC's thinking between the theory offered in the university (representing TE's definition of

good teaching) and the collegial and bureaucratic vagaries of classroom demands (connected to what TE's claim is bad teaching) causes great confusion, increasing the likelihood of TC disengagement with difficult knowledge.

The ongoing problems of provoking identifications tied to race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexuality and so on that TC's in this study have reported are not simply attributable to an over-determined presentation of black and white issues, the rejection of anti-oppressive teaching methods by colleagues, nor the failure of teacher educators to be perfect, but with TC's ambivalent struggles as they attempt to process extremely difficult information and knowledge about themselves and others in an environment purposely and fundamentally designed to disturb them to the core.

Chapter 5: A Psychoanalytic Framing of Teacher Candidate Experience

Chapter 4 revealed a powerful nexus of pressures that teacher candidates identified as externally interfering with their thinking, learning and actions. The impact of these institutional and collegial hostilities and the contradictions, ambiguities and psychological splitting off, to which many succumbed led (for some) to undifferentiated feelings of tension, anxiety, isolation, and ambivalence. While, at times, the sources of these pressures were discursively attributed to persons, practices or institutions, ideas, and concepts, the cumulative, antipathy became cognitively, linguistically, and psycho-dynamically aimed toward the conglomerated entity referred to as "UD" or "the program." At other times, this undifferentiated aggression was focused on goals, ideas and concepts, not necessarily because some candidates disagreed with the ideological and ethical ideals that moored the program, but because their experiences in the field taught them that implementing these ideas in the classroom (given the present neo-liberal economic-political–educational reality), was fantastical and could threaten their future employability.

A closer, more psychoanalytic reading of teacher candidates' conversations, assignment reflections, questionnaires, interviews and focus groups revealed both discursive indications and unconscious signs and symptoms embedded in their responses. These entrenched affects indicate and characterize how the external interruptions (perceived contradictions, ambiguities, and oversights) disturbed TC focus on the program, sometimes shifting their thinking, feeling and practice. While these signs indicated the intrinsic, active work of the unconscious processing what the candidates identified, it was only when candidates spoke more directly about their struggles with difficult knowledge, especially concerning the self and other, that the unconscious machinations became readily apparent.

This chapter examines some intrinsic forces and dynamics (many identified by TC's) that emerged in reflections of the program and also contains an analysis of the impact which the small group space had on their ability to reflect and process difficult knowledge.[45] What comes to the fore are the unconscious attachments that teacher candidates have made to other students, teacher educators and mentor teachers who (as subjects identified with larger social and political systems) come to represent, in the minds of teacher candidates, both objects of love and persecution. Before proceeding, it is critical to recall that well documented and predictable resistance has appeared year after year in the UD program. Also, that resistance has plagued the 40-year history of multicultural, antiracist, and anti-oppressive work in educational environments. The small groups were designed to be a holding space for candidate aggression and an environment where teacher educators could put on hold their desire to immediately inculcate a particular vision of the world. By creating this environment, the researcher hoped to configure a more ethical, pedagogical approach to difficult knowledge. The aim was to help students make meaning from their resistance and perhaps help them overcome identificatory thinking that shuts out the difference in defence of a fragile subjectivity.

All respondents, including teacher educators and former teacher candidates, with one exception, noted below, stated that the small groups were introduced to provide a place where TC's would feel safe to explore and express their thinking while also feeling comfortable to expose struggles with hard to contain feelings. To begin the process of learning to become more sensitive to the often hidden and constantly shifting unconscious foundations of thinking and feeling, candidates had to learn to articulate or intuit these sensibilities as honestly and clearly as

---

[45] In psychoanalytic theory, what belongs to the self, and what belongs to the object, or the external world, are intermingled, making an untangling of directionality difficult.

possible, recalling Winnicott's construction of a holding environment (1971), a sense of belonging, mutual support and trust had to be built. Emily, in her submitted answers to the Guiding Questions for Focus Groups and Interviews (See Appendix C), recalls, "I felt that the purpose was to provide us with a smaller group in a safe place where we could connect and provide each other with support." Another teacher candidate, Julie, specifically recollects a critical incident that demonstrated how the small group space and the support provided therein worked in action.

The incident occurred both during and after a rally on January 24, 2008, held in response to the discovery of racist graffiti on the York University Black Students' Alliance (YUBSA). The graffiti read, "N-----s go back to Africa" and "all N-----s must die." Upon hearing about the rally, the UD team decided to cancel afternoon classes and encourage the entire cohort to attend what was advertised as being a rally *against racism*. Reportedly, speakers' primary focus would be the ongoing problem of racism on campus and the administration's failure to protect racialized minorities (Girard, The Toronto Star, 2008). After some obvious disorganization, a speaker approached the podium and uttered some general comments about how the university must be a safe space for minority students. After about 5 minutes, Chris recalls, "this one speaker went right off the hook," making anti-Semitic statements about Jews and Israel. After hearing these comments, the researcher looked around and recognized that many UD TC's were visibly disturbed and highly agitated. Shortly after that, most UD students left the rally to re-convene the small groups. Julie and Aviva separately recall the role they believe the small groups played in helping many candidates work through their shock and anger in response to the public, verbal attack on Jews and Judaism at the rally. Julie reflects,

> What I remember is that the Jewish people were offended by one of the protester's comment. I can't recall what he said, but deep feelings about that. Some people left the protest . . . One

of the Jewish girls was deeply offended, and Jordan and Audrey. encouraged her to write. I remember lots of sad feelings and feel that a small group was for dealing with these feelings. Part of the small group was for people to feel safe and feel it.[46]

In a separate focus group, Aviva adds she appreciated the sense of safety provided and that this was an essential aspect of the small group environment in allowing her to express her thoughts:

> There was a safety element in it for me, but when I reflect on it, I think very much that it was because of our instructor who made sure that was the understanding that you could say anything here (Facilitator's Group).

Both Aviva and Julie identified safety as an "essential" "element" in the small groups' functioning. An integral part of facilitating a safe environment required building a trusting relationship between the group members, thereby increasing the likelihood that they would share their feelings and thinking process.[47] Indeed, a foundational characteristic of the small group design was to create a "holding environment" capable of supporting candidates who would be gently encouraged to "own their emotions and question the origins of their affective orientations to knowledge" (Garrett & Segall, 2013, p. 300). Julie and Aviva's comments also point to a strong correlation between good facilitation, creating a safe environment and the ability of a group to support its members while expressing their thoughts and feelings. When asked why her group functioned so well, Emily (a member with Aviva of the small group facilitated by the researcher) stated in her written answers to questionnaire that was the basis of the focus groups and discussions held one year after graduation.

> The space where the group met was private and provided an atmosphere of safety and support; with the consistency of the members of the group and the 'comfy' atmosphere (Timbits were provided, and many people brought tea or coffee), it became a space where

---

[46] Almost every small group, with one exception, discussed what happened at the rally. Facilitators encouraged TC's to discuss and describe their thinking and feelings in response to this critical incident.

[47] During the same focus group, Julie (in concordance with all participants in this study) said that she needs to feel safe to explore her thinking and feeling in greater depth. Unfortunately, she did not feel safe in her small group. Why Julie and others in her group did not feel safe will be explained in the conclusion.

people were more likely to speak about personal issues related to the program that might not have elsewhere surfaced.

Emily's description captures some of the characteristics of a functional group and some of the positive consequences of the group's healthy functioning, including discussing topics that were unlikely to be discussed elsewhere in the program. Nevertheless, not all groups were functional or productive, and according to Camilla, the reason for this dysfunction was easily explained by the facilitator's "cold" and "robotic" demeanour, which created a sense of distrust where she felt "judged." In agreement, Riyanshi added, that this facilitator "was more of like a professor of a large classroom" who was "detached" from the students.

For the vast majority of TC's in this study, in the five remaining small groups, the less formal environment provided within the small group contributed to a level of familiarity and closeness not achieved in other forums within the program. This informality worked in part to counteract the psychological discomfort that often ensues when engaging with difficult materials. Chris comments that this type of "intimacy" could not exist in the larger group because he is generally uncomfortable speaking, preferring "real conversation" rather than posturing for the teacher. He expands,

> I felt that some aspects of the program were formal, and there was lots of pressure. In the small groups, you could express yourself, and you could say what you wanted to say on whatever topic, which was less stressful. With the bigger groups, it was like, Okay, answer the question. You have two minutes. With a small group, you could listen and take your time to respond.

Chris points to a lack of pressure (a non-competitive environment), intimacy and being given ample time to respond as central aspects of the small group that made it possible for him to express himself. He then caustically counter poses the lack of time in the large group and clarifies that giving candidates such a short period to think about complex ideas is wholly insufficient. Later, in the focus group, Chris expands and reiterates this point stressing that

candidates must be given the necessary time to think and express themselves; time, he

emphasized, is crucial in having "real conversations." Similarly, Emily explains,

> I enjoyed attending the group sessions. They were a refreshing change from the intense
> learning of the classroom. I felt listened to and liked having an opportunity to discuss my
> learning. I also liked that the groups were non-competitive. They were not a team-building
> exercise with projects and marks.

For several other candidates, the opportunity to discuss their learning in a more communal setting

was appreciated for other reasons. According to Peter, the smaller number of students, which he

likened to a "community setting," enabling an "intensified" dynamic that led him to recognize his

tendency to silence others. He mentions that this is a behaviour he would not have noticed so

much in the larger group. Previously, he had simply considered himself as just one of those

students who participates all the time. In his words,

> That's another thing you can do with the small group because it is a different dynamic. It's a
> community setting, so when you recognize your voice, which you are hearing so much, I
> think that you may recognize that you may be silencing others.

Peter's comments are corroborated by the researcher's similar observations, a course director, and

a teacher assistant in the program. Audrey a seconded faculty member, sums up how these

dynamics contribute not only to being able to speak and think and trust, but also that "those who

have no problem speaking in class have learned to listen" (Audrey, Session 7 notes). Similarly,

while Emily recognizes this tendency to speak up too much and silence others, her comments

reveal a cornucopia of underlying thoughts, fears and effects attached to her present and past

behaviour.

> It was challenging for me not to talk too much (I would sometimes sit leaning on my elbows
> with my hands over my mouth to remind myself to listen – not talk) as there were so many
> spaces where no one spoke at first. I tried (as the 'whitey') to back off and listen and not ask
> too many questions (as I didn't want to offend). Coming from my background (which I now
> realize is privileged), I am used to speaking out, answering questions, and sitting up at the
> front of the class. It was a challenge for me to step back and allow others to come forward
> to learn from what I hadn't realized in all my years of schooling that one of the reasons I

speak out so freely is my invisible backpack. I always had assumed those sitting at the back chose to be exempt from discussions and hadn't considered their perspective" (original emphasis and punctuation).

Emily's comments begin by referring to herself pejoratively as 'whitey'. Her sarcasm provides the first hint of aggression lurking in her choice of ensign. The term whitey both marks and implicates her "whiteness" in the same moment as it recognizes and communicates to the researcher how she believes that others may view her, and consequently, her white identity.[48] Shortly after that, she writes, "It was a challenge for me to really step back and allow others to come forward for me to learn from and listen." What emerges is that for Emily to become temporarily silent and attentive to what others have to say (during the small group) involved some struggle. Soon afterwards, she shares a realization about her past behaviour, partly inspired by her newfound knowledge of white privilege, her "invisible knapsack."[49] Indeed, Emily claims that "one of the reasons" she spoke out so often in the past, and why she now struggles against this impulse, is due to what she has learned in UD concerning whiteness and white privilege. She reflects, "I hadn't realized that in all my years of schooling that one of the reasons I speak out so freely is my invisible backpack," referring directly to the well-known article, "Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," by Patti McIntosh (1990). She continues to recollect the assumptions that she used to make about "those sitting at the back of the class" in high school. By connecting her present struggles and past recollections and judgments in short succession, Emily may be characterizing all the "others" of both her past and present as non-white students offset against

---

[48] This observation does not attempt to equate Emily's experience, that is, her emotional struggle, with understanding the personal and social implications of whiteness, to the experience of racialized persons whose lives are marked in a more fundamental and consequential manner.

[49] See below for a detailed explanation of the highly referenced paper "Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack" by Peggy McIntosh (1990).

her normative "whitey" presence.[50] While this equivalency (in her imagination) between the others of her past and those others in her recent present cannot be made at this point with certainty, she does nevertheless ascribe to her high school "others" the same deficit laden, Eurocentric, racist and classist attributes, which have been itemized and analyzed so often in anti-oppressive research. Referring again to students from her high school, she says, "I always had assumed those sitting at the back chose to be exempt from discussions." The clear implication here is that those at the back of the class, whom Emily has signified, we can say, as mostly non-white, are the architects of their ignorance.

At this point, a nagging question remains. How does Emily now imagine these "others," her classmates in the UD present? Does she see them in the same manners as those whom she has denigrated from her past? Or has she simply not explained (nor processed) how her thinking about "others" in the present has changed beyond the realization that she used to silence these (same, similar, or different) others, due in part to her white privilege. Stated alternately, her reflections (one year after the UD program about her time in the small groups) regarding her past thinking and behaviour make it clear that she struggles to change her perspective based on what she has learned. Nevertheless, whether her thinking has changed and what relationship there is, if any, between her thoughts and actions, remain. Is there an identifiable inter-relationship between what she is saying, what she is thinking and how she acts? Or is inconsistency not an indication of a failure to learn but rather what Britzman has described as a type of regression that occurs

---

[50] This framing of the past is from a doubly marked temporal vantage point. Present and past (the time of her writing is used to reflect on her UD reflections of her high school past – from the vantage of the writing present) meaning that her memory is re-framing her thoughts based on what she has now learned. How much of the new categories, demarcations described in her reflections accurately describe such a distant past is unknown? Whether or not she demarcated self = white = authority, and other = black= ignorant in such a tidy fashion is unknown.

due to having two incompatible ideas in mind and which "accompanies the revision of working through"? (Britzman, 2013, p. 105).

By examining what Emily has said in the quote above alongside her later remarks below, our analysis becomes sharper. Adding credence to the conclusion that her thinking has changed (despite not naming in detail who those others are) and that she is trying to change her behaviour (or perhaps both may be in the process of changing) are signs and physical symptoms of powerful *affects* evident in the first sentence describing how, "I would sometimes sit leaning on my elbows with my hands over my mouth to remind myself to listen – not talk." What Emily describes here is much more than a conscious decision to delay her speech to listen more attentively. Upon closer examination, perhaps there is something much deeper at play. There is a conscious force working to hold her back physically and a much more primal and unconscious force that is simultaneously propelling her forward. Emily provided the clue (a semiological hint) to piecing together what else is going on beneath her conscious awareness in the second sentence's parenthesis. Reduced to parenthesis only, she says, "As the whitey. I didn't want to offend". Was the offence to which she refers, one which would expose her ignorance about others' lives – an ignorance that would indicate and implicate her thinking due to an understandable lack of knowledge? Or was the offence to which Emily referred to a more nefarious character, indicating an offensive question unconsciously or consciously rooted in a type of ignorance born from racism and intolerance? Might her comment invariably indicate both and perhaps much more? Examining Emily's later description of what happened in her small group when people were offended and her thoughts on the connection between offence, hurt and learning will help characterize what forces more fully may have been propelling Emily's struggle of mind and body. Emily writes,

I do admit that it wasn't always tea and Timbits. There were times when students did feel singled out, or issues that came up caused offence, but this was an opportunity for growth. If no one had been offended, how could <u>we</u> learn what offended? If no one ever felt hurt, how could <u>we</u> learn what hurt others? I personally learned a lot about others' perspectives. I gained a much better understanding of racism and my advantages being white in the small group sessions than I did through the readings."

In the first long quote, Emily clearly stated that she did not wish to offend, given her whiteness. Now, the second written narrative's pedantic nature accentuates her declaration (after rhetorically sparring with herself) that the only way to learn about others is to learn what offends others, and the only way to learn what offends, is to offend them. Placed contiguously – she seems to be saying both; I do not want to offend others, and that offending others is the only way to learn about others. In isolation, either of these statements would not have provided enough information to identify the potentially contradictory thoughts and affects present. As I will now argue, this is because the ambivalence contained in the two seemingly oppositional statements attempts to hide not just from the researcher but also herself - what is going on in her mind. The ambivalent character of her thoughts, reflections and physical actions reveal that her past identifications (including unconscious affects and linguistic associations) continue to reverberate in the present. To our purpose, this iterates that both offending "others" and changing one's ego disposition involves an unconscious, physiological and cognitive struggle wherein pain, denial, contradiction, and repression are inescapable. By taking some time to explore this ambivalence, we can unravel several particularized identifications that propel the dynamics characterizing her struggle.

Emily also connects her sense of being identified as "whitey" with not wanting to offend others. While this may be true, there is no indication yet, that the physically passive, though discursively assertive words towards others in the group, described by Emily– as listening and not talking – contains any external aggression aimed at, or intended to, offend others to learn.

That said, by physically restraining her own body, Emily's aggression (or energy) is directed internally. Perhaps, the second quotation about having to learn from offending others, which was phrased more emphatically, is meant to demonstrate a deeper understanding of the complex issues at hand, beyond a simplistic and politically correct – passive stance of maintaining the peace at all costs? We must consider that Emily's responses were submitted in written form as she could not attend the focus groups or interviews. Her responses, however, are to the very same questions that guided the focus groups and interviews one year after graduation (See Guiding Questions for Focus Groups and Interviews, Appendix C). Consequently, Emily did not benefit from responding to other former teacher candidates' thoughts and feelings in a focus group, nor the dynamics of a face-to-face interview. However, she had more time to deliberate about her answers as she submitted them one month after meeting with the other TC's. Furthermore, given Emily's demonstrated diligence in class, we can surmise that she took the requisite time and care in crafting her answers in such a manner as to impress the researcher. Following this line of thought, we can also conclude that her words were chosen deliberately to present a sophisticated understanding of what has been taught in the UD class. If true, why the clear inconsistency and contradiction in her responses, unless unbeknownst to her or an interpreter of her discourse, reveal something other than what she consciously and unconsciously desired to conceal? Another set of comments by Emily clarifies that while she stated that discovering what offended others would help her learn about others, she nevertheless reacted to such signs of aggression and offence by others, frustration, anger, and aggression. To illustrate, in answer to the question, "Did you experience any difficulties in your small group?" She exclaimed,

> I felt frustrated at times with the two girls who stuck together in their own 'club' ready to defend themselves at any hint of racism. I wanted to be on their side and wished they hadn't been grouped together as they shut the rest of us out.

The club that she is referring to is made up of six other students whom Emily earlier identified as a group that ". . . consistently attempted to isolate themselves from the rest of us. She continued:

> In this group, there was a group of students who seemed to attempt to isolate themselves from the rest of us consistently. I wondered if this was because they have been finding others like them and behaving this way all through their lives and brought this behaviour along with them. It is survival for an ethnic group to seek out each other in the mainstream schools, but it was unfortunate that it happened in our program.

The club to which she is referring were all black students. Interestingly, despite her earlier exhortations about understanding "white privilege" and the impact of power and race, her comment about being shut out by these students and her seeming understanding of why "own group cleavage" occurs, she seems surprised that this behaviour did not suddenly disappear in the group. Furthermore, when asked, if there was any difference in how racially and culturally diverse students responded to the small groups, Emily again mentions the two girls, now inexplicably labeled as women. She exclaims, "The two women had been together all year, and when they felt threatened, reacted with anger. I wonder if they would have reacted the same way if they had not been together (H). Here again, her words seem a bit perplexing in light of what she described earlier about the necessity of learning what offended others. Now, when this offence is identified, as evidenced in the quote above, she suddenly wonders why these students, whom she earlier stated would gravitate to each other for survival, would react with anger when a perceived threat was detected. Perhaps, Emily felt that offending others or learning what offended others could be accomplished without actual offence, or Emily's hypothetical thinking could not yet stand the test of being placed in the firing line of another's hostile affect and words. Might guilt over her initially projected hostility toward the Others' in high school be coming back to attack her with renewed vigour, affectively increasing her sensitivity to the perceived hostility of the 2-black woman in the present? What does seem clear is that Emily took offence at the

black girls in the group being hyper-vigilant to signs of racism, a response that, given all that had been discussed in class, and light of her earlier comments, logic would dictate, should have been her expectation, at least on a conscious level.

Moreover, we also could easily interpret all of her writing simply as a failed attempt by Emily to maintain the 'right' discourse to please the researcher. After all, she was in the researcher's small group and would be quite knowledgeable concerning how to phrase an answer to please the researcher. She would have been attuned to giving an answer that the researcher wished to hear if she desired to please the researcher. Nevertheless, while there is truth in this insight, there is much more going on than simply pleasing the teacher or guilt, confusion, hypocrisy or self-deception, as a sociological lens might identify.

Placed in relief, the two initial, though separate statements made by Emily concerning her offending others, remain fascinating but can only really be interpreted by examining more closely how ambivalence marks her discourse. The first comment indicates that she did not wish to offend or hurt *those* teacher candidates she has constructed as raced and classed (not white or privileged). In the second comment, she identifies with those who need to "learn" and "grow" by including herself in this judgment through her use of "we": "If no one ever felt hurt, how could <u>we</u> learn what hurt others?" "We," in this sentence, can also denote (whiteness/class – they are being those perceived as other) or "we," meaning all teacher candidates. Restated, Emily says that "we" (I as white and privileged- or all teacher candidates) can learn about "other's perspectives" by finding out what hurts/offends others. When we read both comments together by placing them alongside one another, I can learn *about* others by finding out what hurts other people who are different from me, but I don't want to hurt or offend others. Therefore, I will not learn about others. Alternatively, we can all learn *about* others and grow by knowing what causes

hurt or offence to others, but even though I want to learn, I also don't "want to offend others," although I recognize that this is something that I must do to learn.

Emily struggles with what she describes as her learning about others. She writes, "I personally learned a lot about others' perspectives. I gained a much better understanding of racism and my advantages being white in the small group sessions than I did through the readings." To get to this place in her thinking, a position that marks a growing awareness that accounts for both the individual and systemic levels of oppression, she had to "really step back and allow others to come forward" so that she could "listen – not talk" to learn more about others' perspectives. Intolerance of raced others does characterize how Emily now imagines or previously imagined her white identity as normative, her past thoughts and behaviours in high school and her frustration towards the two black girls/ladies in her small group. In traditional anti-oppressive fashion, her convoluted thinking and potential guilt would likely be labelled as "dysconscious racism," but there is much more than this lurking in her responses. We can also view her present struggles as indicative of an ethical opening up to the other. The presence of intolerance, misunderstanding, contradiction, ambivalence, excuses, or linguistic gymnastics neither defines Emily's subjectivity nor indicates how she experiences the world now, in the past, nor how she will experience the external world in the future. The disjunction in her thoughts and memories act as a screen that represses those very aspects of herself that she wishes to disown or expel (Philipps, 1994). Her intellectual wrestling is a struggle over how to act, when to talk, listen, offend, or be silent. All these queries might indicate the opening of her ego towards learning from the other, as opposed to learning about the other, (Todd, 2003) despite the cognitive or linguistic absence of this distinction in her writing. We can also surmise that Emily's desire to learn, to know and to understand (from her perspective) is being interfered with by the will to

ignorance; psychoanalytically speaking, she is defending against that which she cannot bear to know, which may be, amongst other possibilities:

1. her desire to hurt the other or the recognition that she has hurt the other in the past

2. the knowledge that she had/has some racist and classist beliefs

3. a realization that she is not the ideal student that she has imagined or that she imagines that I (the teacher) wish her to be

4. an understanding that aspects of herself that she had previously projected outwards (as not belonging to herself) onto objects that she had identified as bad under Freud's self-preservative rule – do indeed belong to herself

Emily's willingness to change aspects of her thinking and to relate to others is clear, as is the fact that something powerful within her is still struggling physically, psychologically, and intellectually to be (perhaps not quite to think) otherwise. She says, "I would sometimes sit leaning on my elbows with my hands over my mouth to remind myself to listen – not talk." Emily wants to change, a fact that we can witness in her physical struggles to contain her past behavioural pattern of expressing her thinking by speaking out – deciding instead to listen. As well, in the past, she had identified "those sitting at the back" as embodying deficit tropes often associated and projected on raced and classed bodies. Because of the assumptions embedded in these prejudgments, Emily indicates that she believed these 'other' classmates had chosen not to speak in the past. However, now (in the present recollection), she struggles to allow others to talk, aware of the racism, privilege, and prejudice that informed her confidence to speak up and over others. These behaviours assessed alongside her discourse mark a change in her actions and thinking, despite her seeming to lapse into prior ways of being, evidenced in her lack of empathy and understanding concerning two black ladies' aggressive responses.

Her reflections also show that Emily's present deliberations continue to resonate with her past imaginings, even while her new sensibilities shift and re-frame the contours of her memory. Stated alternatively, I turn to Granger, who reminds us that:

> What is most important to keep in mind is that for psychoanalysis, every manifestation of "self" contains material from former manifestations, which in turn means that the nachtraglich[51] reading of an event is both recursive and reflective, because the self doing the post facto reading is informed (and formed) by the self who originally experienced the event (2007, pp. 101-103).

Examining Emily's recollections once again, we can see how her present (written narrative) is linked to her past (UD experience), which was constructed, in part, through imagined and illusive perceptions of others (which were reflected by her interpretation of previous classroom experiences). Emily's thinking can be understood by pondering how she was intellectually and emotionally invested in the 'deficit' significations associated with raced and marginalized others in a manner that reinforced her sense of self as a good student (and now a good teacher) capable (through hard work, sitting at the front of the class and answering questions) of school success. Such a conscious and unconscious sentiment is consistent with meritocratic beliefs that have been bolstered through how she has interpreted the black students in the back of the classroom as embodied representatives of racist tropes. By referencing whiteness and privilege, a conscious recognition that the 'cultural capital' (Bordieu, 1973) she has learned taught her how to use the tools in her "invisible knapsack" to succeed in school as well as constructing some of the ontological foundations of her (conscious and unconscious) identity. By admitting that she used to think that "those sitting at the back chose to be exempt from discussions," she also indicates

---

[51] Nachtraglichkeit is a characteristic of working through trauma, which has been translated as "afterwardsness" (Laplanche, 1999) or "deferred action" (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1983, p. 111) and describes how the process of repressed memory works (and when something which is seemingly forgotten) is not "completely forgotten [but is] present somehow and somewhere, and [has] merely been buried and made inaccessible to the subject" (Freud, 1937b, p. 260). What is buried later can be excavated by the work of the present self upon the past.

that she now understands that her previous thinking not only dismissed these students as un-interested in school (following common perceptions of raced/classed bodies as being intellectually deficient and lazy) but also perhaps, as the architects of their failure. Viewing others in this manner would allow Emily to exonerate herself (in the past) from any awareness of prejudice (or hate or aggression towards others). Effectively, this eliminates (or more accurately eliminated) the need to do anything to change herself or work to change others' situations. Now, however, these framings of otherness are conscious, although her unconscious apprehension of the presence of others are in a state of flux, as we can see through her contradictory (ambivalent) desires to hurt and not to hurt as well as her intolerance of others when they show aggression towards perceived racist ideas.

We could also assess her present recollections to be in a continued state of revision and repetition through a conflagration of past and present identifications that include her present desire (while writing her responses) to represent a good teacher in the eyes of the researcher. To clarify, as a UD graduate, Emily would surmise that the researcher believes good teaching should include a deep concern about racism, diversity, equity. Hence, she would comport herself (and frame her discourse) in a manner consistent with what she perceives to be the researcher's desires, which is for her to be (to perform) her identity in such a manner that it reflects how she believes the researcher imagines her as an ideal student. In such a case, deferential enunciations of her shifting understanding of self/other identity constructs could simply indicate that she has become adept at performing her identity (and expressing how she relates to and understands others) to please in divergent contexts. Regardless, we can say that ambivalence remains a factor in her thinking and responses. We can also say that her sense of ambivalence (denotatively) expressed as a type of guilt was for Emily, the starting point of a more ethical orientation towards

others and did not indicate a shutting down of her thoughts and actions regarding otherness. Her encounter with the other (and her own otherness) was "the necessary precondition for meaning and understanding" (Todd, 2003, p. 10) and produced the possibility for the type of "connections, disjunctions and ruptures" (p.10) which are necessary for her, not only to remake herself but also to make new meanings from her past encounters with others. Moreover, as Granger points out:

> The qualities of the encounter with an Other and learning from that Other may not be altogether oppositional, particularly if we consider that connections can form out of what is disjointed, that a rupture can become an opening, meaning might be made from a breakdown in meaning. In that sense, perhaps learning from another might engender learning, in the form of insight (literally, seeing in), about one's self (2007, pp. 101-103).

In sum, we can conclude that Emily's thinking has changed and more to our purpose that she can describe some of the insight that she has gained about herself and how she saw and now sees others. We can also say that for Emily, the slippery interrelationships between discourse, identity, the other, imagination and the strange untimely movements of unconscious processes all came into play in her attempts to recall her prior thinking while processing and contemplating how to reveal her present thoughts. While deliberating about what a new theory of learning and difficult knowledge might entail, Deborah Britzman describes cogently how this particular process of signification occurring as a "revision of working through" moves in between the untimeliness of the unconscious and the real world while also being caught between the very conflicts that "sustain the difficulties of their symbolization" (Britzman, 2013, p. 105). In other words, the movements of affect and thought (as psycho-dynamically deconstructed from the mediums of speech, text, or behaviour) can appear to move back and forth through linear time as non-linear unconscious processes, the agency of the super-ego and the id clash through intermittent and regressive detours that echo early infantile fantasies on the way to making new meaning.

Underlying Emily's recollections and most others' thoughts in this study are the sensibilities of fear, intimidation, and exposure. In likewise fashion, many TC's at various points in small groups, private conversations, and focus groups also mentioned similar feelings and repeatedly mentioned that feeling safe in the small groups was a prerequisite for the group's success. The explicit desire for safety voiced by all teacher candidates directly implies a perceived threat, which points to more than a fear of being judged by other TC's. For some, this menace worked to dampen their willingness, ability, and desire to explore and genuinely express their thoughts and feelings in the small group. Such an association is clarified by another former teacher candidate, Andrea, while describing her ability to respond authentically in a discussion of the Patty McIntosh article, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack" (1990). The piece outlines the many ways that unearned and taken for granted privileges are bestowed on whites and how their education and experience preclude their knowledge of how race bestows unearned rewards upon them. In her article, considered a classic in the field, McIntosh demonstrates how these historical, political and social dynamics work through personal examples. She metaphorically posits that whites carry with them "an invisible weightless backpack of special provisions, maps, codebooks, clothes, tools, and blank checks," which provides daily access to unearned remuneration (McIntosh, 1990, p. 13). Andrea's comments recall her small group experience, which immediately followed a lecture about "white" resistance given by the researcher. Before examining her comments more closely, some context here is crucial to understand *what else* in this case (in addition to all the external pressures outlined in the previous chapter) may influence Andrea's written reflections on the efficaciousness of small group processing.

During the lecture that preceded Andrea's recollection, a detailed overview was provided of

how, in the program's historical past and the literature on the subject, many white students had

become upset by the issues and ideas concerning race, whiteness, racialization and white

privilege. The researcher made a point of also describing the difficult experiences of minoritized

and racialized TC's as they "may feel retargeted" (Rozas & Miller, 2009, p. 24) by the subject

matter of the program, especially when asked to re-live disturbing aspects of their lives, feeling

obliged to share personal experiences and feelings about issues of race and racism that could

insight secondary trauma. To raise awareness of these possible emotional and intellectual

responses, the researcher transparently outlined the many ways that "white" teacher

candidates defended against knowing what they did not wish to know. This was explained as

traditionally understood as a form of white defensiveness or dysconscious racism (Roman, 1993,

1997; King, 1993). I ended this portion of the seminar with a quote from Ann Louise Keating

(1997, p. 915). In choosing the quote, I hoped to dampen the shock to teacher candidates' egos by

reinforcing some key aspects of the seminar I had just delivered. Keating's words reinforce the

importance of distinguishing between individual and collective racism and individual versus

collective responsibility.

> The point is not to encourage feelings of personal responsibility for slavery, the decimation
> of Indigenous peoples, land theft, and so on that occurred in the past. It is, rather, to enable
> students of _all colours_ more fully to comprehend how these oppressive systems that began
> in the historical past continue misshaping contemporary conditions (1997, p. 915).

After a short break, I presented an alternative explanation of resistance, which follows this

research's logic. I explained that conflicting affects could become attached to thoughts which

may be experienced as guilt, or anger or discomfort, but that this (counter to traditional

explanations) could indicate an opening up of a primordial moral orientation to the other

(Levinas, 1969; Todd, 2003). Effectively, I discussed this dissertation project's goals in some

detail and outlined how social justice-based educational research literature had explained

common resistance practices. To these past discourses, the researcher added insights (based on

my experience as a social worker as well as the work of Britzman, 1997, 1998, 2001; Freud,

1991; Felman, 1987; A. Freud, 1979; Pitt, 1998; Todd, 2003) that strong unconscious affects

become attached to words, ideas, others, and concepts, on both a conscious and unconscious

level. Subjectively, this can be experienced as strong emotions that can often become convoluted

or overwhelming before thinking clearly and carefully about the implications of the ideas that

have elicited disturbing sensibilities. The thinking that transpires is bound up with powerful

affects, and the significations to which they become attached shape the contours of thought. I

clarified that sometimes, these affects and seemingly concomitant feelings (which attach to

thoughts or ideas) work to defend against our knowing something about ourselves, others, ideas

or the world we do not want to know. Finally, I reiterated that past discussions about race and

white privilege have often resulted in an intense and passionate response from many teacher

candidates and asked that students take some additional time to process these sensibilities in

order to trace out their origins and, in so doing, hopefully, move beyond these initial deeply-

internalized cognitive and emotional responses. I described (reflecting both the literature and my

own experience) how many white teacher candidates in the past had reacted with anger, shame,

guilt, sadness, ambivalence and a sense of victimization when they learned about the violent

history of whiteness and racism. I explained that these reactions are quite normal and

understandable, given a sense of helplessness that one can feel in the face of horror, racism, and

oppression. I then stated that the goal of learning about whiteness, race and oppression was not

an exercise in blaming, but instead a method through which to study how historical processes of

identity construction have become discursively elaborated and subjectively expressed in social,

cultural, and political concerns related to teaching, learning, education and schooling. I asked all students to try and take the time to process and understand the origins of these responses and let them know that we would be doing this work with them, supporting them in a small group space.

Returning to Andrea's thoughts on the McIntosh article, she describes how the small group environment engendered closer relations with other students. In this space, as opposed to the larger classroom, she could speak, react, and respond more openly to her peers. In her words,

> I think when we talked about white privilege (for me personally) the small groups helped address this issue. This was a touchy topic and quite uncomfortable for me personally. It was less *intimidating* to deal with this article and these ideas in small groups, and I was able to speak more freely about my reactions and be more open-minded to the small number of peers in my group, as opposed to listening to opinions in the larger group setting.

Significantly, this is the first mention of a connection between a small safe space and being able to open one's mind and consider others' opinions. Andrea also links her ability to listen openly to others (without as much excessive internal/external interference and prejudgment which occurs in the larger group) with the opportunity to "speak more freely" about her reactions. This process led her to challenge her own opinions and become, in her words, more open-minded. She explains, "When discussing issues in a smaller group, I am more inclined to listen to the speaker's opinion and challenge it against my own opinions." These challenges to one's opinions are cognitive and incitements of one's ego disposition, as we are identified with (to various extents) those thoughts, ideas, and people that we have accepted (internalized and introjected) as part of our self/ego. We can say that parts of the ego/id are cathected with identifications that are attached to objects and people. The strength of the defence deployed by the ego would depend on the character and strength of the ego-object relation/cathexis, nexus 'perceived as' being threatened. Also, suppose the identifications/cathexis made by the ego/id

occurred under the self-preservative rule before the differentiation of the id into ego and super-ego. In that case, the *threat* could be perceived unconsciously as an existential *threat*.[52] One wonders, beyond (or underneath) the tropes of white talk, race evasiveness, simple guilt, the pressure to please the teacher or defence of white privilege what exactly made talking about white privilege "a sensitive issue" and "a touchy issue" which made her "quite uncomfortable." How was Andrea quieting her thinking, enabling her to listen to another actively and genuinely?

What is clear is that Andrea was not particularly resistant to white privilege ideas and was able to explore (and admit) the social, political, and historical impact of these dynamics on contemporary issues of race, racialization, racism, diversity, equity, sexuality, (dis)ability and identity. Additionally, Andrea was noticeably confident in expressing her opinions, even when her opinions differed from others, including TE's in larger groups and her small group facilitator. Moreover, she was also aware that white privilege provided her with unfair benefits (and claimed to be willing to give up some of that privilege). Given these factors, we can confidently say that Andrea does not fit the typical profile of a resistant, white preservice teacher. Nevertheless, she still experienced a strong sense of intimidation while situated in the larger UD classroom configuration, which was significantly dampened in the smaller groups. To be concise, a dynamic existed in the full classroom environment, which elicited fear in Andrea. This fear produced anxiety in her about what might occur if she genuinely expressed her unrevised thoughts and feelings about issues concerning identification and race, whereas the small group enabled her "to speak more freely about my reactions." Exploring her sense of apprehension

---

[52] Increasingly, the challenges to one's sense of identity (ego-ideal) become magnified in the UD program as the intensity of conversations (by design) increase as the year progresses.

more closely as well as Andrea's character will help to elucidate a further dynamic of

interference working to diminish many TC's ability to process difficult information.

Examining Andrea's choice of words for affective traces, in another comment reveals that she

felt a constant external (manipulative and aggressive) pressure to examine herself internally and

how she thought about *others* different from herself:

> I think the purpose was to push people to explore the views and opinions of others. I think it
> forced us to think outside ourselves and explore perspectives of people with very different
> perspectives from our own. It helped us reduce some of our biases by causing us to listen to
> the biases of others and experience an idea, concept, theory etc., from someone else's point
> of view (Andrea)

Andrea's sense of both aggression and manipulation (emanating from the program – and

attached to the teacher educators who represent the program) is clear and recalls Sharon Todd's

admonition about the wrongheadedness of trying to aggressively direct students to think how

instructors believe they should think (Todd, 2003). Andrea's discourse is punctuated by phrases

like "push people to explore," "forced us to think," and "causing us to listen," all of which point

to aggressive and even violent relations enacted, in some measure, against her will or

desire.[53] The aggression that she describes on the part of the program (and its representatives,

without calling it aggression) locates the antagonism she identifies with the program and can be

seen as an expression of her aggression and ambivalence about the program. The intimidation

Andrea expressed about communicating freely in the program and her recollections of those

feelings she identifies as originating in and from the program itself. According to Winnicott

(1984: 84), aggression itself can be an indication of fear. While Andrea's choice of words meant

to reflect how she believed she was being made to feel, was forceful, she indicates through her

---

[53] The fact that this teacher candidate is the daughter of a psychology professor may have some bearing on how she
felt about the methods used in the small group and the program in general.

choice of words that the aggression both originated and emanated from the program's demands to think in a particular way. Her words and insight reveal that both aggression and fear were affects that moved back and forth between the program and the thinking and feeling that the program provoked in Andrea's psyche.

The multiple complex valences of ambivalence that Andrea experiences are hard to pin down, although the directionality can to some extent be identified. The first location of aggression is external, in the form of a (systematically planned) provocation of Andrea's identifications, which are framed within particularly embedded (political, ideological, and performative) expectations for Andrea to respond (in her role as a student) and to learn what is both implicitly/explicitly carried in the curricular and pedagogical address of the UD program. Todd's reading of Levinas illuminates the pitfalls of such a pedagogical address, which frames an ethical response to the other as a "problem of knowledge" (Todd, 2003, p. 15). These stakes are not only unethical in terms of how we address the other, invariably as a reductive reflection of ourselves but also psychological in that we risk doing real psychic harm to our students when we undertake such methods. In an anti-oppressive classroom, these stakes are heightened as the demand to alter student subjectivity inheres within its founding theoretical principles, which are in large measure, informed by the ideological and political desires of social justice-oriented teacher educators to remake a kinder social world, ostensibly the project of social re-constructionism. A fundamental part of this project is embedded within the curriculum's design, which intentionally provokes the dislocation of self through "cognitive dissonance" to jump-start self-alteration through alienation. Such an aggressive curricular address for Todd is both violent and unethical. In practice, this type of approach is seen when TC's do not respond or change according to TE's desires (and the aims of anti-oppressive education). In response, TC's refusal to change is labelled as resistant,

willfully ignorant or dysconsciously racist. Simply put, researchers see what we want to see when we feel the knowledge that we offer (which we are passionately attached to) being rejected, or in some measure, willfully misunderstood. Furthermore, as Taylor sums up Todd's argument, "There can be no ethical relationship when I reduce an individual or group to an object of knowledge that conform to stable, predictable, instrumentalizable categories" (Taylor, 2011:12), which is precisely how anti-oppressive education is, as noted above, experienced by many students.

   The impact of what I will call aggressive pedagogical presumption is not limited to white students only but, as this study has also revealed a diverse array of students. How individual teacher candidates are pedagogically addressed (regardless of background) and how the curriculum attempts to symbolize otherness, or the other as knowable, by reducing the other to an object framed through the gaze of the self, violently reduces the endpoint of learning and the location and meaning of another's subjectivity as reducible to the self, contemplating that difference, reducing the Other to me (Todd, 2003, p. 15). In Andrea's case, she is cognitively, unconsciously, and politically sensitive to being told that she is white, or more precisely, that there is virtually no distinction between her whiteness and the whiteness of Christians or Catholics or anyone else considered Caucasian or identified as being white. To be clear, Andrea was able to understand and agree that she benefits from white privilege. However, this cognition is a contextually pragmatic and performative admission that can only ever be partial as the unconscious history of Jews as non-white continues to circulate as affect attaching itself to alternating and various thought constructs associated with identity. In Andrea's case, she has never imagined herself or her identity in the self-same category as white others who share white

privilege, despite her admission that she shares that privilege. Being a Jew, or more precisely, the being of a Jew, is different.

Taken to its logical conclusion, the case of Jewishness (and Andrea's identifications with being a Jew) provides insight into why Andrea demonstrated ambivalence to the UD program while also highlighting the conceptual of anti-oppressive approaches that do not account for unconscious dynamics and contradictory identifications which may carry ambivalent affects. Prevalent discourse in cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, and education suggest that "Jews fall into the category of White" (Langman, 2000, p. 171). This is, however, a relatively recent racial construction that presents many problems. Jews have been variously and historically categorized as representing a race, culture, ethnicity and religion. These constructions can be either helpful or more common, reductionistic, dangerous and politically expedient. Jews are, one can accurately surmise, most certainly not a race. Jews can be Black, Asian, Hispanic, White, etc. In Europe, from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth century, the colour of Jews was largely recognized, and depicted as black or non-white (Gilman, 1991, p. 173). Later, "the general consensus of the ethnological literature of the late nineteenth century was that the Jews were "black" or, at least, "swarthy" (Gilman cited in Back & Solomos, 2000, p. 230). In North America, Jews were considered Asian (Singerman, 1986) and were referred to as "primitive, tribal, Oriental" (Gilman, 1991, pp. 116-117). These constructions of Jews, coupled with other denigrating discourses and depictions of their 'ugly' physical characteristics, became well entrenched in social, historical, and political discourses. As a result, "being black, being Jewish, being diseased, and being 'ugly' came to be inexorably linked" (Gilman 1991, p. 173). The physiognomic constructions of Jews as being similar to Blacks persisted into the twentieth century, most destructively in the Nazi depictions of Jews as non-Aryans, non-white and

infectious poisoners of Aryan racial purity. For Jews, it has also been argued that social and political discourses echo self-referentially upon how they have seen themselves historically reflected in society. The discourses consequently inform and help to shape the internal relationship between Jewish racial identity and cultural memory. Jewish identity comes to unconsciously represent something other than whiteness. In Sandor Gilman's "Are Jews White?" he reflects on this conundrum and says of Jews that "they also mirror within their own sense of selves the image of their own difference" (Gilman, 2000, p. 233). Relatedly, Jonathan Boyarin, in his search for a distinct Jewish ethnography, comments "that Judaism contains the Other in its own genealogy, that is to say, its own imaginary" (1992, p. 66). The unique relationship between the Jewish unconscious and the historically racialized social imaginary means that asking a Jew to identify as white is an extremely problematic request.

While the socially constructed nature of race is clear, what is not clear is the cognitive and unconscious effects of these historical constructions upon those whom these discourses have so marked Jews as Other. Indeed, both real and imagined differences have historically characterized Jews. I think the example of Jews raises an imperative for anti-oppressive approaches, that teacher educators become more sensitive to the complexities and fluidity of identity while becoming familiar with the troubling ethical problematics of past theoretical, methodological and pedagogical practices. Looking to other theoretical frameworks, such as culturalist studies, can help gain a more nuanced understanding of how history, culture, and location shape subjectivity in general and identity in particular. Also, familiarity with psychoanalytic approaches to subjectivity can help explain how historical memory and trauma affect identification processes (Simon, 1992; Simon, Rosenberg & Eppert, 2000). The breakdown here occurs between how pedagogy imagines student identity, who they are and what they should know and how they

respond to an address (in a social space), which fails to account for the actual fragility of how

identity has been constructed historically and psychically by students (Donald, 1992, p.2 in

Ellsworth, 1997, p. 42).

Interestingly, Andrea also claims that listening to others' biases in the small group

(notwithstanding her being forced to do so) helped her think outside herself. In a very real sense

then, Andrea could not listen to others with the same attentiveness in the larger group, but when

she felt more comfortable in the small group, she was able to let her thinking shift/move outside

of herself. Naturally, these sensibilities would become accentuated in a highly charged,

competitive and emotional environment such as the UD program. Given the internal and external

pressures of TC's experience in the UD program, the question remains how did some TC's

overcome the powerful impediments to processing difficult knowledge.

Internal Processing, a Different Kind of Reflecting

While discussing her experience, Aviva recalls the type of perceptual work that she was able

to undertake in her small group:

> I remember it was more of a comfort zone. For me, anyways, where, instead of reflecting,
> we had the time to go through our thought processes and verbally express them, that's what
> I remember. Often topics would come up which were debatable topics, and it was a place to
> release that energy or put out our thoughts because, in the bigger group, not everybody could
> be heard, especially in a discussion like that, but in a small group, there was an opportunity
> for everyone to be heard. And when it comes to the big topics to be hashed out.

> I don't really know how to explain it, but the topics are so intense, and you have things going
> through your mind all at once that personally I had never thought about before. Here's an
> opportunity to talk through it to hear your voice to hear other people's opinions.

Aviva begins by differentiating between what happened in the small groups and the type of

reflecting she is used to doing in the education program. In mentioning "reflection" or

"reflecting," she is referring to what is quite possibly the most common method utilized in

teacher education programs to encourage critical thinking (Tatum, 2001). Reflection, in a

preponderance of teacher education literature, refers to a type of thinking about one's thinking, (meta-thought) the promotion of self-reflexive awareness concerning presumptive thoughts and perceptions of their roles as teachers' and the roles of their students (Banks, 1994; Tatum, 2001). In the Urban Diversity/Anti-Oppressive oriented context, these "reflections" would include considering the vast and complex issues and implications of teaching for social justice (Solomon, et al., 2011). Aviva characterizes the small group space, without any prompting from the researcher, as a place for "a different kind of reflecting." She distinguishes what she did in the small group as something which helped her to pay attention to the machinations of her thought, "to hear herself think," which came about as she describes it, by being given the opportunity to "go through our thought processes and verbally express them." Initially, she describes the experience of having "so many things" going through her mind all at once, as beyond her capacity for explanation,[54] which may be indicative of the process of symbolization. She refers to the topics in question and presumably the thoughts themselves, or how the thoughts register physiologically as phenomena, sensations or affects, as "intense."

Aviva adds that she is thankful for being given the opportunity to talk through "it." It is being used grammatically (perhaps as a form of condensation) to signify what she described as the "things going through your mind all at once"; the experience of a large number of thoughts felt to be occurring "all at once" and the experience of having to consider topics which she had personally "never thought about before." Additionally, the process, time, trust, environment, facilitation, and informality of the group helped Aviva hear her own "voice" and other people's opinions. In this instance, voice may well represent not just the sound of her voice or how her

---

[54] Her inability to explain is not necessarily from a lack of linguistic skills but more likely due to an abundance of affect and stimuli searching for attachments to a symbolic order, the previously stable signifying chain of which is being altered.

speech indicates meaning or communicates her opinion or presence, but how she is choosing to describe what she experiences as the internal processes of thought. As such, the concept of voice is standing in as a descriptive condensation, enlisted linguistically to represent her mind's sensations, which is not necessarily made up of words. As a result, her attempts to represent this phenomenon in words alone will fail or lose full coherence when compared with her more sensate experience. Moreover, Aviva describes this sensation as intense, which may indicate that she detects tension with(in) the vital movement of instinctive energy "affect" as it registers antecedent to the spoken word in search of attachment. She may also sense the movement of affect towards symbolization –experienced as something she cannot represent in words, a vast "totality of sensations and imagined experiences linked to a moment of both anxiety and desire (Haynal, 1993, p. 8).

For Aviva to listen, to hear what others were saying, she first needed to reduce the preponderance of what she perceived to be simultaneous thoughts occurring in her mind in response (from her perspective) to the new experiences and ideas coming from outside of her mind - from others in the group. The affect overloaded her processing capability and capacity. We can delineate some of these dynamics in Aviva's physicality, especially her facial expressions, which were alternatively strained, excited, elated and confused. These alterations in her visage and body language provide some clues, beyond her words, as to the affective psychological and physiological energy required of her to recall her past thoughts (as she has reframed them at the time of the focus group). As well, these exertions of energy (felt as anxiety which needed to be released) could possibly mirror aspects of her initial unconscious struggles in UD class, where she described the small group as a place "to release that energy or put out her thoughts," a description resembling the psychodynamic processes of either accepting

(introjecting) or rejecting (projecting or repressing) thoughts. The release of energy she describes further recalls Freud's hydrodynamic model of libidinal energy. The putting out of her thoughts is akin to how Anna Freud and Melanie Klein have described the mechanisms, dynamics and vicissitudes of ego defence. What is clear is that from Aviva's perspective, her thinking (or attempt to consider new thoughts) required (what felt like) a build-up of energy (*it* represented a condensation of all the above information), which needed to be released or expelled and that this process enabled her to listen more openly to others. In her words, "Here's an opportunity to talk through it to hear your voice to hear other people's opinions."

To further flesh out and elucidate the intensity of these dynamics, we turn to Neil's sentiments during a lively focus group. Neil is a veteran social activist who, in his angry and accusatory comments about the program, embodies and gives voice to these complex troubles. Neil describes his overwhelming sense of frustration by communicating how he felt about the position of futility that he described being placed in by the UD program. "You are against the Star. You are against the TDSB. You are against the parents. You can't quote Paulo Freire because they don't give a shit!" Neil's brief though angry exhortation is striking as his words indicate powerful feelings of persecution and significant aggression. Deconstructing his discourse for signs of affect, we easily uncover even stronger forms of hostility, fear, anger, confusion, and abandonment. Excavating further, we can identify ambivalent affects hidden in the discursive heart of his statements.

Neil claims that (you) indicating himself and (presumably the teacher candidates in the program) are pitted against the media, the TDSB (Toronto District School board) and the parents of our students. He goes on to intimate that 'you' (indicating himself and all teachers committed

to the UD vision) are fighting for the ideas and ideals represented by Freire[55]. The reader will recall how Paulo Freire's ideas form part of the essential theoretical groundwork and intellectually transformative aims of the Urban Diversity Program—in particular, striving for "conscientization" (Freire, 1973) through "[r]eflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1970, p. 51). The revealing of social and political contradictions (Freire, 1973, p. 35) and a commitment to work against anything that oppresses freedom of thought and action (Freire, 1973). In Neil's case, the political philosophy that gives rise to these interventionist directives have become internalized and embedded as essential ideological components of his constructed identity; the beliefs become symbolically linked with an instinctive commitment to the survival of his *being- as* an activist, social worker and a teacher in the process of becoming. The use of a profane example by Neil herald affects born of fear and aggression. He exhorts, "they don't give a shit" as it best represents the reality that he has experienced in response to his attempts to defend the Freirean ideals and actions (undergirding the UD program) to teachers and parents– ostensibly defending himself against an attack on his own internalized ideals, a long-term investment evidenced in his life as a person who takes action – an activist. What is undeniable is that Neil perceives this rejection, to a significant degree, as a dismissal of essential aspects of who he is as a person, an activist who is now a teacher with passionate intellectual, emotional, and affective investments in Freirean ideals. Adding cognitive insult to psychological injury, Neil feels particularly torn apart because the very people for whom he is fighting are often the same people he feels are fighting against him. To try and understand

---

[55] Later another teacher candidate chooses to use Freirean concepts as an example of the type of work that teachers view as impossible to do given the numerous demands of day-to-day teaching. PETER says, "I have been taking a course about critical pedagogy, and students are saying who is this Paulo guy and where is there room for critical pedagogy when you have all these things to do?"

what is going on inside of Neil, we need to examine the (location, power, and character) of the forces that Paul believes he is pitted *against*.

Neil states that he is *against* his students' parents, and he is *against* the Toronto District School Board (TDSB), the collective body that represents his colleagues and is imbued with the power to enact politically influenced policy and practices. Additionally, he is *against* the cities' most popular daily newspaper, *The Toronto Star*, which also happens to have the country's largest circulation. Furthermore, the paper is viewed by many with a social justice orientation as the only large daily paper committed to social issues. Thus, we can reasonably say that in Neil's mind, the forces arrayed against him are made up of a sizable number of individuals supported by significant social, political, and bureaucratic interlocking systems of both real and symbolic power. We can also conclude that Neil is pitted against all those who reject the issues, ideas and (objects) representative of many aspects of his subjectivity, a rather daunting gauntlet to face with the seemingly impotent symbolic power of idealistic theory.

Being *against* something/someone could mean being in opposition, in disagreement, or even at war with a particular person or idea to which a person has become symbolically attached. That is, the subject of another person's being (objectively perceived) who holds an idea in opposition to one's own becomes intuited/internalized as an objective representation of a particular ideological position. In such a case, the person becomes identified with the idea, and the variously configured and shifting attachments that one has made will be, in some measure, extended (cathected to) the person perceived as a representative of that idea. As well, if you are against someone (or an idea that they have become identified with), then they become imaginatively constructed (identified with) hostile forces arrayed against what you believe in.

Psychoanalytically speaking, if there is a sufficient amount of energy propelling the cathexis of affect with a word/idea/concept and the object/idea nexus that has become associated with a person (subject) or body of persons (TDSB/The Star) carrying the idea, alloyed with ego-libido,[56] then any attempt to threaten/challenge the idea will become perceived as a direct attack on the ego. Suppose the threat is perceived to be carried/represented by the very people that one has committed to making a better world for (and towards whom one has made psychological and professional investments). In that case, other teachers, parents, principals, and colleagues can simultaneously become representative of both friend and foe, objects of love and hate. The resulting experience echoes ambivalent affects as the desire for love and acceptance from those whom one has become identified with as a teacher can become simultaneously associated with very real feelings of threat and impending annihilation.

Neil's ego posture accentuates and directs how ambivalent affects attach to words and thoughts. The intensity and exasperated tone of his discursive responses reiterates how he actively/affectively experiences the belief that he is against everyone – because everyone is against him. In this case, while his thoughts may sound tinged with paranoia, they are instead realistic. Unfortunately, as the last chapter made clear, living within a persecutory reality is the norm for many who struggle to enact anti-oppressive practices in hostile environments. What his predicament begs us to consider is what it might mean in terms of pedagogy and practice for teacher candidates or teachers who are placed in environments where they are both antagonist and antagonistic sometimes toward the very people whom they believe that they are fighting for

---

[56] Ego libido is the phase in early development before object libido, where the ego looks to external objects. If an ambivalent position is activated or a strong enough aggression is perceived, the ego regresses to the ego-libido stage. This stage operates under the self-preservative rule, where the ego projects anything perceived as a threat. Any object perceived external will not only be discarded but trigger a sense of existential dread.

and hence should not be struggling against. Neil's physical demeanour (his frustrated and angry tone of voice) in tandem with his choice of words also made it clear that he felt engaged in a multipronged battle and that the weapon of theory (represented by Paulo Freire) was impotent when arrayed against the administrative, educational, social, institutional and political powers aligned against him.

Neil's belief that he is battling with many forces entrenched against anti-oppressive teachers, their theoretical standpoint, and their teaching is, while to some extent imaginatively constructed, also accurate and real. Informing Neil's exhortation is his past as a social worker and social justice advocate. He often mentioned these experiences in the past (both public and private spaces), and his comments and criticisms of the program must be understood in this light as well. He suggested that we (the UD program team) needed to plan more activism and mentioned that he tried to start a Paulo Freire group amongst his peers, to no avail. This information explains in part Neil's choice of using the hostile rejection of Paulo Freire's ideas to signify his frustration (in his response above), providing further evidence that conscious and unconscious attachments to ideas, connected to the self, elicit powerfully meaningful thoughts, reactions and behaviours.

Paulo Freire's ideas resonate deeply with Neil's subjectivity, his ego positioning. His angry words recreate a real earlier rejection of himself by his colleagues and the people he is deeply invested in helping. Most often, Neil disparaged the program as not having provided enough practical or pragmatic tools to be used by TC's to explain and defend anti-oppressive practices to an outside majority, whose common sense and traditional perspectives on education were often in opposition to what the Urban Diversity Program taught.

Findings

One overarching goal of anti-oppressive, antiracist, multicultural and social justice praxis in teacher education is to change the historically identified prejudicial or racist beliefs about Others

and social difference held by TC's (Zeichner & Gore, 1990; Boyle-Baise & Grant, 1992; Popkewitz, 1992; Sleeter, 1992; Banks, 1993; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; McLaren, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Kumashiro, 2000; Swartz, 2003; Brown, 2004b; Cochran-Smith et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2005, 2011; Gay, 2010; Hughes & Berry, 2012; Kumar, & Hamer 2013; Shim, 2014; Milner & Laughter, 2015; Jupp et al., 2016; Bartolome, & Macedo, 2017; Glock et al., 2019). Grounding this work are two major assumptions, the first being that social justice commitments can be forged by altering white TC subjectivity through the strategic deployment of knowledge and experiences with Others unlike themselves (Lopez, 1995; Giroux, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000; McCarthy, 2003; James, 2004; Picower, B. 2009; McManimon & Casey, 2018). Stated less academically, corrective information and encounters with Others will change/transform TC's from being prejudiced/ill-informed to becoming enlightened allies against intolerance. The second assumption encompasses a future horizon of hope embedded in the belief that is transforming TC's thinking and practice, will, through the education of their present/future students, move the social reconstructionist goals of anti-oppressive, social justice commitments forward, diminishing intolerance and racism in an ever-expanding sphere of local, regional, national, and global influence.

A major impediment to the success of antioppressive teacher education efforts continues to be framed as a result of TC's resistance. Moreover, while the depiction and analysis of white identity have become more complex (see Jupp et al., 2016), the crux of this work remains an exploration of TC resistance practices and how white teacher candidate's thinking and actions indicate an unwillingness to examine "whiteness," "race," "racism," or "privilege" (King, 1991; McIntyre, 1997; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001; Picower, 2009; McManimon & Casey, 2018). The problem of white TC resistance in its various configurations, what it means, and how to

productively engage with TC's, has haunted (Gordon, 1997) attempts to impact TC's thinking and practice, as well as how to measure the efficaciousness of these efforts (Burden, 1990; Larkin et al., 2016; Kennedy 2016). Unfortunately, examining how learners experience these attempts at changing TC subjectivity is exceedingly rare (Zeichner, 1999; Lowenstein, 2009). In response, this research has focused on exploring how TC's experience a fully integrated social reconstructionist, anti-oppressive teacher education program.

Undertaking an examination of the amalgam of theories, methods, and pedagogy that comprise contemporary anti-oppressive approaches (and the program under study) has exposed embedded ethical, ideological, and political assumptions. In practice, these methods, in tandem with indelicate and confounding deployments of "race" and "whiteness," this research concludes significantly contribute to TC resistance. Additionally, because anti-oppressive frameworks and methodological applications of theory crudely translate in face-to-face encounters, many TE's, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or class, tend to frame white teacher subjectivity (and by extension all teachers' subjectivities) through reductionist and categorical lenses, making resistance by all (not just white) TC's more likely. Moreover, by considering unconscious dynamics, specifically, socially and psychodynamically defined ambivalence (Freud, 1991; Bhabha, 1994), as an important aspect of TC's self/Other relations; this study has revealed resistance practices are tied to how race is knotted up imaginatively with identity, racialization, representation and difference, further displaced in time by memory and influenced by economic pressures in addition to contradictory professional issues of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

Moreover, attending to the ethical problematics embedded in the methodological and disciplinary aspects of how the field of anti-oppressive education has been formulated and applied in teacher education classrooms, specifically the belief that knowledge of the Other will

lead to better ethical choices (Todd, 2003, p. 8-9), has also been brought into serious question. The other work of this dissertation, designed to help answer the former question, was to animate (in the formation and analysis of discursive and non-discursive communication arising from small group processing) an alternative framework buoyed by psychoanalytic framings of subjectivity (Freud, 1961, 1991; Winnicott, 1971, 1992b) and an ethical vision of inter-subjective relationality that positions humankind's fundamental susceptibility to Others as the grounds for ethical behaviour (Levinas, 1985, Todd, 2003).

This study has also recognized multiple trajectories of pressure, some external (sociologically based), and others internal (having an unconscious origin), baring down on TC's as they pursue their teaching degrees, significantly informing the process of becoming a teacher and profoundly shaping their thinking and practice. The intentional (inevitable and often necessary) provocation of all TC's in programs such as Urban Diversity greatly intensifies these forces and undercurrents. Accordingly, this research distinguishes a significant aspect of white TC's resistance is/as an indication of the unconscious at work, requiring attention and the allotment of time and support. What emerged when careful support and processing time was provided to TC's in the small group environment is a more nuanced depiction and understanding of TC subjectivity (underlying and beyond whiteness). Additionally, resistance to anti-oppressive efforts may also be a reaction to the pedagogical implementation of TE's preferred frameworks, which simplify TC's learning and distort how TE's view white TC subjectivity. Ultimately, the method undertaken in this study has resulted in a discernable increase in the quantity and quality of productive learning engagements with TC's and outcomes (changes in thinking) more in keeping with anti-oppressive aims.

One objective of this research study has been to provisionally surmise if TE's theoretical dispositions and actions can be understood as a feature in the intended learning, contemplating how preferred conceptual frameworks and ideological principles impact their interactions with TC's. In this regard, an examination of past, anti-oppressive educators' propensity to maintain paradigmatic adherence to certain theoretical aspects of and methodological approaches to anti-oppressive education has revealed many assumptions and repercussions pertaining to learning dynamics, subjectivity, and knowledge acquisition. Indeed, those TE's in this study who maintained deferential adherence to traditional sociological, structure/base models, and cognitive-behavioural or developmental psychology as the paradigms through which to understand and interpret TC's thinking, interactions and practice, had the most difficulty facilitating their small groups (for more detail see below). Faithfulness to a specific framework is common (not only in education but in most disciplines) as one's academic identity can become bound up with the preparation they have had and the work they have done and continue to do. This process closely reflects Thomas Kuhn's thinking about how paradigms, training and identity coalesce in forming a scientist. According to Kuhn, "in learning a paradigm, the scientist acquires theory, methods, and standards together, usually in an inextricable fashion" (Kuhn, 1962: 109).

What I aim to point out here is that being educated in a particular discipline such as sociology, psychoanalysis or arguably education can result in one's thinking being bound by the disciplinary training that one has received (Kuhn, 1962). Of course, this need not be the case as many academics are able to expand beyond their initial training. Kuhn further describes the course of being inducted into a discipline as a socialization process through which shared epistemological ways of knowing are reinforced through the common significations derived within the agreed-upon meaning of specific paradigmatic examples. Therefore, identity as a reflection of ontology

and epistemology become strongly linked through the socialization process of becoming inducted into a profession. If this is so, and I believe that it is for many academics (write large) then theory is not just experienced as an intellectual abstraction if ones' communal and individual identity is inextricably bound up with the meaning of one's academic work as linked to personal, social, and political commitments. As a result, a theoretical challenge to one's paradigm can become a threat to one's vocation and self. In the present context, Kuhn's work helps to understand how the challenges faced by some TE's to move beyond familiar frameworks involves dislodging deeply held beliefs about their social, professional, and individual identities, a dislocating dynamic (which this research has demonstrated) is activated when unconscious processes (like those of TC's) are strongly prompted to (recognize and accept), previously unthinkable ways of thinking and being in the world.

Returning to the effects of traditional anti-oppressive renderings of theory in pedagogical attempts to change white TC's, past research most often interprets TC resistance to engage with the negative legacy of whiteness as marking TC's failure to inculcate anti-oppressive perspectives/objectives. Furthermore, as the learning frameworks utilized in anti-oppressive classrooms continue to operate as though the relationship between teaching, learning, change, and white subjectivity is sociologically based, TC's and TE's understanding of themselves, others, and the learning process itself will most likely become sociologically framed. Correspondingly, TC's success or failure to become good teachers is linked in the minds of many TE's to their becoming enlightened, which is signified by their explicit commitment (demonstrated through the practicum, course work, and university classroom discussions) to become politically engaged fighters against oppression and inequity. Most notable in this regard is that TC's are good students, and as such, they have learned how to "perform" in the manner

best suited to procure academic success. The only reliable way to examine/understand the long-term impacts of anti-oppressive education would be follow-up studies of future TC actions, according to the TC's and those with whom they have worked, including students, colleagues, and administrators.

One effect of a temporally fixed and conceptually reductive conceptualization of TC success is that the learning frameworks which TC's believe must be embodied to become good teachers are statically shaped. Additionally, contradictory messages from the university, mentor teachers, administrators, and colleagues, again, as to what comprises good teaching, further confounds TC's, placing them in an inescapably adversarial position, having to choose between alternatively being lauded or criticized by either mentor teachers, or TE's, unaware of whom they need to please most to ensure a successful future. Some TC's internalize this binary construction of success/failure, believing that inadequate anti-oppressive efforts in their practicum placements instantiate them as racist (in the eyes of TE's) because they did not perform as prescribed by the conceptualization of the program and the stated desires of a TE. Nonetheless, the real-politic of contemporary schooling, standards-based curriculum, high stakes testing, and accountability measures may, as TC's have attested, convince them that anti-oppressive teaching is presently unrealistic and counterproductive for their careers (Solomon et al., 2011).

Race, subjectivity & identity: slipping on the dangers of essentialism

This research has also discovered that TC often intentionally withdraw their attention due to paradoxical, contradictory, convoluted or especially moralizing lectures, seminars, comments, or pronouncements about the (real and theoretically constructed) relationships between "whiteness," "race," and "racialization," Again, perfectly matching theory with practice in all contexts, is an unrealistic goal, but considering the unconscious as a feature in learning and taking seriously the considerations delineated above, can help in the coordination of pedagogical ideas and methods

among an expanded TE team. Suppose such efforts as mentioned above are not put in place. In

that case, a serious pedagogical danger lies in indiscrete explanations and invocations by

educators of "whiteness" or "white privilege" in a manner that a) obscures the individual vs.

structural dynamics of white racialization, (b) fails to identify how whiteness involves an

ongoing process that should not be contained categorically (McCarthy, 2003, pp. 127, 132), c)

reduces TC's pronouncements or actions concerning whiteness and white racialization as

indications of intolerance or racism (Lowenstein, 2009), d) does not account for the profound

effects of how the unconscious knots up self-Other relations (Todd, 2003) and, e) assumes that

teaching and learning occur in a temporally contiguous fashion (Britzman, 2013). Unfortunately,

I have too often witnessed pedagogical approaches from TE's that reflect a paternalist missionary

posture in which they seek to prematurely and impulsively "correct" the wrong thinking of TC's.

In concert with Allen & Hermann-Wilmarth, I believe that if TE's feel compelled to constantly

tell TC's where their thinking should be (in response to TC's whose discourse or behaviour miss

the mark of anti-oppressive ideals) that such pedagogy "is inadequate, ineffective, presumptuous,

and unethical" (Allen & Hermann-Wilmarth, 2004). Further, "Presuming to know and control

what students are to learn makes possible only certain kinds of changes and closes off the infinite

changes yet to be imagined" (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 76). In such instances, TE's assumptions about

white TC's might preclude what it is that teacher candidates do know or are in the process of

thinking about, forgetting that TC's are already and always embedded in, and know something

about, the inequitable social relations that anti-oppressive education seeks to intervene. Making

statements to TC's that we disagree with their ideas is different from telling them that they are

racist or immoral; encouraging further questioning and providing TC's with

counterarguments/examples or readings that challenge their thinking/experience is much more

productive. Again, when we are faced with resistance or outright intolerance in the classroom, we need to ask ourselves, not whether our TC's are right or wrong, or focus on reiterating our beliefs, but whether it is our message or the method we use to communicate that message is most likely to engender change? (Brown, 2004). Perhaps, even more disturbingly, this missionary zeal closely reflects the "banking concept" (Freire, 1970) of schooling, which presumably anti-oppressive education seeks to transcend, falling into the same methodological trap as the perennial/essentialism that it seeks to replace. In sum, premature pedagogical declarations based on assumptions about TC subjectivity treats as suspect their willingness or capacity to work within and learn from their new encounters with knowledge and Others. Some TE or theorists may be tempted to again look for a more complex understanding of white teacher subjectivity to improve our efforts to change who they are, but this only repeats the mistake of believing that fixed knowledge of another can ever match an individual's distinctiveness. As Kumashiro (2002) summarises,

> The solution is not somehow to align who the teacher thinks the students are with who they actually are. Such a match is never possible because no student is ever unitary or stable. In fact, when teachers address a fixed position and students come to assume that position, both teachers and students are merely repeating a social relationship that is not moving toward anti-oppressive change; such a "match" is a relationship stuck in repetition" p. 77-78).

What the present context under study shows us is that even within exemplary programs such as Urban Diversity, there are counterproductive programmatic or pedagogical methods that resistance practices camouflage, and that no matter how much control we wish to maintain, our efforts will often be stymied by those (TC's or TE's) who believe or behave differently than we would like. What we can do to mitigate some of these difficulties is triangulate our pedagogical ministrations to TC's. We can co-ordinate and discuss what and how we will be teaching TC's about inequality and personal responsibility. In the present case we can discuss, as a team, both

the meaning of and how to invoke white privilege and its interrelationships with (racism) and (racialization) in-depth amongst TE before meeting with TC's. I am convinced that this will also help enable TC's to listen more attentively to the distinctions we wish them to make about how whiteness and race function, historically, politically, socially, systemically, and individually.

Co-constructing Knowledge with Teacher Candidates

For our pedagogy to be effective and care-full requires critical self-reflexive thinking on the part of TC's and ourselves. Considering not just the political mission of anti-oppressive education but also what precisely we are asking of our students is a great way to begin. What assumptions are we making about TC's backgrounds and lived experiences when we attribute meaning to their statements? Moreover, how might these judgments reflect the self-same negatively derived presumptions that we warn our TC's not to make about their racially and socially diverse students? Most importantly, we must ask, "What am I doing that contributes to this failure?" (Ladson-Billings, 2000). Revisiting our pedagogical assumptions concerning what is most likely to effect change over time, I am reminded of Kenneth Zeichner & Ryan Flessner's advice in Educating Teachers for Critical Education (2009),

> One of the most important ways to strengthen the impact of social justice teacher education is for teacher educators to exemplify and model the dispositions and practices that they hope their students will take up during their education for teaching (Zeichner and Flessner, 2009, p. 296).

Taking these recommendations seriously, I agree with Kumashiro (2002) who also recommends that anti-oppressive teaching requires a deep examination of how our own identities, educational experiences and ideological commitments continue to influence how we teach and interpret the meanings of what we observe in our classrooms.

> Such a process will likely require teachers to unlearn their ideas of "good" teaching. Anti-oppressive teaching involves educators constantly complicating their identities, knowledge, and practices. It is not unlike anti-oppressive learning. Just as students are likely to enter and work through crises as they learn and unlearn, so too are educators likely to enter and work

through a crisis as they learn to engage in uncomfortable ways of teaching. Both students and educators need to challenge what and how they are learning and teaching (p. 79).

Two anti-oppressive educators who have taken up such a challenge and shared their findings are Allen & Wilmarth (2004). In a brave and forward-thinking article, entitled, *Cultural Construction Zones,* they painstakingly describe how their pedagogical approach transformed after participating with TC's in small groups, journal writing exercises, undertaking the same racial, cultural and historical "interrogation" of themselves that they had assigned their TC's. Simultaneously, they reflect on their past propensity to view white TC's objectively as theoretical tropes representing racist beings, realizing that "What we were asking of students was not only to develop a new value system but to reject elements of a value system inculcated in families they loved" (223). Fascinatingly, what Allen & Wilmarth (2004) discovered in their propensity to link whiteness and race in a manner that reproduces "essentialist racism" (Frankenberg, 1993) was not just how bias impacts TE's pedagogy but that their approach reinforced TC's resistance to change. Their efforts and this research illuminate how much more anti-oppressive TE's can achieve if we work with our TC's in mutually constructing a learning space where new meaning and knowledge can take shape in unpredictable ways.

Creating this type of classroom space will require a rethinking of our theory and practice in addition to an examination of whether our methods are commensurate with our beliefs about social justice and respect for each individual. Additionally, an ongoing re-imagining of the function of antioppressive education is necessary. What I am suggesting here is that we view anti-oppressive theory/method as evolving tools to assist TE's in building and modelling more inclusive classrooms for TC's and their future students, instead of as a set disciplinary paradigm, the tenets of which cannot be challenged, modified and improved by other perspectives. Within such an environment, TE's could learn not to label each TC based upon what we think we know

about them derived from an intersectional theoretical reading of their being or measurements of their physical, cognitive or psychological ability, but rather learn from each student what their needs are, given their irreducible uniqueness. In making this statement, I am not jettisoning all the insights into learning, subjectivity, and identity that theory has provided, but rather am suggesting that we be guided by our students' understanding of their subjectivity and identity, at least as much as by theory. In such an environment, enlightened change will follow with less resistance.

Unproductive Provocation: Inciting the Unconscious

Another very confusing aspect of whiteness studies which also incites TC's unconscious, making the experience of anti-oppressive pedagogy difficult, is the dualistic nature of whiteness studies. On the one hand, it confers meaning upon the white body demarcated through geography (the West) and history (imperialism). On the other hand, its evocation in critical whiteness studies theorizes the replacement of white racialization as an objective fact with white racialization as a process of domination in social relations (Levine-Rasky, 2008: 466-467).

Hence, in the same moment that Critical Race Theory (CRT)/whiteness Studies identifies who is white and who benefits from white privilege, it requires recognizing the historic and present-day processes of white racialization, a dynamic driven by social dominance practices. Levine-Rasky suggests that this dualism can be overcome by focusing not on who is white but on how whiteness functions (467). This suggestion is helpful theoretically (as are recent studies that attempt to complicate our theoretical attempts to refine whiteness further – see Jupp et al., 2016). Nevertheless, none of these increasingly complex framings take account of the initial unconscious responses of some TC's (not just white TC's) that occur before learning about (let alone understanding) the complex dynamics of how whiteness functions. What I mean to point out here is that before (or if) TC's understand this incredibly complex and rather slippery

concept, that many will feel personally under attack because the information that we are

providing, knowledge intentionally designed to provoke their subjectivity, or in traditional

parlance create "cognitive dissonance," can be experienced unconsciously as traumatic. We may

also ask ourselves what it may mean for TE's to take such an approach to "race" from the

perspective of those who identify as "black" if we take seriously Franz Fanon's theories about

internalized colonial ambivalence, where black and white identity contains significant aspects of

one another (Fannon, 1986). More to the point, as Sharon Todd warns us,

> There is thus a kind of trauma in encountering what is outside the subject because that outside
> threatens the stability of the ego. In confronting difference, the subject brings to the scene of
> learning its history of affect, which then becomes woven into the fabric of the present (Todd,
> 2003, p. 10).

Todd's comments also remind all teachers how difficult ideas impact the unconscious and that

learning is often belated in such cases. Expecting unconscious TC struggles, our pedagogical

approach needs to include a facilitated safe space to process the cognitive and unconscious

shocks of provocative knowledge. In this way, we can help students make meaning from their

unconscious ambivalence and "provide students opportunities to process complex and

emotionally charged issues, which is a necessary component for cognitive growth and acceptance

of social justice issues (Chizhik, 2003:455). Creating a safe space does not mean that TC's

feelings will not be emotionally hurt (because this is inevitable). However, it does mean that we

will be there to help both those who hurt Others and are hurt to process any connections made

between emotions and cognition, between reacting to threat and overcoming challenges to the

ego, assisting TC's in making new meaning from the struggle.

If we are not careful, then we risk alienating the very TC's (who given time and support) could

very well become allies. We could also further trouble our subsequent attempts to have TC's

consider the historical, social, cultural, and political processes of white racialization, reducing the

likelihood of producing TC's who utilize culturally relevant pedagogy. As Allen & Hermann-Wilmarth (2004) have pointed out, "If we do not provide a safe, nonjudgmental place in which students can grow around issues of cultural privilege, how can we expect them to become culturally engaged teachers?" (p. 11).

Strikingly, anti-oppressive assumptions, including how subjectivity is framed, is not just a problem for white TC's but also for all other students as there remain open and troubling questions concerning how the overuse of whiteness theory and a concerted focus on white teachers a) recapitulates dualistic thinking and, b) reinforces a black/white binary, moving Others to the periphery of consideration, c) positions Others as experts, re-instantiating essentialism (hooks, 1994), d) continues to neglect the requirements of other raced and minoritized students in their learning to teach in culturally responsive ways (see Montecinos, 2004) and, e) fails to explore the complex social justice implications of how progressive educational efforts to ensure equitable practices has knotted together, identity constructs such as race, class, gender and sexuality with psychological, cognitive, and physical ability/disability. To illustrate, data from the TDSB has demonstrated that. . . "perceptions of who is at greatest risk of being identified as disabled has a notable relationship to racialized, classed, and gendered identities" (Brown & Parekh, 2015, p. 6).[57] Indeed, illuminating the impact of these efforts upon students' success as well as how they may both create and instantiate discrimination remains undertheorized.

Too often, I have also witnessed an assumption that racialized and minoritized TC's are already "woke" and that their practices are commensurate with the social justice imperative as a kind of socio-biology effect. Frequently, these suppositions about raced TC's are far from accurate, and these individuals have complex subjective investments arising from their histories

---

[57] Also see The Toronto Connection: Poverty, Perceived Ability, and Access to Education Equity (2011).

and experiences, which lead them to resist aspects of anti-oppressive praxis as well. In tandem, many non-white students in the present study, Asian and East Indian TC's, felt angered and ignored by the preponderance of focus on a black/white binary, leading some to question the authenticity of anti-oppressive perspectives or to withdraw their focus in class when such issues were discussed, and they felt forgotten. Considering all the discussions above can help us strategize how best to fight against anti-black racism (see below).

Small Group Facilitation

Overall, the small group aspect of this dissertation demonstrated that if a facilitator was able to provide and support a transitional space (Winnicott, 1953) where TC's felt free to explore and process their thinking and emotions in response to issues that challenged their sense of selves and Others; then, the small group was successful. Each effective group, in turn, contributed to the overall well-being of the larger classroom environment. To illustrate, while discussing the efficacy of the small groups, Galina references the racial animosity that surfaced every year around the same time, she comments, "Audrey and I noticed that this year for the first time the class never came up to that crescendo and exploded" Another TE, Galina mentioned that as a result of facilitating the small groups, "I had students come to me for all kinds of advice or to talk or to ask me questions. . . I had some great positive experiences, and I felt that the students in my group became close and really got to know each other." Regarding the emotionally supportive function of the groups, Cindi shared that while the members of her group "didn't always agree at all - they challenged each other, and you really had a feeling of great respect." While these TE narratives may appear self-serving, they comport with the reports given by TC's relative success of their respective groups.

Each small group, without exception, reported having fruitful conversations, exploring in greater depth issues brought up in seminars, lectures, the practicum, or that arose from the

curriculum. Small groups that were less cohesive (according to TC reports) were the ones that, not surprisingly, strayed from the design of the small group environment. These groups were more reserved than the others, and group members did not trust the facilitators enough to express their thinking and emotions honestly. Thus, in these two small groups, the facilitators' inability to provide an open, trusting, and exploratory environment seriously influenced their effectiveness. The shutting down of a transitional space occurred when facilitators asserted too much control over the discussion format (for example, having TC's take turns talking, rather than allowing a discussion to develop), Riyanshi in discussing her facilitator, clarifies, "she would be like okay let's go around the group (I really didn't like that). It was annoying. If I want to say something, I'll say it. I am a good listener, and I'll listen! A lot of times, I felt myself really disengage." The transitional space also broke down if, while exploring emotional ideas, the facilitators seemed "cold" or overly eager to lead students to certain outcomes or insights.

The lead investigator's small group had productive conversations about racism, classism, and whiteness (at the micro and macro level). These discussions explored "white talk," and how whiteness acts as a "hidden referent" (Juárez & Hayes, 2010), which circulates in conversations, attitudes about students, and impacts teacher behaviour. Also, how Whiteness, Blackness, and identity positions, in general, are both constructed, though ontologically experienced as real. The group also had civil but lively discussions about how culture is often collapsed into race and ethnicity (Davis, 2001) and shared divergent experiences of colonialism. Additionally, the group discussed how Blackness, Whiteness, Chineseness, Africaness, First Nationess can be lived alternatively. As Deandre pointed out, "We can ask pointed questions about terminology about culture or race - the smaller group offers opportunity." Beyond prejudice reduction or cultural awareness approaches, the reproduction of racism (Milner, 2003; Vaught, 2008) was discussed at

both the personal and systemic levels. Finally, I would be remiss if I did not mention that a longer and more intensive training period for facilitators would have been immensely helpful in allowing them to build more cohesive and open small group dynamics. While limited time to train TE's was an issue when consecutive teacher education programs were a year in duration, the extension of teacher education programs to two years in Ontario should allow for prolonged preparation for small group facilitators.

All facilitators mentioned the dilemma of finding a balance between allowing students to honestly express their thoughts and feelings and not wishing to support racist or intolerant pronouncements that could retraumatize TC's. Making these judgment calls is not easy and proper facilitation calls for specialized training as not all TE's are well-suited for this work. In thinking about suspending our political agenda's during small group processing, I would encourage all of my colleagues to consider that if we do not provide TC's the opportunity to openly explore and communicate what is in their minds (even if it is racist and insensitive), how they think/feel about *what* we are teaching them, and *who* they will be teaching, how can we genuinely hope to influence their thinking and teaching? Would it be preferable to have TC's pretend to agree with our ideas and approaches, deceptively performing as dutifully ideal students? Suppose TC behaviours and pronouncements continued to be racist and offensive. In that case, we can take whatever action is deemed appropriate to protect present TC's and future students.

Further, it seems clear that to date, what has been called "resistance," in part, illuminates the limited ability of teacher educators to control what they intend students to learn, regardless of how well planned and well-meaning the curriculum, experiences, and pedagogy. I am reminded of what Sharon Todd (2003) has pointed out regarding the illusion of control that characterizes

much of our educational efforts. She addresses all educators' especially those who intend to transform their students being in the world, that "People bring a host of idiosyncrasies and unconscious associations that enable them to resist, transform, and create symbolic attachments that pedagogy cannot predict or control (Todd, 2003, p. 16). Perhaps, it is our incapacity to accept a lack of control (that becomes incited by resistance to our efforts) that will continue to haunt our passionate endeavours to do good. As we have seen, thinking through how the unconscious of TC's interact with TE's, the content of the curriculum, and the pedagogical methods undertaken to elicit subjective change, is necessary to begin untangling the complexity contained in TC's responses to anti-oppressive teacher education's efforts to change the subject. Our attempts to decode another's unconscious, we must also admit, speak to the limits of what we can and cannot know. Nevertheless, helping TC's through the distressing process of examining self/Other relations is something we can do.

Moving Forward: Anti-black Racism and Research Applications

Recently, the endemic nature of anti-black racism, as evidenced in the spectacle of police brutality against black and brown bodies, has come to the fore of public consciousness. The undeniably disproportionate hospitalization and death rates from Covid-19, among those already suffering from poverty and racism, have laid bare the profound inequities that anti-oppressive efforts aim to alter. At this time, effective teaching about anti-black racism considering the arguments made above will be most effective if we address this issue as systemic, requiring instituting policies, laws and programs aimed to change behaviour from the top-down, however,

> In order to redress these injustices, policy cannot just espouse vague aspirations about equitable schools and an equitable society, it must grapple with racism as a historical, structural, and ideological construct and reality, accounting for inequalities and taking concrete steps to effect change (George et al., 2020, p. 172).

Additionally, anti-black racism needs to be addressed at the individual level. Doing so requires anti-oppressive approaches to change the thinking and choices that individuals make every day. As David Gillborn describes,

> Racism cannot be understood adequately by a perspective that focuses only on the separate beliefs, actions, and fears of individual social actors, but neither is racism purely a facet of a depersonalized system; racism is remarkably resilient because it is both systemic and shaped by individual agency (2018, p. 67).

While policies, programs, laws and even popular sentiments can prescribe (on pain of punishment or being ostracized) how people act, genuine thoughts/emotions remain underneath the surface. As history has repeatedly shown, racist attitudes (whether conscious or unconscious), when forced underground, fester below the surface of social awareness, arising again with renewed vigour during times of chaos and uncertainty, such as pandemics, economic downturns, mass-migrations, and environmental catastrophes often leading to wars where the humanity of Others is again invariably denied and destroyed.

To alter the present landscape where anti-black racism exists alongside newly resurgent antisemitism and anti-Asian sentiments, anti-oppressive educators must still focus on helping our TC's, understand the historic, political, social and unconscious dynamics that contribute to anti-black racism, but more importantly, give TC's the relational tools to help all of their students overcome racism, prejudice and intolerance in all forms. To make this goal possible, TE's must also be required to engage in the same work that we ask of our students because as teachers committed to antioppressive goals, fundamentally, "our challenge as teacher educators . . . has been to examine our assumptions about the value of the knowledge we offer and how we offer this knowledge" (Hopper & Sanford: 2004: 71). To answer this challenge means that we need to fearlessly examine how our own education and experiences inform our ideological commitments, and influence how we teach and interpret the meanings of what we observe in our classrooms. If

we do not meet this challenge then our methods and pedagogy will continue to experience great difficulties in responding to where students thinking is, as opposed to where we expect that it should be.

As we have seen, to buy into what we teach in anti-oppressive classrooms requires the engagement and recognition of all TC's regardless of their backgrounds, requiring us to teach about all other forms of dangerously endemic racism and discrimination such as antisemitism, islamophobia, ethnocentrism, colonialism, heterosexism, cisgenderism/transphobia and ableism. Ultimately, to awaken another's conscience requires an ongoing genuine examination of our own thoughts and feelings, remaining attentive to how our caring and informed example assists in kindling our students' inherent capacities to care for Others.

In conclusion, the method undertaken in this study has resulted in a discernable increase in the quantity and quality of productive learning engagements with TC's (including those who are white). Additionally, the outcomes (evidence of changes in thinking) of this research study are more in keeping with anti-oppressive aims than many previous attempts to alter TC thinking and commitments to social justice. The method and findings of this research, along with the framing of small group processing, can be used in a variety of other disciplines and settings, including social work practice, community-based diversity initiatives, agencies doing multi-ethnic, multicultural, or international work and corporate environments where issues of racial and social difference impact on the well-being of employees.

Final Thought

In agreement with Nkomo & Dolby (2004), I strongly believe that

We will not, paradoxically, create racism-free environments by focusing solely on eliminating racism. Instead, we must simultaneously be building and modelling new forms of human connection that will create the solidarities that hundreds of years of racism have prevented and destroyed (p. 6).

To build new forms of connection and design pedagogy more conducive to learning about selves, others and the world beyond race, subjectivity, and representation, we need to explore approaches to being and knowing that are not new per se but novel from the standpoint of traditional educational theory and the Western Canon of knowledge. We can readily find inspiration for creating praxis-based, intersubjective and intrasubjective forms of connection through approaches like Socially Engaged Buddhism (Shah, 2017) and Indigenous epistemologies such as Body Soul Rooted Pedagogy (Sosa-Provenscio et al., 2020). These perspectives view the role of education as emancipatory and share the Freirean ideals forming the foundation of much antioppressive theory. Additionally, both trouble our ways of knowing and conceiving how we fit into existence, how we care for one another and how we are inseparably connected with creation, being and the natural world. Moreover, because these approaches situate each human as a sacred and embodied aspect of the greater chain of being through which humanity is interconnected with all of existence, such approaches can help model connection that illuminate the constructed and illusory nature of the subject positions and intellectual frameworks to which we are attached. Ultimately, educators should undertake the exploration of anti-materialist paradigms alongside the present antioppressive amalgam of theory and method, not to erase past learning, but instead to continually question the limits of our understanding and search for more effective/affective approaches to pedagogy that enhances rather than detaches human connection.

References

Abram, J., & Karnac, H. (1997). *The language of Winnicott: a dictionary and guide to understanding his work*. J. Aronson.

Ahmed, S. (2007). 'You end up doing the document rather than. doing the. doing': diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation. *Ethnic & Racial Studies. 30*, 590–609.

Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 13*(3), 405-436.

Alcorn, M. (2010). "The desire not to know" as a challenge to teaching. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, 15*(4), 346-360.

Allen, J., & Hermann-Wilmarth, J. (2004). Cultural Construction Zones. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(3), 214–226

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Appel, (1995.). The Unconscious Subject of Education.

Applebaum, B. (2013). Vigilance as a Response to White Complicity. *Educational Theory*, *63*: 17-34.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Great Britain: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1993). Constructing the "other": Rightist reconstructions of common sense. In McCarthy, C., Crichlow, W. (Eds.), Race identity and representation in education (pp. 24-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M., Au, W., & Gandin, L. (2009). *The Routledge international handbook of critical education*. Routledge.

Asher, N. (2007). Made in the (Multicultural) U.S.A.: Unpacking Tensions of Race, Culture, Gender, and Sexuality in Education. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(2), 65–73.

Aveling, N. (2002). Student teachers' resistance to exploring racism: Reflections on 'doing' border pedagogy. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(2), 119–130.

Back, L., & Solomos, J. (2000). *Theories of race and racism a reader*. Routledge.

Ball, D. (2000). Bridging Practices: Intertwining Content and Pedagogy in Teaching and Learning to Teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 241–247.

Bandura, A. (1982). The assessment and predictive generality of self-percepts of efficacy. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, *13*(3), 195–199.

Banks, James, A. (1993). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. *Review of Research in Education*, *19*, 3–49.

Banks, J. A. (1994). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. (1994a). Transforming the mainstream curriculum. Educational Leadership, *51*(8), 4-8.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68(4), 296–305.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Banks, J. A. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., Darling-

Hammond, L., Duffy, H., & McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-

Hammond L., & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers should Learn and be Able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-Tal, D. (1982). Sequential development of helping behaviour: A cognitive-learning approach. *Developmental review, 2,* 101-124.

Bartolome, L. I., & Macedo, D. P. (2017). Dancing with bigotry: The poisoning of racial and ethnic identities. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & M. P. Baltodano (Eds.), The critical pedagogy reader (3rd ed., pp. 196-215). New York, NY: Routledge.

Baszile, D. T. (2009). "Deal with it we must: Education, social justice and the curriculum of hip hop culture." Equity and Excellence, v42 (1), pp. 6-19.

Behar-Horenstein, L., & Morgan, R. (1995). Narrative Research, Teaching, and Teacher Thinking: Perspectives and Possibilities. *Peabody Journal of Education, 70*(2), 139-161.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(2, Summer), 171-217.

Berlak, H. (2008). Race and the achievement gap. Retrieved June 2008, from Rethinking Schools Online: htt:/www.rethinkingschool.org/archive.

Berry, T. R. (2012). Father, daughter, schooling: Curriculum theorizing from a critical race feminist perspective. In S. Hughes & T. R. Berry (Eds.), The evolving significance of race: Living, learning, & teaching (pp. 17–21). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Berry, T. R. (2014). Internationalization, internalization, and intersectionality of identity. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 30, 4–14.

Berry, T. & Candis, M. (2013). Cultural identity and education: A critical race perspective. *Educational Foundations (Ann Arbor, Mich.), 27*(3-4), 43.64.

Berry, T., & Stovall, D. (2013). Trayvon Martin and the curriculum of tragedy: Critical race lessons for education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(4), 587–602.

Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. 1996. *Cultures in Between. Questions of Cultural Identity*. In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.), London: Sage Publications.

Bigelow, B., Christensen, L., Karp, S., Milner, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice* (Vol. 1). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Bigelow, B., Harvey, B., Karp, S., & Miller, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice* (Vol. 2). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Bion, W. (1959). Attacks on Linking. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *40*, 308.

Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.), *Knowledge, education, and cultural change* (pp. 71-84). London: Tavistock Publications.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. (1986). Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought. New York: Basic Books.

Boyarin, J. (1992). *Storm from paradise: The politics of Jewish memory.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Boyle-Baise, M. (2005). Preparing community-oriented teachers: Reflections from a multicultural service-learning project. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(5), 446-458.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Grant, C. A. (1992). Multicultural teacher education: A proposal for change. In H. C. Waxman, J. Walker de felix, J. E. Anderson, & H. Prentice Baptiste (Eds.), *Students at risk in at-risk schools* (pp. 174-193). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Boyle-Baise, L. & Sleeter, C.E. 1996. Field experiences: Planting seeds and pulling weeds. In C.A. Grant & M.L. Gomez (Eds.) Making Schooling Multicultural: Campus and Classroom. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 371-388.

Boyle-Baise, M. & Sleeter, C. E. (2000). Community-based service learning for multicultural teacher education. *Educational Foundation, 14*(2), 33–50.

Brayboy, B. M. J., Castagno, A. E, & Maughan, E. (2007). Equality and justice for all? Examining race in education scholarship. *Review of Research in Education*, *31*(1), 159–194.

Britzman, D. (1993). The ordeal of knowledge: Rethinking the possibilities of multicultural education. *The Review of Education*, *15*(2), 123–135.

Britzman, D. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory*, *45*, 151-155.

Britzman, D. (1997). The tangles of implication. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *10*(1), 31–37.

Britzman, D. (1998a). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. State University of New York Press: Albany.

Britzman, D. (1998b). Some observations on the work of learning. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing,14*(2), 53-59.

Britzman, D. (2001). *Some remarks on Freud's Civilization and its Discontents*. Class Handout.

Britzman, D. (2006). *Novel education: Psychoanalytic studies of learning and not learning.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Britzman, D. (2011). *Freud and Education*. Routledge.

Britzman, D. (2013). Between psychoanalysis and pedagogy: Scenes of rapprochement and alienation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43*(1), 95–117.

Broderick, A., & Lalvani, P. (2017). Dysconscious ableism: toward a liberatory praxis in teacher education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *21*(9), 894–905.

Brodkey, L. (1996). *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only*. University of Minnesota Press.

Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of educational psychology*, 75, 631-661.

Brown, K. (2004a). Assessing preservice leaders' beliefs, attitudes, and values regarding issues of diversity, social justice and equity: A review of existing measures. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *37*(4), 1-11.

Brown, K. (2004b). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *40*(1), 79-110.

Brown, E. L. (2004). What Precipitates Change in Cultural Diversity Awareness during a Multicultural Course: The Message or the Method? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *55*(4), 325–340.

Bruton, A. & Robles-Pina, R. A. (2009). Deficit thinking and Hispanic student achievement: scientific information resources. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century,* 15, 41-48.

Burden, P. R. (1990). Teacher development. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 311-328). New York: Macmillan.

Burns, B. A., Grande, M., & Marable, M. A. (2008). Factors influencing teacher candidates' participation in a paid field experience with urban students. *Issues in Teacher Education, 17*(2), 101-116.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity, London, Routledge.

Capella-Santana, N. (2003). Voices of teacher candidates: Positive changes in multicultural attitudes and knowledge. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(3), 182-190.

Carlson Learning Company. (1996). Discovering Diversity Profile. Minneapolis, MN.

Carr, P. R., & Klassen, T. R. (1997). Different perceptions of race in education: Racial minority and White teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *22*(1), 67–81.

Carson, T. & Johnson, I. (2000). The difficulty with difference in teacher education: Toward a pedagogy of compassion. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *46*(1), 75–83.

Carter, D. J. (2008). On spotlighting and ignoring racial group members in the classroom. In M. Pollock (Ed.), *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school* (pp. 230-234). New York: New Press.

Case, K., & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education (Beverly Hills, Calif.)*, *40*(6), 606–626.

Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life: Life histories of women teachers working for social change.* New York: Routledge.

Chizhik, E. W. (2003). Reflecting on the challenges of preparing suburban teachers for urban schools. *Education and Urban Society, 35*(4), 443-461.

Chubbuck, S. (2010). Individual and structural orientations in socially just teaching: Conceptualization, implementation, and collaborative effort. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(3), 197–2010.

Clifford, G., & Guthrie, J. (1988). *Ed school: a brief for professional education*. University of Chicago Press.

Cockrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with "diversity" and "multiculturalism" in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*(4), 351–366.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1992). Interrogating cultural diversity: Inquiry and action. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(2), 104-115.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: research, practice, and policy. In J. Banks, & C. Banks (Eds.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (*2*), (pp. 931–975) Jossey-Bass.

Coles, R. L. (1999). Race-focused service-learning courses: Issues and recommendations. *Michigan Journal of Community Service, 6*, 97-105.

Crocco, M., Munro, P., & Weiler, K. (1999). *Pedagogies of resistance: women educator activists, 1880-1960*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chubbuck, S. (2010). Individual and structural orientations in socially just teaching: Conceptualization, implementation, and collaborative effort. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(3), 197–210.

Chubbuck, S. M. & Zembylas, M. (2008). The emotional ambivalence of socially just teaching: A case study of a novice urban schoolteacher. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(2), 274–318.

Curtis, B., Livingston, D. W., & Smaller, H. (1992). *Stacking the deck: The streaming of working class kids in Ontario schools*. Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves Foundation.

Czop Assaf, L., Garza, R., & Battle, J. (2010). Multicultural teacher education: Examining the perceptions, practices and coherence in one teacher preparation program. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 115-135.

Dalal, F. (2001). Insides and Outsides: A Review of Psychoanalytic Renderings of Difference, Racism and Prejudice. *Psychoanalytic Studies 3*(1), 43-66.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Learning to teach for social justice. In L. Darling-Hammond, J. French, & S. Garcia-Lopez (Eds.), *Learning to teach for social justice* (pp. 1-7). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Powerful teacher education. Lesson from exemplary programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, S., & Wei, R. (2013). Developing and assessing beginning teacher effectiveness: the potential of performance assessments. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *25*(3), 179–204.

Davis, C. P. (2001). *The evolution of pedagogical changes in a multi- cultural context: Journey of a university professor*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

de Courcy, M. (2007). Disrupting preconceptions: Challenges to pre-service teachers' beliefs about ESL children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *28*(3), 188–203.

Dee, T. (2004). Can a teacher's race boost results? *District Administration 40*(5), 11.

Dei, G. J. S. (1996). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Dei, G. J.S. (2000) Towards an anti-racism discursive framework. In G. S. Dei & A. Calliste (Eds.), *Power, Knowledge and Anti-Racism Education* (Halifax, Fernwood Publishing), 23–40.

Dei, G. J. S., Karumanchery, L. L., & Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2004). Playing the race card: Exposing White power and privilege. New York: Peter Lang.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3): 280-298.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Delpit, L. (2008). Lessons from teachers. In W. Ayers, G. Ladson-Billings, G. Miche, & P. A. Noguera (Eds.), *City kids, city schools: More reports from the front row* (pp. 113-138). New York: New Press.

Deutsch, M. (1949). A Theory of Co-operation and Competition. *Human Relations*, *2*(2), 129–152.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dixson, A., & Rousseau, C. (2005). And we are still not saved: critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 7–27.

Duarte, V, & Reed, T. (2004). Learning to teach in urban settings. *Childhood Education, 80*(5), 245-250.

Durham District School Board. (2000). *Curriculum for Anti-Racist Education.* Durham: Durham District School Board.

Duster, T. (2001). The "morphing" properties of Whiteness. In B. B. Rasmussen, E. Klinenberg, I. J. Nexica, & M. Wray (Eds.), *The making and unmaking of Whiteness* (pp. 113–137). Durham, SC: Duke University Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297–324.

Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering: Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy (pp. 90-119). New York: Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). The double binds of whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Off white: readings on race, power and society* (pp.259-269). New York, Routledge.

Ennis, C. D., & McCauley, M. T. (2002). Creating urban classroom communities worthy of trust. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 34*(2), 149-172.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language. New York: Longman.

Fanon, F. (1986). *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto.

Farley, L. (2007) The "Shadowy Underside" of Learning History, Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, *29*(5), 423-440.

Farley, L. (2009). Radical Hope: On the Problem of Uncertainty in History Education *Curriculum Inquiry, 39* (4), 537-554.

Farley, L. (2013). Without discipleship: a psychoanalytic study of influence for education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *21*(3), 361–382.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferguson, R. F. (1998). Teachers' perceptions and expectations and the Black-White test score gap. In C. Jencks & M. Phillips (eds.), *The Black-White test score gap* (pp. 273-317). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Fernandez, A. E. (2003). Autobiography in multicultural, anti-racist education: Three case studies. *Teaching & Learning, 18*, 5-15.

Felman, S. (1987). *Jacques Lacan and the adventure of insight: Psychoanalysis in contemporary culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Felman, S. (1995). Education and Crisis or The Vicissitudes of Teaching. In C. Caruth (Ed.), *Trauma explorations in memory* (pp. 13-59). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Felman, S. (1987). Psychoanalysis and education: Teaching terminable and interminable. In S. Felman, Jacques Lacan and the adventure of insight: Psychoanalysis in contemporary culture(pp. 69-97). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Felman, S. & D. Laub. (1992). *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge.

Festinger, L. A. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Field, K. (1989). Afterword. In F. Kay, B. J. Cohler & G. Wool (Eds.), *Learning and Education: Psychoanalytic Perspectives*, (961-979). Madison, CT: International Universities Press, Inc.

Finn, & Finn, M. E. (2007). *Teacher education with an attitude: preparing teachers to educate working-class students in their collective self-interest*. State University of New York Press.

Flax, J. (2004). What is the subject? Review essay on psychoanalysis and feminism in postcolonial time. *Signs*, 905-923.

Flessner, R. (2012). Addressing the Research/Practice Divide in Teacher Education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *34*(2), 159–171.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Frankenberg, R. (2004). Growing up White: Feminism, racism and the social geography of childhood. In A. Prince & S. Silva-Wayne (Eds.), *Feminisms and womanisms: A women's studies reader* (pp. 139–165). Toronto, ON: Women's Press.

French, R. B. (1997). The Teacher as Container of Anxiety: Psychoanalysis and the Role of Teacher. *Journal of Management Education*, *21*(4), 483–495.

Freud, S. (1937). Constructions in analysis. In S. Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 23) (J. Strachey, A. Freud, A. Strachey, & A. Tyson, Trans.), (pp. 256-269). London: The Hogarth Press.

Freud, A. (1974). Four Lectures on psychoanalysis for teachers and parents. *The Writings of Anna Freud* (Vol. 1). (Original work published 1930). New York: International Universities Press.

Freud A (1930). *Psychoanalysis for teachers and parents*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1979.

Freud, S. (1961). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company.

Freud, S. (1991). *On Metapsychology*. England: Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1985). *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation*. South Hadley, Mass., Bergin & Garvey.

Friesen, J., & Friesen, V. (2002). *Aboriginal education in Canada: A plea for integration*. Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises.

Frosh, S. (2005). *Hate and the "Jewish Science": Anti-Semitism, Nazism and Psychoanalysis*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gambhir, M., Broad, K., Evans, M., & Gaskell, J. (2008). Characterizing initial teacher education in Canada: Themes and issues. Toronto, ON: OISE/University of Toronto.

Garrett, H. J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re)Considerations of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(4), 294–304.

Gay, G. (1977). Curriculum for multicultural teacher education. In F. H. Klassen & D. M.

Gay, G. (1992). The state of multicultural education in the United States. In K. Adam-Moodley (Ed.), Education in plural societies: International perspectives (pp. 47-66). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching : theory, research, and practice* . Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.

Gay, G. (2010). Acting on Beliefs in Teacher Education for Cultural Diversity. Journal of Teacher Education, *61*, 143-152.

George, Rhonda, Maier, Reina & Karen Robson. (2020). Ignoring race: a comparative analysis of education policy in British Columbia and Ontario, *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *23*(2), 159-179.

Georgis, D., and R. M. Kennedy. 2009. "Touched by Injury: Toward an Educational Theory of AntiRacist Humanism." Ethics and Education *4*(1): 19–30.

Gillborn, D. (2018). Heads I Win, Tails You Lose: Anti-Black Racism as Fluid, Relentless, Individual and Systemic. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *93*:1, 66-7

Gilman, S. (1991). *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, Chapman Hall.

Gilman, S. (2000). Are Jews White. In L Back, & J. Solomos (Eds.), *Theories of Race and Racism: A Reader* (pp. 229-237). New York: Routledge.

Gilroy, P. 1992. The end of antiracism. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *Race, Culture and Difference* (pp. 49-61). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Girard, D. (2008, January 25). York Students Rally Against Racism. The Toronto Star, GTA.

Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis. *Harvard Educational Review* 53, 3: 257-292.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. (1997) Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: towards a pedagogy and politics of Whiteness. *Harvard Education Review*, *67*, 285-320.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). *Public spaces, private lives: Democracy beyond 9/11*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Giroux, H., & MacLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(3), 213–238.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glock, Sabine & Kovacs, Carrie & Pit-ten Cate, Ineke. (2018). Teachers' attitudes towards ethnic minority students: Effects of schools' cultural diversity. British Journal of Educational Psychology.

Gluck, S.B., & Patai, D. (Eds.). (1991). Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History (1st ed.). Routledge.

Goldberg, D. T. (Ed.). (1990). Anatomy of racism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Goodlad, J. L. (1990). Better Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *72*(3), 184–194.

Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Francesca Polletta (eds.) (2001). Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goodnough, K., Falkenberg, T., & Ron MacDonald. (2016). Examining the Nature of Theory–Practice Relationships in Initial Teacher Education: A Canadian Case Study. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *39*(1), 1–28.

Gordon, A. (1997). Ghostly matters: haunting and the sociological imagination. University of Minnesota Press.

Gordon, P. (2001). Psychoanalysis and Racism: The Politics of Defeat. *Race & Class*, *42*(4), 17–34.

Gorski, P. C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism: The de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. Intercultural Education, 17(2), 163-177.

Gorski, P. (2013). *Reaching and teaching students in poverty: strategies for erasing the opportunity gap*. Teacher College Press.

Gorski, P. C., & Dalton, K. (2020). Striving for Critical Reflection in Multicultural and Social Justice Teacher Education: Introducing a Typology of Reflection Approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *71*(3), 357–368.

Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Books*. International Publishers.

Granger, C. A. (2004). *Silence in Second Language Learning: A Psychoanalytic Reading* (Vol. 6). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Granger, C. A. (2007). *Silent moments: a psychoanalytic autoethnography of learning and teaching*. Thesis (Ph.D.) York University.

Grant, C. A. (1985). Race-gender status, classroom interaction, and children's socialization in elementary school. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), *Influences in classroom interaction* (pp. 403-422). New York: MacMillan.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2007). *Doing multicultural education for achievement and equity*. New York: Routledge.

Greene, M. (1992). *The passion of pluralism: Education and the expanding community*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, San Francisco.

Greene, M. (1998). Introduction: Teaching for social justice. In W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt, & T. Quinn (Eds.), *Teaching for social justice* (pp. xxvii-xlvi). New York: New Press.

Greene, M. (1998). Moral and Political Perspectives: The Tensions of Choice. *Educational Researcher*, *27*(9), 18–20.

Greenman, N. P. & Dieckmann, J. A. (2004). Considering criticality and culture as pivotal in transformative teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education 55*(3), 240-255.

Grosland, T. (2019). Through laughter and through tears: emotional narratives to antiracist pedagogy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *22*(3), 301–318.

Guo,Y., Arthur, N., & Lund, D. (2009). Intercultural inquiry with pre-service teachers. *Intercultural Education* (London, England), *20*(6), 565-577.

Haberman, M. (1991). Can cultural awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teacher Education, 4*(1), 25–31.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1992). Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income minority students? *Midwest Educational Researcher*, *5*(2), 29-31.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1998). Teachers for multicultural schools: The power of selection. *Theory Into Practice*, *37*(2), 96–104.

Hall, S. 1980. Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance. In *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism* (pp. 305-345). Paris: UNESCO.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures* (pp. 274-291). Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Open University Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publications.

Hall, S. (1998). "*Cultural Identity and Diaspora*." In, The Third Space, edited by J. Rutherford, 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart Limited.

Hancock, S. D. (2006). White women's work, white teachers/diverse classrooms. In J. Landsman, & C. M. Lewis, *White teachers/diverse classrooms: A guide to building inclusive schools, promoting high expectations, and eliminating racism*, (pp. 93-109). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Harper. Helen. (1997). Difference and Diversity in Ontario Schooling. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *22*(2), 192-206.

Hartman, G. (1996). *The Longest Shadow: In the aftermath of the Holocaust*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haymes, S. (1995). White culture and the politics of racial difference: Implications for multiculturalism. In C. Sleeter & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Difference* (pp. 400-425). Albany: SUNY Press.

Haynal, Andre. (1993). Psychoanalysis and the Sciences: Epistemology-History. University of California Press.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 67– 80). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. Helms, J. E

Helms, J. E. (1994). The conceptualization of racial identity and other "racial" constructs. In E. Trickett, R. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 285-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Henry, F., C. Tator, W. Mattis & T. Rees. (1995). *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co.

Hogan, M. (2008). A tale of two Noras: How a Yup'ik middle schooler was differently constructed as a math learner. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 2*(2), 1-25.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2003). Teaching Community: a pedagogy of hope. Routledge.

Howard, G. R. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hughes, S., & Berry, T. (2012). *The evolving significance of race: living, learning, and teaching* . Peter Lang.

Hynds, A. (2010). Unpacking resistance to change within-school reform programmes with a social justice orientation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *13*(4), 377– 392.

Ignatieff, M. 1998. *The Warrior's Honor: Ethnic War and the Modern Conscience*. New York: Viking.

Ignatiev, N., & Garvey, J. (1996). *Race traitor.* New York: Routledge.

Ignatiev, N. (1995). How the Irish became white. Routledge.

Irigiray, Luse. (2008). Teaching. Ed. Luce Irigaray with M. Green. London: Continuum.

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.

James, C. (1995). Multicultural and Anti-Racism Education in Canada. *Race, Gender & Class, 2*(3), 31-48.

James, C. E. (1999). Race, Ethnicity and Cultural Identity. In C. James (Ed.), *Seeing ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture* (2ᵈ Ed.) (pp. 39-63). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

James, C. E. (2004). Urban education: An approach to community-based education. *Intercultural Education*, *15*(1), 15-32.

Jay, G. S. (1987). The subject of pedagogy: Lessons in psychoanalysis and politics. *Psychoanalysis and pedagogy II, 49*(7), 785-800.

Jensen, B., Whiting, E., & Chapman, S. (2018). Measuring the Multicultural Dispositions of Preservice Teachers. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, *36*(2), 120-135.

Jordan, M. L. J. (1995). Reflections on the challenges, possibilities, and perplexities of preparing preservice teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(5), 369-374.

Juárez, B. G., & Hayes, C. (2010). Social Justice is Not Spoken Here: Considering the Nexus of Knowledge, Power and the Education of Future Teachers in the United States. *Power and Education*, *2*(3), 233–252.

Jupp, J. C., Berry, T. R., & Lensmire, T. J. (2016). Second-Wave White Teacher Identity Studies: A Review of White Teacher Identity Literatures From 2004 Through 2014. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1151–1191.

Kanu, Y. (2007). Increasing school success among Aboriginal students: Culturally responsive curriculum or macrostructural variables affecting schooling? *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 1*(1), 21-41.

Keating, A. (1995). Interrogating "Whiteness," (De)Constructing "Race". *College English, 57*(8), 901-918.

Kennedy, Mary. M. (2016). How Does Professional Development Improve Teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 945-980.

Kincheloe, J. (1999) The struggle to define and reinvent Whiteness: A pedagogical analysis. *College Literature 26*(3), 162-194.

Kincheloe, J. L. & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). So purely white: whiteness in critical multiculturalism. In J. L. Kincheloe & S. R. Steinburg, *Changing multiculturalism* (pp. 206-229). Philadelphia, PA, Open University Press.

Kincheloe, J. & Steinberg, S. (1998). Privileged and getting away with it: The cultural studies of white, middle-class youth. *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, *31*(1), 103–126.

Kinchelow, Joe & Mclaren, Peter. (2002). Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146.

Kirby, Sandra & Kate McKenna. 1989. *Experience, Research, Social Change: Methods from the Margins*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Joyce E. King. (1991). Dysconscious Racism: Ideology, Identity, and the Miseducation of Teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*. *60*(2), 133-146.

Jardine, Alice. (1985). Gynesis: *Configurations of Woman and Modernity*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Klein, M. (1946). "Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms." In *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works 1946-1963*. Hogarth: Reprinted Virago, 1988: 1-24.

Kleinfeld, J. (1995). Effective teachers of Eskimo and Indian students. In L. Roberts & R. A. Clifton (Eds.), *Cross-currents: Contemporary Canadian educational issues* (pp. 68-96). Toronto, ON: Nelson Canada.

Kozol, J. (1992). *Salvage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. Boston: Houghton.

Kreuger R.A. (1988). *Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research.* London: Sage.

Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30–52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J.J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 70, 3–24.

Kumar, R., & Hamer, L. (2013). Preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward student diversity and proposed instructional practices: A sequential design study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(2), 162-177.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25-53.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in the practices of learning, teaching, supervising, and researching. *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*(1), 67–92.

Kumashiro, K. (2004). *Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning Toward Social Justice*.

Kumashiro, K. (2006). Toward an anti-oppressive theory of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *9*(1), 129–135.

Labaree, D. (2005). Progressivism, schools and schools of education: An American romance. *Paedagogica Historica*, *41*(1-2), 275—288.

Lacan, J. (1975). *Le Semaire de Jacques Lacan, Livre XX*: *Encore 1972-1973*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Beyond multicultural literacy. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 147-157.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 747-759). New York: Macmillan.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Towards a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing Teachers for Diverse Student Populations: A Critical Race Theory Perspective. *Review of Research in Education*, *24*, 211–247.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In E. Taylor, D. Gillorn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), Foundations of critical race theory in education (pp. 17–36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langman, P. (2000). Including Jews in multiculturalism. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters & X Zúñiga (Eds.), *Readings For Diversity and Social Justice* (pp. 169-177). New York: Routledge.

Laplanche, J. & J. B. Pontalis. (1983). *The Language of Psycho-Analysis* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). London: Karnac Books and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

Laplanche, J. (1999). Notes on afterwardsness. In J. Fletcher (Ed.), *Essays on otherness* (L. Thurston, P. Slotkin, & L. Hill, Trans.) (pp. 264-269). London, New York: Routledge.

Larkin, D., Maloney, T., & Perry-Ryder, G. (2016). Reasoning About Race and Pedagogy in Two Preservice Science Teachers: A Critical Race Theory Analysis. *Cognition and Instruction*, *34*(4), 285–322.

Layton, L. (2008). What Divides the Subject? Psychoanalytic Reflections on Subjectivity, Subjection and Resistance. *Subjectivity*, *22*(1), 60–72.

Lensmire, T. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on White privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard educational review,* 83(3), 410-431.

Lensmire, T. J. & Snaza, N. (2010). What teacher education can learn from Blackface minstrelsy. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(5), 413–422.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Levinas, E. (1985). Ethics and Infinity. Translated by Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2000) Framing Whiteness: Working through the tensions in introducing Whiteness to educators. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(3), 271–292.

Lewin, K. (1935). Psycho-sociological problems of a minority group. *Journal of Personality 3*(3), 175-187.

Lewis, G. (2017). Questions of Presence. *Feminist Review*, *117*(1), 1–19.

Lewis, S. (1992). Recommendations for Dealing with Issues of Race in Ontario: Official Report for the Government of Ontario.

Levy, E. & K. J. Cambell. 2000. D.W. Winnicott In The Literature Classroom. *Online Journal of the National Council of Teachers of English*. 27, 3: 320-328. Retrieved July 20, 2001, from

Lin, M., Lake, V. E, & Rice, D. (2008). Teaching anti-bias curriculum in teacher education programs: What and how. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 187-200.

Linton, C. & Singleton, G. E. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lockwood, A. T., & Secada, W. G. (1999). Transforming education for Hispanic youth: Exemplary practices, programs, and schools. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Logue, J. (2008). The unbelievable truth and the dilemmas of ignorance. Philosophy of Education Archive. Retrieved from http://ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/view/1342/92.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lowenstein, K. L. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education: Reconceptualizing White teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational Research, 79*, 163–196.

Luhmann, S. (1998). Queering/querying pedagogy? Or, pedagogy is a pretty queer thing. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 141-155). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lund, D. E., & Carr, P. R. (Eds.). (2015). *Revisiting the great White north? Rethinking Whiteness, privilege, and identity in education* (2nd Ed.). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Macdonald, E. (1991). The Trouble with Subjects: Feminism, Marxism and the Questions of Poststructuralism, *Studies in Political Economy*, *35*(1), 43-71.

Madison, D. (2005). *Critical Ethnography: method, ethics, and performance*. Sage.

Marx, S. (2008). Popular White teachers of Latina/o kids: The strengths of personal experiences and the limitations of Whiteness. *Urban Education (Beverly Hills, Calif.)*, *43*(1), 29–67.

Massey, I. (1991). *More than skin deep: Developing anti-racist multicultural education in schools*. London, UK: Hudder & Stoughton.

Matias, C. E. (2013). Who you callin' White?! A critical counter-story on colouring White identity. Race Ethnicity and Education, 16, 291-315

Matias, C. E. (2016). "Why do you make me hate myself?": Re-teaching Whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education (Columbia, S.C.)*, *27*(2), 194–211.

Matthews, S. (2007). Some Notes on Hate in Teaching. Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society 12(2):185-192.

McAllister, G., & Irvine, J. J. (2000). Cross-cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 3-24.

McAllister, G. & Irvine, J. J. (2002). The role of empathy in teaching culturally diverse students: A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(5), 433-443.

McCarthy, C. (1995). The problem with origins: Race and the contrapuntal nature of the educational experience. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies 17*(1), 87-105.

McCarthy, C. (1997). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affliction*. New York: Routledge.

McCarthy, C. (2003). Contradictions of power and identity: Whiteness studies and the call of teacher education. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 127-133.

McCaskell, T. (2005). *Race to equity: Disrupting educational inequality*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

McFalls, E. L. & Cobb-Roberts, D. (2001). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 164–175.

McIntosh, P. (1990). Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School, 49*(2), 31–36.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of Whiteness: Exploring racial identity with White teachers.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

McIntyre, A. (2002). Exploring Whiteness and multicultural education with prospective teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(1), 31-49.

McLaren, P. (1997). Unthinking Whiteness, rethinking democracy: Or farewell to the blonde beast: Towards a revolutionary multiculturalism. *Educational Foundations 11*(2), 5-39.

McLaren, P. (1998). Revolutionary pedagogy in post- revolutionary times. *Educational Theory, 48*(4, Fall), 431-462.

McLaren, P., Leonardo, Z. & Allen, R. L. (2000) Epistemologies of whiteness: transforming and transgressing pedagogic knowledge. In R. Mahalingam & C. McCarthy (Eds.), *Multicultural Curriculum: New Directions for Social Theory, Practice, and Policy* (pp. 108–123). New York: Routledge.

McManimon, S.K., & Casey, Z.A. (2018). (Re)beginning and becoming: antiracism and professional development with white practicing teachers. *Teaching Education, 29*, 395-406.

Merton, R. & E. Barber. (1976). Sociological ambivalence. In R. K. Merton (Ed.), *Sociological ambivalence and Other Essays* (pp. 3-31). London: Macmillan.

Miller, E. J. (1990). The development of the Leicester model. In E. Trist & H. Murray (Eds), The social engagement of social science: Vol. I (pp. 165-185). London: Free Association Books.

Milner, H. R. (2003). Reflection, racial competence, and critical pedagogy: How do we prepare pre-service teachers to pose tough questions? *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 6*, 193-208.

Milner, H.R. (2006). Preservice Teachers' Learning about Cultural and Racial Diversity: Implications for Urban Education. Urban Education. *41*(4), 343-375.

Milner, H. R., & Laughter, J. C. (2015). But good intentions are not enough: Preparing teachers to center race and poverty. The Urban Review, *47*(2), 341-363.

Ministry of Education and Training. (1993). *Antiracism and ethnocultural equity in school boards : guidelines for policy development and implementation, 1993*. Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training.

Mishra Tarc, A. (2013). Race moves: following global manifestations of new racisms in intimate space. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *16*(3), 365–385.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 1995. "Translator Translated. Interview with Cultural Theorist Homi Bhabha." *Artforum International Magazine Inc*, 33, 7: 80-84.

Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher Identity as Pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualization in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7,* 172-188.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Curriculum Studies*, *19*(4), 317–328.

Ng, R. 1993. Sexism, racism, Canadian nationalism. In H. Bannerji (Ed.), *Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics* (pp. 197-211). Toronto: Sister Vision Press.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new Century. *Journal of Teacher Education 51*(3), 180-187.

Nkomo, Mokubung & Dolby, Nadine (2004). Common origins, common futures: Reflections on identity and difference in education. *Perspectives in Education*. 22. 1-9.

Norquay, N. (1999). Social Difference and the Problem of the "Unique Individual": An Uneasy Legacy of Child-Centred Pedagogy. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne De l'éducation*, *24*(2), 183–196.

Nylund, D. (2006). Critical multiculturalism, whiteness and social work: Towards a more radical view of cultural competence. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 17*(2), 27–42.

Omi, M. & H. Winant. (1994). On the Theoretical Concept of Race. In C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race Identity and Representation in Education* (pp. 3-10). New York: Routledge.

Parekh, Gillian & Underwood, Kathryn. (2015). Inclusion: Creating school and classroom communities where everyone belongs. Research, tips, and tools for educators and administrators. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Toronto District School Board.

Parekh, G. (2013). A case for inclusive education (Report No. 12/13-09). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Toronto District School Board.

Parekh, G. (2014). *Social citizenship and disability: Identity, belonging, and the structural organization of education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Patton, M.Q. (1989). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (10th printing). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Paccione, A. V. (2000). Developing a commitment to multicultural education. *Teachers College Record, 102*(6), 980-1005.

Parak, R. (1992). *FWTAO Newsletter* (February/March, pp. 1-4). Ontario: The Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario.

Parker, L. & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology, *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*(1), 7–22.

Philipps, A. (1998). *The Beast in the Nursery: On Curiosity and Other Appetites,* New York: Pantheon.

Piaget, J. (1926). *The language and thought of the child.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner.

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.

Pitt, A. (1997) Reading resistance analytically: on making the self in women's studies. In L. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), *Dangerous territories: struggles for difference and equality in education* (pp. 127-142). New York: Routledge.

Pitt, A. (1998). Qualifying resistance: Some comments on methodological dilemmas. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(4), 535–553.

Pitt, A. (2000). Hide and Seek: The play of the personal in education, Changing English, 7:1, 65-74.

Pitt, A. (2003). *The play of the personal: psychoanalytic narratives of feminist education*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Pitt, A., & Brushwood Rose, C. (2007). The significance of emotions in teaching and learning: on making emotional significance. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *10*(4), 327–337.

Pohan, C. A., & Aguilar, T. E. (2001). Measuring educators' beliefs about diversity in personal and professional contexts. American Educational Research Journal, 38(1), 159-182.

Pollock, M., Deckman, S., Mira, M., & Shalaby, C. (2010). "But what can I Do?": Three necessary tensions in teaching teachers about race. Journal of Teacher Education, *61*(3), 211–224.

Popkewitz, T. (1992). Culture, pedagogy and power: Issues in the production of values and colonization. In K. Weiler & C. Mitchell (Eds.), *What Schools Can Do: Critical Pedagogy and Practice* (pp. 133-150). New York: SUNY Press.

Portelli, J. P., & Solomon, R. P. (2001). The erosion of democracy in education: from critique to possibilities (Calgary, Alberta, Detselig Enterprises).

Portelli, J. P., Vibert, A., Shields, C., & Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (2007). *Toward an equitable education: Poverty, diversity, and students at risk: the national report*. Toronto, Ont: OISE/CLD.

Powell, L. C. (1997). The achievement (k)not: Whiteness and black underachievement. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Offwhite: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 3–12). New York: Routledge.

Rasmussen, B. B., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, I. J. & Wray, M. (Eds.) (2001). *The making and unmaking of Whiteness.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ringrose, J. (2007) Troubling agency and 'choice': a psycho-social analysis of students' negotiations of Black Feminist 'intersectionality' discourses in Women's Studies. *Women's Studies International Forum, 30*(3), 264–278.

Rodriguez, R. (1999). The Study of Whiteness. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 16*(6), 20-25.

Robertson-Baghel, M. (1998). *The Social Construction of Racial Identity of White Student Teachers and its Impact on Their Learning to Teach*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, York University, North York, Canada.

Risko, V. J., Peter, J. A., & McAllister, D. (1996). Conceptual changes: Preservice teachers pathways to providing literacy instruction. In E. G. Sturtevant & W. M. Linek (Eds.), *Growing literacy: The eighteenth yearbook: A peer reviewed publication of the College Reading Association* (pp. 100–119). Commerce, TX: The College Reading Association.

Rist, R. C. (2000). HER classic: Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *70*(3), 257–301.

Rizvi, F. (1993). Children and the grammar of popular racism, in: C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, Identity and Representation in Education*, pp. 126–139 (New York, Routledge).

Roberts, J. (2001). Dialogue, Positionality and the Legal Framing of Ethnographic Research. *Sociological Research Online*, *5*(4), 37–50.

Robertson, S. (2001). Working through the hyphens. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *22*(2), 295–298.

Roediger, D. R. (1991). *The wages of Whiteness.* New York: Verso.

Roediger, D., Davis, M., & Sprinker, M. (2007). *The wages of whiteness race and the making of the American working class* (Rev. ed.). Verso.

Roman, L. (1993) White is a colour!: Defensiveness, postmodernism, and anti-racist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 71-88). New York, Routledge.

Roman, L. 1997. Denying (White) racial privilege: Redemption discourses and the uses of fantasy. In M. Fine., L. Weis, L.C. Powell & L. Mun Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society*, (pp. 270-282). New York: Routledge.

Russell, T., McPherson, S., & Martin, A. (2001). Coherence and collaboration in teacher education reform. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *26*(3).

Ryan, J., Pollock, K., & Fab Antonelli. (2009). Teacher Diversity in Canada: Leaky Pipelines, Bottlenecks, and Glass Ceilings. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *32*(3), 591–617.

Said, Edward, W. (1978). New York: Pantheon.

214

Schick, C. (2000) 'By virtue of being white': Resistance in anti-racist pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 3*(1), 83–102.

Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 295–317.

Schmidt, P. (1997). *Beginning in retrospect: Writing and reading a teacher's life.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Schultz, E. L., Neyhart, K., & Reck, U. M. (1996). Swimming against the tide: A study of prospective teachers' attitudes regarding cultural diversity and urban teaching. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 20*(1), 1-7.

Schulz, R. (2005). The Practicum: More than Practice. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *28*(1/2), 147–167.

Shah, V. (2019). Calling in the Self: Centering Socially Engaged Buddhism in Critical Pedagogy Through Personal Narrative International Journal of Critical Pedagogy.

Shaw, C. (1993). A content analysis of teacher talk during middle school team meetings. *Research in Middle Level Education, 17*(1), 27-45.

Sheets, R. H., & Gay, G. (1996). Student perceptions of disciplinary conflict in ethnically diverse classrooms. *NASSP Bulletin*, *80*(580), 84-94.

Sheets, R. H., & Gay, G. (2002).

Shim, J. M. 2014. The Story of an Antiracist Project: Misalignment between Conscious Intent and Unconscious Desire. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 10.

Shim, J. M. 2017. "Play of the Unconscious in Pre-Service Teachers' Self-Reflection around Race and Racism." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 49 (6): 830–847.

Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching Against the Grain*: *Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Simon, R. (1995). Face to face with alterity: Postmodern Jewish identity and the eros of pedagogy. In J. Gallop (Ed.), *Pedagogy: The Question of Impersonation*, (pp. 90-105). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Simon, R., Rosenberg, S., & Eppert, C. (2000). *Between Hope & Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical Trauma.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Simon, R. I. (2005). *The touch of the past: Remembrance, learning, and ethics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simon, R. I. (2011). Afterword: The turn to pedagogy: A needed conversation on the practice of curating difficult knowledge. In E. Lehrer & C. Milton (Eds.), *Curating difficult knowledge* (pp. 193–209). New York: Palgrave MacMillian.

Singer, J. (2003) *Ambivalence as a major aspect of resistance to antiracist pedagogy*. Thesis (M.Ed.), York University.

Singerman, R. (1986). The Jew as racial alien: The genetic component of American Antisemitism. In D. Gerber (Ed.), *Anti-Semitism in American history* (pp. 103-128). Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press.

Sey, J. (1998). Psychoanalysis and South Africa. *American Imago*, *55*(1), 3–8.

Sleeter, C. (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. (1992). Resisting Racial Awareness: How Teachers Understand the Social Order from Their Racial, Gender, and Social Class Locations." *Educational Foundations* 6: 7- 32.

Sleeter, C. E. (1993). How White teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education, 1*(4, Spring), 5-8.

Sleeter, C., & Montecinos, C. (1998). Forging partnerships for multicultural teacher education. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education* (pp. 113-137). New York: Falmer.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Schools: Research and the Overwhelming Presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2), 94–106.

Sleeter, C. (2008). An Invitation To Support Diverse Students Through Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *59*(3), 212–219.

Sleeter, C. E. & Zavala, M. (2020). Transformative Ethnic Studies in Schools: Curriculum, Pedagogy and Research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sosa-Provencio, Sheahan, A., Desai, S., & Secatero, S. (2020). Tenets of Body-Soul Rooted Pedagogy: teaching for critical consciousness, nourished resistance, and healing. *Critical Studies in Education*, *61*(3), 345–362

Solomon, R., Levine-Rasky, C., & Singer, J. (2003). *Teaching for equity and diversity research to practice*. Canadian Scholars' Press.

Solomon, 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.

Solomon, R. P. & Daniel, B.J. (2007a). Discourses on race and white privilege in the next generation of teachers. In P. R. Carr & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *The great white north? Exploring whiteness, privilege and identity in education* (pp. 161-172). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Solomon, R., & Sekayi, D. (2007b). *Urban teacher education and teaching : innovative practices for diversity and social justice* . Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Solomon, R. P. & Allen, A. M. A. (2001) The struggle for equity, diversity and social justice in teacher education, in: J. P. Portelli & R. P. Solomon (Eds) The erosion of democracy in education: from critique to possibilities (Calgary, Detselig), 217–244.

Solomon, P., Singer, J., Allen, A., & Campbell, A. (2011). Solomon, R. (2011). *Brave new teachers: doing social justice work in neo-liberal times*. CSPI.

Solórzano, D., & Yosso, T. (2002). Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23–44.

Sperling, R. (2007). Service-Learning as a Method of Teaching Multiculturalism to White College Students. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *6*(4), 309–322.

Spinthourakis, J., Karatzia-Stavlioti, E., & Roussakis, Y. (2009). Pre-service teacher intercultural sensitivity assessment as a basis for addressing multiculturalism. *Intercultural Education (London, England)*, *20*(3), 267–276.

Starnes, B. A. (2003). When white teachers teach minority children. *Education Digest, 69*(4), 54-57.

Swartz, E. (2003). Teaching White pre-service teachers: Pedagogy for change. *Urban Education*, *38*(3), 255–278.

Szollosy, M. (1998). Winnicott's Potential Spaces. Paper presented at the 1998 MLA Convention San Francisco, University of Sheffield. Retrieved July 26, 2001, from, http://www.psychematters.com/paper/szollosy.htm.

Tate, W.F. (1997). Critical Race Theory and Education: History, Theory and Implications. In M.

Apple (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, vol 22 (pp. 195-250). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Tatum, B. D. (1992) Talking about race, learning about racism: the application of racial development theory in the classroom, *Harvard Educational Review, 62*, 1–24.

Tatum, B. D. (2001). Professional development: An important partner in antiracist teacher education. In S. H. King & L. A. Castenell (Eds.), *Racism and racial inequality: Implications for teacher education* (pp. 51-58). Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.

Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York: Routledge.

Taylor, M. C. (1979). Race, sex, and the expression of self-fulfilling prophecies in a laboratory teaching situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(6), 897-912.

Taylor, L. (2011). Feeling in crisis: Vicissitudes of response in experiments with Global Justice Education. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies 9*(1), 6-65.

The Four-Level Working Group on Metropolitan Toronto Black Canadian Community Concerns, *Towards a New Beginning* (Toronto, 1992).

Thomas, S., & Vanderhaar, J. (2008). Negotiating resistance to multiculturalism in a teacher education curriculum: A case study. *The Teacher Educator*, *43*(3), 173–197.

Thompson, B. W. (2001). *A promise and a way of life: White antiracist activism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Thompson, I., McNicholl, J., & Menter, I. (2016). Student teachers' perceptions of poverty and educational achievement. *Oxford Review of Education*, *42*(2), 214–229.

Todd, S. (1997). Learning desire: Perspectives on pedagogy, culture, and the unsaid. *New York: Routledge.*

Todd, S. (1998). Veiling the "other," unveiling our "selves": Reading media images of the hijab psychoanalytically to move beyond tolerance. *Canadian Journal of Education, 23*(4), 438-451.

Todd, S. (2001). 'Bringing more than I contain:' Ethics, curriculum, and the pedagogical demand for altered egos." *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33*(4), 431-450.

Todd, S. (2001). Guilt, suffering and responsibility. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 35*(4), 597-614.

Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education.* State University of New York Press.

Toronto District School Board. (1999). *Equity Implementation Documents.* Toronto: Toronto District School Board.

Townsend, B. K. (2000). Integrating nonminority instructors into the minority environment. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 112*, 85-93.

Troyna, B. & Williams, J. (1986). *Racism, education, and the state*. London: Croom Helm.

Vick, M. (2006). "It's a Difficult Matter"1: Historical perspectives on the enduring problem of the practicum in teacher preparation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(2), 181–198.

Villegas, A., Strom, K., & Lucas, T. (2012). Closing the racial/ethnic gap between students of color and their teachers: An elusive goal. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *45*(2), 283–301.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waddell, J. (2011). Crossing borders without leaving town: the impact of cultural immersion on the perceptions of teacher education candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *20*(2), 23+.https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A274955667/EAIM?u=yorku_main&sid=EAIM&xid=97282891.

Walcott, R. (1993). *Critiquing Canadian multiculturalism: towards an anti-racist agenda*. Thesis (M.A.). University of Toronto, 1993.

Walcott, R. (1994). P. *Discourse (Abingdon, England)*, *15*(1), 64–74. Pedagogical Desire & The Crisis of Knowledge. *Practice*, *42*(4), 305-312.

Rozas, L., & Miller, J. (2009). Discourses for Social Justice Education: The Web of Racism and the Web of Resistance. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *18*(1-2), 24–39.

Wiegman, Robyn. (1999). Whiteness Studies and the Paradox of Particularity. *Boundary 2*, *26*(3), 115–150.

Winant, H. (1997). Behind blue eyes: Whiteness and contemporary US racial politics. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Off-White: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 40–53). New York: Routledge.

Winnicott, D. (1971). *Playing and reality*. New York: Routledge.

Winnicott, D. (1984). *Deprivation and delinquency*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Winnicott, D. (1992a). Aggression and its roots. In C. Winnicott., R. Sheperd & M. Davis. (Eds.), *Deprivation and Delinquency*, (pp. 84-99). London: Routledge (Original Published in 1939).

Winnicott, D. (1992b). Transitional objects and transitional phenomena." In *Through Paediatrics to Psychoanalysis*: *Collected papers*, (pp. 229-242). New York: Brunner/Mazel (Original Published in 1951).

Yon, D. (1999). Pedagogy and the "problem" of difference: On reading community in The Darker Side of Black. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *12*(6), 623–641.

Yon, D. (2000). *Elusive Culture: Schooling, Race, and Identity in Global Times*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006a). Belonging and the politics of belonging, *Patterns of Prejudice, 40*(3), 197-214.

Zeichner, K. M. (1992, September). Educating Teachers for Cultural Diversity. NCRTL Special Report. *National Centre for Research on Teacher Learning.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. (1981). Are the Effects of University Teacher Education "Washed Out" by School Experience? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*(3), 7–11.

Zeichner, K. M. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. In K. M. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 133-175). New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K & Flessner, R. (2009). "Educating Teachers for Critical Education" , in *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* ed. Michael W. Apple , Wayne Au and Luis Armando Gandin (Abingdon: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the Connections Between Campus Courses and Field Experiences in College- and University-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 89–99.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Interrogating "teacher identity": Emotion, resistance, and self-formation. *Educational Theory*, 53(1), 107-127.

Zembylas, M. (2012). Pedagogies of strategic empathy: Navigating through the emotional complexities of anti-racism in higher education. Teaching in Higher Education, 17, 113–125.

Zimpher, N.L., & Asburn, E. A. (1992). Countering parochialism in teacher candidates. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 40-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zirkel, S. (2008). Creating more effective multiethnic schools. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 2*(1), 187-241.

Werkmeister Rozas, L., & Joshua Miller. (2009). Discourses for Social Justice Education: The Web of Racism and the Web of Resistance, Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, *18*:1-2, 24-39.

Appendix A

Table 1 - Themes/Stages in the Process of Developing a Commitment to Equity

Stage One: Contextual Awareness	Stage Two: Emergent Awareness	Stage Three: Transformational Awareness
Influence of the Family/Childhood Experiences	Heightened Awareness of Issues Related to Diversity	Influence of Training, Educational Course, Books
Motivation from Empathy, Moral Disposition, Religious/Spiritual Convictions	Significant Temporal Environment Initiative from Job Situation	Critical Incident(s)/ Significant Event(s) Influence of Mentor, Role Model, Friendship Interactive/Extensive Cultural Immersion
Discrimination/Racism due to Minority Status	Discrimination/Racism due to Minority Status	
	Influence of Mentor, Role Model, Friendship	
	Interactive/Extensive Cultural Immersion	

Taken from: Angela V. Paccione. Developing a Commitment to Multicultural Education. *Teachers College Record* Volume 102 Number 6, 2000, p. 989.

Appendix B

<u>Teacher Candidate Questionnaire – Urban Diversity</u>

1) What is your present understanding of the concept of equity?

2) Give an example of an equitable teaching practice and why you believe it demonstrates your present understanding of equity.

3) List in order of importance which of the following aspects of identity you believe have played the most significant role in your becoming the person who you are now.

Culture, Language, Social-Class, Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation, Physical or Psychological Challenge/Disability

1)
2)
3)
4)
5)
6)
7)
8)
9)

4) Please explain briefly the reason or reasons why you placed the first and the last aspects of identity listed above where you did.

5) How will these aspects of identity influence your teaching?

6) How will these aspects of identity influence your learning?

7) How do you think your work as a teacher can be connected to issues of social justice?

8) What do you see as your biggest EDSJ challenge?

9) What personal /professional growth plan would you like to focus upon this year?

Appendix C

<u>Guiding Questions: Interviews and Focus Groups</u>

1) What do you remember about the small groups' aspect of the UD program?

2) What do you think was the purpose of the small groups?

3) How would you describe the relationship between the UD program's goals and the program's small groups' aspect?

4) How do you think that the small group contributed to the UD program?

5) Can you think of any particular time when the small groups directly help to deal with an important issue that would not otherwise have been addressed?

6) Is there anything you would change about how the small groups were organized and/or run?

7) What do you think about the demographics of the small groups? What would you change about the design and methodology through which the small groups were chosen, for example, race/gender, personality, experience etc.?

8) How do you think the students responded to the small groups?
Looking for direct memory of student interactions and opinions

9) Was there any difference in how the diverse racial and cultural groups responded to the small groups?

10) What suggestions did the students make regarding how the small groups were run and/or organized?

11) Can you describe your personal feelings regarding the small groups?

12) Did you experience any changes in your attitude, beliefs or understanding of the small groups over the school year?

13) Did you experience any difficulties in your small group?

14) In what ways did the small groups' aspect of the UD program challenge you personally and/or professionally?