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Our purpose with this study is to make visible, organize, compose, and promote understanding of White teacher identity studies with special emphasis on recent literatures from 2004 through 2014. The term White teacher identity studies refers to an area of education research that seeks to prepare and conscientize a predominantly White preservice and professional teaching force for teaching and learning across cultural differences in public schools. This article, while providing an historical account of the area in section two, emphasizes results from a
systematic review of literature between 2004 and 2014 that we termed second-wave White teacher identity studies.

The rationale for this study emerges from historical exigencies in the United States and the need to better articulate White teacher identity studies in the present moment. White teacher identity studies recognizes the demographic imperative and the resegregation of public schools as historical exigencies. Recognizing the demographic imperative in teaching and learning and the unequal resegregation of public schools, White teacher identity studies addresses, describes, or critically confronts historically institutionalized racial inequalities, racism, and whiteness in preparing White teachers for work in increasingly diverse schools.

Focusing on the demographic imperative in teacher education (e.g., Banks, 2004; Cochrane-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), White teacher identity studies is anchored in an understanding that students of color now represent 48% (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2011) of students in public schools while White teachers constitute 84% (NCES, 2008) of the teaching force. The demographic imperative is further exacerbated by the resegregation of public schools over the last three decades (Kozol, 2005; NCES, 2009). This resegregation, especially in urban areas but in other areas as well, reconstituted unequal majority–minority schools. During this same historical period, accrediting agencies continued to merely address diversity (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2013; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008) without emphasizing clear understandings of power, race, whiteness, and White teacher identities. Though understanding the crucial need for more teachers of color in the teaching force, White teacher identity studies focuses on the preparation and conscientization of White teachers for teaching across understandings of race, class, culture, language, and other identity differences in increasingly diverse public schools.

In what follows, we provide a critical discussion on White teacher identity studies that informs education research and teacher education, yet beyond that, we emphasize recent literatures between 2004 and 2014 that have not been fully incorporated into education research or teacher education programs. As researchers, we seek to answer the following primary research question: What does White teacher identity studies since 2004 offer education researchers and teacher educators? Answering this question is crucial for better defining the field that recognizes and confronts the historical exigencies of our present moment.

In the first section, we provide a methodological discussion on the notion of the synoptic text used in our review of White teacher identity studies’ literatures. In the methodological discussion, we explain our focus on literatures between 2004 and 2014 as determined by recency and also by the consolidation of the White teacher identity studies field in 2003. Furthermore, the methodological discussion includes descriptions of representational purposes, criteria for text selection, and analytic processes as this section clarifies and substantiates the methods used in the literature review in the third section.

In the second section, we provide an historical account of the development of White teacher identity studies that historically situates the literature review in the third section. The purpose of this historical account, providing background for understandings in the third section, is to review predominant White privilege and
White race-evasive themes now familiar in education research and teacher education that we identify as first-wave White teacher identity studies. In the third section, we apply the method of the synoptic text to systematically review and discuss literatures between 2004 and 2014 articulating the notion of second-wave White teacher identity studies. The purposes of the third section on second-wave White teacher identity studies are twofold: to document the persistence of White race-evasive identity themes in the literatures and to identify new race-visible White teacher identity studies as a burgeoning focus in the field.

In our discussion and conclusion, we provide an analysis of second-wave White teacher identity studies’ contributions. Here, we emphasize that second-wave White teacher identity studies, while maintaining fidelity to radical epistemological directions in African American and critical White studies traditions are distinct from first-wave White teacher identity studies. Having documented the shift in the multidimensional field of the present, we note that second-wave research has taken a definitive and important pedagogical turn toward whiteness pedagogies for teaching and learning with White preservice and professional teachers.

**Autobiographies**

Importantly, our study came from an ongoing engagement in teaching and learning across difference in public schools, education research, and teacher education. As further developed throughout our review, we believe that our identities should be understood in complex ways and as having multiple dimensions. This complexity and multidimensionality is demonstrated in our autobiographies below.

James C. Jupp, a White middle-class male who spent 18 years in majority-minority settings teaching predominantly Hispanic and African American students, has spent the last decade researching practices of teaching and learning across race, class, culture, language, and other differences. Jupp’s main line of research focuses on White teachers’ cultural learning, understandings of cultural competence, and narratives of conscientization in urban and rural contexts.

Theodorea Regina Berry, a multi-ethnic, Black American and Afro-Caribbean, middle-class woman, has spent nearly 20 years teaching and researching on race, ethnicity, and gender in public schools and teacher education programs from a critical and critical race theory perspective. Berry’s main line of research focuses on the critical and historical examination of race, ethnicity, and gender for teaching and teacher education via critical race theory/critical race feminism and explorations of the lived experiences of women of color as teachers and teacher educators.

Timothy J. Lensmire, a White middle-class male from a working-class background, has spent the last two and a half decades studying and writing about the problems and possibilities of progressive and critical pedagogies that recall in complex ways his working-class background. His current research explores the complexity of social class and race and seeks to contribute nuanced descriptions and theorizations of whiteness and White identities as part of the broader project to mobilize White people for anti-racist action.
Identities Within Structurings

Tied to the complexities of our lived identities, shared insights, and ongoing conversations, we add a conceptual clarification at the outset of our study. Following understandings in critical race feminism (e.g., Berry, 2012, 2014; Berry & Candis, 2013; Berry & Stovall, 2013; Harris, 1997; Hughes & Berry, 2012; Wing, 1997) and critical White studies (e.g., Jupp, 2013; Jupp & Slattery, 2010a; Lensmire, 2011, 2014; Lewis, 2004; McDermott & Samson, 2005; Moon & Flores, 2000; Perry & Shotwell, 2009; Winans, 2005), we understand identities within social and historical structurings in nonessentializing ways. Nonessentializing identities, as definition, refer to understanding identity as a complex and multidimensional social–historical construction that should not be reduced or essentialized to one of its characteristics or dimensions. Following understandings of nonessentializing identities, we insist on recognizing injustices in historical and social structurings; nonetheless, we insist that “identities are intertwined and interconnected, functioning simultaneously” along multiple dimensions, and we argue our identities provide both problematics and potentials that can “address issues of equity and equality” (Berry, 2012, p. 21).

Our lived identities, nonessentializing understandings, and developing racialized consciousnesses strike a similar chord as the overall trajectory of White teacher identity studies discussed in this essay. In this way, our study of White teacher identity studies literatures is as complex as our identities and experiences. In advancing our review, we provide the following concordant definitions of whiteness and White identity for clarification of how these terms are deployed below. Whiteness, as definition, refers to hegemonic racial structurings of social and material realities operating in the present moment that perpetuate racialized inequalities and injustices. White identity, as definition, refers to the multiple, intersecting, and (often) privileged race-evasive ways of conjugating White identities in the present moment. Importantly for our essay, our understanding of White identity recognizes White privilege and race-evasive identities, but it does not totalize, reduce, or essentialize White identities to these important, however partial, understandings.

Method

As a methodological choice, we focused our literature review on White teacher identity studies between 2004 and 2014 in part because of recency. However, in addition to recency, we focused on White teacher identity studies starting in 2004 because of Marx’s (2003a, 2003b) special issue on White teacher identity studies in Qualitative Studies in Education that marked the consolidation of the field. As we will demonstrate in the following section’s historical account, Marx’s (2003a, 2003b) special issue can be considered a watershed moment that both defined and culminated what we term first-wave White teacher identity studies.

The Synoptic Text

In conducting our systematic review of White teacher identity studies in the third section, we used the research methodology of the “synoptic text” (Pinar, 2006, p. 1; see also Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Schubert &
Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carol, 2002). We adapted this methodological approach from curriculum scholars as a means to carefully trace a subtle shift in the field we call second-wave White teacher identity studies. The synoptic text uses the “‘documentary’ methods of intellectual history” (Pinar, 2006, p. 6) with special attention to paraphrasing, citing, or quoting the contributions of each study to a broader field with intentions of reflecting, rendering, and making comprehensible a field of study.

In its methodological intentions, the synoptic text attends to the faithfulness of “the paraphrase of the original text and attendant danger of over-simplification” (Pinar, 2006, p. 6). Pushing back against the academic obscurantism that separates researchers’ into silos, the synoptic text strives to communicate shifts within a field of study so that researchers and practitioners both inside and outside that field can better communicate and “effectively participate” (Schubert et al., 2002, p. 71). The synoptic text, as taken up generally within other fields or specifically with White teacher identity studies, assumes that efforts at synopses are tension-filled and move dialectically between expansion and synopsis, and although synoptic texts strive for faithful representation, they also perpetually fall short of this goal (Schubert, 2010).

Despite the incompleteness of representation, the purpose of our adaptation of the synoptic text as methodology is to provide a synopsis of White teacher identity studies literatures that articulates emergent thematic shifts in the field. These emergent thematic shifts indicate broad trends in White teacher identity studies that seek to enable education researchers and teacher education practitioners to find, recognize, and apply new literatures to their research efforts and work more effectively with White preservice and professional teachers.

Criteria for Study Selection

In designing our study, we conducted a search of the literatures in White teacher identity studies following established protocols (PRISMA, 2009). In this search, we engaged electronic databases such as ERIC EBSCO, Academic Search Complete, and J-Stor and meta-search databases such as GALILEO-DISCOVER. Search terms we used in these data bases included White teachers, White teacher identity, whiteness, and Boolean combinations of those terms. Overall, the simple and general search term White teachers cast the broadest net and yielded the most useful results. In determining which articles to include in the literature review, we developed the following criteria: (a) publication date between 2004 and 2014, (b) appearance in journals with peer-reviewed status, (c) central focus on White preservice or professional teacher identities, and (d) use of qualitative and/or narrative research methodologies.

The criterion regarding publication dates between 2004 and 2014 came from our understanding of the field’s consolidation, and this range of dates served to delimit our literature review. Significantly, this delimitation allowed for a focus on recent and critically insurgent White teacher identity studies knowledge not yet currently established in teacher education or textbook representations. The criterion regarding appearance in peer-reviewed journals served to advance research on White teacher identity that scholars in the field considered new contributions rather than commentary, textbook representations, or rehashings in companion texts. The criterion
regarding primary focus on White preservice or White teacher identities served to keep the literature review on the topic of White identity rather than following broader discussions of teacher education. The last criterion regarding qualitative or narrative research methodologies emphasized our focus on understandings of identity formation in specific cultural contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

As a result of the searches, we developed a textual document universe \( (N = 65) \) for this literature review. In developing this textual document universe, we catalogued and summarized each study attempting, as much as possible as always—already embedded researchers, to represent the studies with fidelity to their own epistemological and methodological assumptions. During and after summarizing these studies, we analyzed and organized these studies according to emergent thematic patterns in the document universe along the lines of relative emphases. That is, a single study almost always contained more than one theme, but given that condition, we analyzed each document not as an absolute categorical statement on a single theme but rather along the lines of contribution emphasis to the field of White teacher identity studies. Focusing on contribution emphasis, we developed broad themes and subthemes. We develop, elaborate on, and detail the results of our analyses in the third section.

**An Historical Review of White Teacher Identity Studies**

In this section, we provide an historical account of White teacher identity studies and its development as a field of research. Our aim in this account is to historically situate the systematic review of White teacher identity literatures provided in the next section. Toward that end, we provide an historicized account that (a) acknowledges antedating and codeveloping foundational understandings in African American and critical White studies\(^5\) traditions, (b) outlines the emergence of White teacher identity studies, and (c) reviews recent conceptual critiques of the field. Although we believe the historical account provided here effectively and accurately situates the systematic review of the literatures that follows in the third section, this historical account does not represent a systematic review of the literatures prior to 2004, nor does this historical account aspire to render the entirety of the literatures that informed the emergence of White teacher identity studies.\(^6\) Rather, this historical account works within the limitations of providing a brief outline of broad intellectual currents that informed but did not cause nor result in the emergence of White teacher identity studies.

**Foundational Understandings**

Understanding the development of White teacher identity studies requires an acknowledgement of foundational understandings in African American and critical White studies traditions. These foundational understandings recognize and acknowledge the ongoing racialized tragedy in the United States emerging from White supremacy, discursively changing oppressive structures of racism, and the continuing savage injustices represented socially and educationally by segregation that structures White privileges along with violence and pathological deficit thinking regarding people of color.\(^7\)

The development of White teacher identity studies in the 1990s drew, in broad intellectual currents, on two separate sources: African American intellectual
traditions and critical White studies’ conceptual content. Often underemphasized or variously overlooked, antedating African American intellectual traditions provided important foundational contributions for White teacher identity studies as the latter emerged in education research and teacher education. These contributions included understandings of racism as dehumanizing historical–social institution (e.g., Douglass, 1845/1986; Du Bois, 1903/1995; Wells, 1991), race as embedded in knowledge and social identity (e.g., Du Bois, 1903/1995; X & Haley, 1964/1999), race as defining the construction of social “problems” (e.g., Du Bois, 1903/1995; Garvey, 1922/2004), an underlying whiteness in “democratic” power structures (e.g., Cooper, 1892/1990; Garvey, 1922/2004; X & Haley 1964/1999), uncritical education as process of whitening African American identity (e.g., Woodson, 1933/2000; X & Haley, 1964/1999), and early understandings of race-evasive White identities that, through moral complicity, perpetuated the structures of racism (e.g., Baldwin, 1963/1998a, 1965/1998b). Writ large, work in African American traditions provided many of the underlying assumptions that helped advance White teacher identity studies.

Though often underemphasized or variously ignored, African American traditions provided the broad intellectual currents that influenced foundational epistemological understandings of the study of race in the social sciences (e.g., Gates & West, 1997; McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993; Omi & Winant, 1986/1994; West, 1994) that both White scholars and scholars of color working in White teacher identity studies emphasize (Hughes & Berry, 2012, Lensmire, 2011, 2014). These foundational epistemological understandings articulated race as a binding yet discursively changing social construction managed through state and other historical institutions tied inextricably to concerns of nation building (McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993; Omi & Winant, 1986/1994). Broad currents in African American intellectual traditions took generations to complete an epistemological shift that moved race from a natural biological paradigm to a social and historical one. This epistemological shift, following broad intellectual currents in African American traditions, provided both initial theorizing on whiteness and White identity and more importantly the horizon of intelligibility for White teacher identity studies in the first place.

In addition to African American intellectual traditions, the emergence and consolidation of critical White studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s also informed and codeveloped with White teacher identity studies. Critical White studies, in its ascendance as an area of study, exercised considerable influence as a hot topic in a number of fields. In critical legal studies, critical race theory (CRT) drove at ways in which whiteness served as an institutional and historical identity-property of White-skinned people that emphasized legal status and guarantees that racialized others did not enjoy (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 1992, Harris, 1993/1995). Of particular importance in the development of critical White studies was Harris’s (1993/1995) notion of White identity property later emphasized in Ladson Billings and Tate’s (1995) introduction of CRT into education research. Though striking differences exist between CRT and critical White studies, scholars in both areas hold several of the same worldviews about race and its role in U.S. society.

In labor history, scholars emphasized that race represented an ever-changing historical–social deployment of White identity and its assimilative processes on
ethnic European immigrants in the United States (e.g., Brodkin Sacks, 1994/1997; Ignatiev, 1995; Roediger, 1994). Important in labor history scholars’ contributions is an understanding of White identity as a discursively constructed category deployed by an elite industrial era political machinery in order to produce an orderly, assimilative, and Americanized working class from unassimilated not-yet-White ethnic groups. Labor historians made visible White identities’ social and historical constructedness, and this understanding was key for advancing White teacher identity studies.

In cultural and literary studies, scholars working through representations in cinema, literature, and the humanities emphasized notions of whiteness as invisible normativity (e.g., Dyer, 1988, 1997; Hall, 1981; Morrison, 1992; West, 1993) that operated as an unseen “white eye” that was “always outside the frame—but seeing and positioning everything within it” (Hall, 1981, p. 39). Within these understandings, scholars argued that the recognition and naming of whiteness as invisible normativity advanced the understandings of power relations that perpetuated racial hegemony. These understandings were important in the development of researchers and teacher educators’ critical interventions directed at White preservice and professional teachers.

In educational leadership and policy studies, Scheurich (1993) discussed whiteness and hidden White racism embedded in the academy and academic identities. Later, Scheurich and Young (1997) published an investigative–speculative essay arguing that whiteness and White privilege were inherent in social science research epistemologies. These understandings informed researchers and teacher educators that whiteness and White identity were inherent in hegemonic institutions and their systems of knowledge.

In feminist theory and gender studies, scholars emphasized notions of White privilege and race-evasive White identities (e.g., Frankenberg, 1993; hooks, 1981, 1984, 1992; McIntosh, 1988). “White privilege,” as McIntosh (1988) defined it in her conceptual research essay, provided “an invisible package of unearned assets” (p. 1) whose existence White-skinned individuals frequently denied in articulating White “color- and power-evasive” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 141) identities. Additionally, hooks (1992) provided an early account of White students’ race-evasive “disbelief, shock, and rage, as they listened to black students talk about whiteness” (p. 339). Notions of White privilege and race-evasive identities came to inform, especially, the emergence of first-wave White teacher identity studies.

Critical White studies, codeveloping and interpenetrating a number of area studies, became its own field by the early 2000s with several edited volumes (e.g., Delgado & Stefancic, 1997; Fine, Weis, Powell, & Mun Wong, 1997; Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 1998) and specific area journals such as Race Traitor initiated by Ignatiev in 1993, New Abolitionist initiated by Niles and Olson in 2000, and Critical Race and Whiteness Studies initiated by Nicoll in 2005. The emergence of critical White studies as a field, along with foundational concepts provided in African American traditions, served to broadly inform and codevelop White teacher identity studies in education research and teacher education.
The Emergence of a Field

Concepts of racial identity as social–historical construct, whiteness as invisible normativity, White privilege and identity property, and White race-evasive identities informed and codeveloped with what we term first-wave White teacher identity studies. First-wave White teacher identity studies refer to research on White teacher identity that documented and critically emphasized White teachers’ articulation of race-evasive identities. Race-evasive studies, although varying in subthemes, all served to describe, substantiate, and document White teachers’ evasions, resistances, and denials of the saliency of race, White identities, White privileges, or whiteness inherent in knowledge and social institutions.

Though White teacher identity studies had important precursor statements (Baldwin, 1963/1998a; Paley, 1979; Woodson, 1933/2000), we identified Sleeter’s (1992, 1993) research as primary original texts in codeveloping and elaborating on critical White studies concepts in education research. Sleeter’s research provided foundational representations of White teachers’ race-evasive identities. Sleeter (1993), in summarizing her findings on a critical multicultural staff development project, wrote,

Faced with the paradox of liking and helping students of color while explaining away the subordination of people of color and adhering to social structures that benefit themselves and their own children, the White teachers I studied responded in patterned ways. Many simply refused to “see” color. Others searched for “positive” associations with race by drawing on their European ethnic experience. . . . Discussing race or multiculturalism meant discussing “them,” not the social structure. (p. 168)

McIntyre’s (1997a, 1997b, 2002) research affirmed Sleeter’s (1992, 1993) findings on White teachers’ race-evasive identities. McIntyre, who conducted interventionist action research, reported partial successes in her work with White female preservice teachers. Of particular importance in her research, McIntyre (1997b) emphasized preservice teachers’ persistent race-evasive “White talk” (p. 45) as an obstacle to consciousness raising efforts with her respondents. McIntyre’s notion of White talk was often cited in subsequent studies on White preservice and professional teachers’ race-evasive identities. White talk, defined by McIntyre (1997b), referred to “talk that serves to insulate White people from examining their/our individual and collective roles in the perpetuation of racism” (p. 45).

More important for understanding the development of White teacher identity studies was the overarching narrative that McIntyre’s (1997a, 1997b, 2002) work provided for other research that characterized first-wave studies. McIntyre’s research provided an overarching narrative that recounted (a) preservice and professional teachers’ common sense race-evasive identities, (b) professors or consultants’ critical interventions, (c) White preservice or professional teachers’ performance of race-evasive denials and resistances, and (d) finally, preservice and professional teachers’ partial conscientization or emergence of White ally identities.
Other research on White preservice teachers (Berlak, 1999; Lewis, 2001; Marx, 2003b; Marx & Pennington, 2003) and professional teachers (Glazier, 2003; Henze, Lucas, & Scott, 1998; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Kalin, 1999) overlapped with, codeveloped, or better defined part of McIntyre’s (1997a, 1997b, 2002) overarching narrative. Kalin (1999), documenting qualitative survey data gathered at staff development in-service trainings, demonstrated that White professional teachers’ understandings focused only on overt individual racism and evaded or failed to comprehend institutional, societal, or any other racialized structurings. Henze et al. (1998), reporting on difficult race-evasive resistances and silences during race-based staff development training, emphasized the importance of rules for open exchange and engagement. Glazier (2003), conducting research with White teachers in a multicultural reading group, documented respondents’ inability to discuss and tentative responses to racialized topics despite the saliency of race in the representations.

Furthermore, Berlak (1999), theorizing her work through a pedagogy of bearing witness, emphasized the problematic evasions of preservice teachers of color who colluded with White preservice teachers to obstruct critical interventions. Marx and Pennington (2003), who developed a self-disclosure pedagogy and mutual cultural therapy, provided similar accounts in which preservice teachers evaded and yet partially adhered to understandings of whiteness and White privilege.

Perhaps emblematic of first-wave White teacher identity studies, Hytten and Warren (2003) provided a thorough typology of White race-evasive identities, including appeals to self, progress, authenticity, and extremes. Lewis (2001), taking a more complex sociological approach than previous studies, thoroughly documented teachers, parents, and administrators’ White race-evasive identities that reproduced the social racialized order in a predominantly White suburban school. Finally, Thompson’s (2003) speculative essay, perhaps signaling the cul-de-sac of exclusively race-evasive foci, emphasized White educators’ paradoxical race-evasive White exceptionalism, White privilege, and the reconstitution of whiteness in the very anti-racist identities ostensibly “offered up” by critical White studies literatures themselves.

Publishing several of the watershed studies mentioned above (Hytten & Warren, 2003; Marx, 2003a; Marx & Pennington, 2003; Thompson, 2003) as well as an important conceptual critique of the area (McCarthy, 2003), Marx’s (2003a, 2003b) special issue of Qualitative Studies in Education, we argue, culminated first-wave White teacher identity studies. First-wave White teacher identity studies embodied the emergence of an area of research that drove directly at racialized injustices in education, called out the insularity of White privilege, denounced the falsity of White race-evasive identities, and provided a much needed discussion of racism, whiteness, and White privilege as it related to teaching, learning, and schooling in the United States.

At the same time, discursive seeds within first-wave studies had already begun to grow and move beyond documenting White teachers’ race evasion. These discursive seeds had begun to move toward greater complexity of analyses inherent in second-wave studies systematically reviewed in the next section. New themes, though not main emphases of first-wave studies, began to appear that examined...
new directions. These new directions included reflexive embeddedness of White researchers within the research and research institutions (Marx & Pennington, 2003; McIntyre, 1997b; Thompson, 2003), critical discussions of whiteness pedagogy (Berlak, 1999; Marx & Pennington, 2003), complex sociological dimensions of color-blind ideologies (Lewis, 2001), racialized critiques of humanist caring (McIntyre, 1997a), and an ethics of vigilance (Thompson, 2003) that critiqued exceptional White positionalities.

More significantly, first-wave White teacher identity studies influenced key educational foundations textbooks destined for preservice and professional teachers’ readership. For example, textbooks came to represent race as an historical–social construction, and whiteness, White privilege, and White teachers’ race-evasive identities became established content in textbook representations (e.g., Bennett, 2007; Johnson, Musial, Hall, Gollnick, & Dupius, 2008; Spring, 2012; Tozer, Senese, & Violas, 2009). Additionally, understandings of White privilege and White teachers’ race-evasive identities appeared in important companion texts directed at White preservice and professional teachers’ readership (e.g., Howard, 1999/2006; Landsman, 2009; Lewis & Landsman, 2011; Nieto, 1999). Within these textbooks, the pathway suggested for White preservice and professional teachers focused on transforming White race-evasive identities into White ally identities (Howard, 1999/2006; Landsman, 2009; Lewis & Landsman, 2011; Nieto, 1999; Tatum, 1997).

**Toward a Second Wave: Conceptual Critiques**

In its first wave, White teacher identity studies became established as a diversity component represented in textbook and companion texts. White teacher identity studies, however tenuously, established a home for itself in education research and teacher education and became institutionalized in educational foundations’ diversity course arrangement in preservice and professional teachers’ programs (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2013; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008).

However, conceptual critiques of first-wave White teacher identity studies emerged, despite the field’s successes and institutionalized status. Working through conceptual critiques, second-wave White teacher identity studies seek to further develop the field outlined above by incorporating previous conceptual content and advancing new concepts. Important in our understanding of second-wave White teacher identity studies are the notions of generous-recognition and critical engagement with first-wave studies. Generously recognizing and critically engaging previous research, second-wave White teacher identity studies reviewed below variously echo, initiate, articulate, or follow conceptual critiques of first-wave studies. These conceptual critiques were developed by both scholars of color and White scholars.

First, and most important, these conceptual critiques assumed that the study of cultural identities was “now well-established in the field of education” (Asher, 2007, p. 65). Conceptual critiques understood first-wave White teacher identity studies not as an insurgent knowledge, as previously understood, but rather as institutionalized knowledge (Asher, 2007; Lensmire et al., 2013; Lensmire &
Snaza, 2010; Lowenstein, 2009). The fact that first-wave studies had become received and institutionalized knowledge suggested the need for further critique and refinement.

Second, from this understanding of received institutionalized knowledge, conceptual critiques identified limitations of essentialized representations of White identities that “group all teacher candidates into a kind of monolithic category” (Lowenstein, 2009, p. 168). McCarthy (2003), in a well-cited conceptual essay critiquing first-wave research in Marx’s (2003b) special issue, argued that monolithic understandings that equated whiteness with White-skinned individuals failed to drive at understandings of whiteness that included historicized complexities of race, class, gender, and nation building.


Fourth, these conceptual critiques, ultimately in their trajectory, rejected identity simplicity that “reifies stereotypes and ‘us’-and-‘them’ binaries,” and in place of essentializing binary thinking, conceptual critiques emphasized “multiplicities and nuances” (Asher, 2007, p. 65). Following these directions, conceptual critiques drove at understandings of White identities that assumed White privilege and whiteness yet understood complex, nuanced, and relational components of White identity in relation to both racialized hegemony and others. In driving at identity complexity, nuance, and relationality, the conceptual critiques emphasized a greater attention to theorizing whiteness pedagogies (Asher, 2007; Jupp, 2013; Lensmire, 2011, 2014; Lensmire et al., 2013; Lowenstein, 2009) as their main critical aim.

Most clearly stating the focus on whiteness pedagogies, Lensmire et al. (2013) critiqued essentialized representations in McIntosh (1988) in explaining

it is time for us to move to more complex treatments of how to work with white people on questions of race and white supremacy and also for new theorizations of the identities and actions white people might take up in the name of antiracism. (p. 412)

The conceptual critiques outlined above understand and emphasize first-wave White teacher identity studies as foundational and necessary interventions. Nonetheless, these conceptual critiques advanced key new themes and directions
for White teacher identity studies research represented in the results of our analyses below.

Results

Emergent Themes in Second-Wave Literatures

Following the research aims of the synoptic text, criteria for text selection, and analysis of thematic patterns described in the earlier section on research methodology, we established a document universe for this study (N = 65). Using a thematic analytical approach, two broad categories emerged that we considered indicative of second-wave White teacher identity studies: (a) race-evasive studies with new emphases (n = 20) and (b) race-visible studies (n = 45). Within the race-visible studies, we detected two predominant subthemes: White identity complexities (30 of 45) and programmatic pedagogy/curriculum (15 of 45). We discuss, detail, and substantiate these emergent themes and subthemes in White teacher identity studies literatures between 2004 and 2014 in the results below (see Figures 1 and 2). Our results document a shift toward second-wave White teacher identity studies that are further discussed in the final section. Second-wave White teacher identity studies refers to a multidimensional field studying the cultural production of race, whiteness, and White teacher identities that articulates complex historical and social forces along with related understandings of teaching and learning in context.

Race-Evasive Studies

New Emphases

Studies emphasizing White teachers’ race-evasive identities continued to make significant contributions to White teacher identity studies. New patterns emergent within race-evasive White teacher identity research included...
(a) new methodological–epistemological directions, (b) increased researcher reflexivity, (c) further conceptual refinements, and (d) fertile paradoxes. Importantly, second-wave White teacher identity studies pushed forward with new refinements in understanding White teachers’ race-evasive identities that have relevance both for education researchers and for teacher education practitioners. Before looking at studies that advanced new emphases, however, it is important to note that several scholars in this group emphasized White teachers’ race-evasive identities (e.g., Amos, 2011; Picower, 2009; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005) in ways that very much reflected previous research studies (e.g., Hytten & Warren, 2003; McIntyre, 1997a, 1997b, 2002; Sleeter, 1992, 1993).

**New Methodological–Epistemological Directions**

We found new methodological–epistemological directions in recent race-evasive White teacher identity literatures. One new methodological–epistemological direction advanced poststructuralist and psychoanalytic understandings in analyzing empirical silences. Mazzei (2004, 2008, 2011) provided these advancements to White teacher identity studies. Theorizing silence in her research, Mazzei came to understand preservice and professional teachers’ empirically observed silences as the expression of White privilege in the first place, as a fear of loss of these privileges, and as a desire to maintain and enact “a whole social world” (Mazzei, 2011, p. 666). Overall, Mazzei (2004, 2008, 2011), through poststructuralist and psychoanalytic understandings of empirical silences, advanced previous understandings of White preservice and professional teachers’ resistances, silences, and inability to articulate their racial identities (e.g., Glazier, 2003; Henze et al., 1998; Marx & Pennington, 2003).

---

**FIGURE 2. Race-visible White teacher identity studies, 2004 to 2014.**

Note: The figure illustrates the subthemes that emerged within race-visible studies.
Another new methodological–epistemological direction focused on representing the voices of preservice and professional teachers of color on the topic of White identities (Amos, 2010; Michie, 2007). Michie, representing this new direction, interviewed teachers of color asking for advice regarding White teachers’ professional identities. Michie (2007) reported that teachers of color advised beginning teachers that “[r]ace is a big issue for students. . . . And it affects their attitudes toward new teachers when they come in” (p. 4). Michie’s respondents, all teachers of color, argued that White teachers needed to move beyond color-blind or White race-evasive identities and develop racial awareness and sensitivities as part of entering the profession.

Amos (2010), developing a similar methodological–epistemological direction, studied voices of preservice teachers of color in her multicultural foundations of education classes. In these classes, preservice teachers of color experienced frustration, despair, and fear regarding angry White preservice teachers’ race-evasive identities and accompanying resentful backlashes. Important in Amos’s (2010) research was the documentation of the perceptions of preservice teachers of color who became “fearful for their own safety” (p. 35). Michie (2007) and Amos’s (2010) inclusion of voices of respondents of color on White identities signaled an important new direction in White teacher identity studies as a further refinement of previous White race-evasive identities.

**Increased Researcher Reflexivity**

In addition to new methodological–epistemological directions, we found increased researcher reflexivity in recent race-evasive White teacher literatures (Case & Hemmings, 2005; Marx, 2004; Pennington, 2007). Marx’s (2004) and Pennington’s (2007) increased researcher reflexivity tied their own stories of teaching and learning about whiteness and White identity with those of their students. This approach of carefully intertwining respondents and researchers’ stories clearly differed from previous research on White teacher identity studies. Marx (2004) and Pennington (2007) emphasized the value of trust between researcher and respondent in creating authentic identity exchanges and sometimes significant transformations with several respondents. Moreover, Marx (2004) and Pennington (2007) articulated the notion of the reflexive researcher embedded in whiteness rather than researcher as critical White studies scholar perched on the observation deck hovering over and analyzing White respondents’ transcripts.

Echoing similar findings to previous race-evasive research, Case and Hemmings (2005) demonstrated increased researcher reflexivity as well. Case and Hemmings’ contribution consisted of an increased reflexivity that made themselves as researchers accountable for White preservice teachers’ failures to gain racialized consciousness. Rather than concluding with disavowals of respondents’ wrong-headedness, Case and Hemmings developed an ethical stance regarding whiteness pedagogy important in other race-visible studies discussed below. In developing this ethical stance, the researchers pedagogically and reflexively approached the content of antiracist curriculum that “may be inadvertently excluding White women” (Case & Hemmings, 2005, p. 622). In demonstrating increased pedagogical reflexivity, Case and Hemmings (2005, p. 623) argued for a “metadialogic approach where students essentially talk about White talk” and its
meanings for White students and students of color. Case and Hemmings’ increased researcher reflexivity represented a significant departure from previous research on White teacher identities because it clearly accounted for White respondents’ “feelings of uncertainty about what they could and could not say” (p. 614). In demonstrating increased researcher reflexivity, Marx (2004), Pennington (2007), and Case and Hemmings contributed to White teacher identity studies by developing ethical responsibilities to engage rather than variously critique or dismiss White respondents’ reified common sense understandings.

Conceptual Refinements

Third, new research on White teachers’ race-evasive identities yielded important conceptual refinements regarding whiteness embedded in humanist caring (Marx, 2008; Pennington, Brock, & Ndura, 2012) and standards-based teaching and learning (Garza & Garza, 2010), along with fine-grained parsings of White race-evasive identities (Picower, 2009). Pennington et al. (2012) examined White preservice teachers’ conceptions of “caring” in ethnographic field notes and student work samples and examined the pernicious role “White privilege plays in teacher/student caring relationships” (p. 767). Advancing similar understandings to McIntyre (1997a), Marx (2008, p. 54) demonstrated that successful White teachers in her study could “relate to students as ‘human beings,’” but that respondents’ a-critical race-evasive identities belied humanist-assimilationist banking education (Freire, 1970).

Further elaborating on humanist-assimilationist education, Garza and Garza (2010) analyzed standards-based teaching and learning protocol-checklists with White respondents deemed “effective teachers” by their principals. Garza and Garza found a laudable standards-based can-do attitude and tenacious belief that all children can learn. Nonetheless, Garza and Garza’s respondents who adopted all children discourses did not engage in discussions of race regarding their students. In respondents’ race-evasive identities, Garza and Garza (2010, p. 200) found White supremacist assumptions in which “assimilation was the underlying premise.”

In addition to illuminating whiteness in humanist caring and standards-based discourses, Picower’s (2009) research provided new fine-grained conceptual content to White race-evasive identities. Picower (2009) demonstrated preservice teachers’ active reconstitution of White privilege (Leonardo, 2002) in teasing out new race-evasive tools, such as “it’s personal not political” (p. 206), “racism is out of my control” (p. 207), Whites can “just be nice” (p. 208), helping the “less fortunate” (p. 209), and “I would kiss a minority” (p. 210). Thus, new refinements of White race-evasive identities were identified in the racialization of caring, effectiveness, and standards-based all children discourses as well as in new race-evasive tools that White preservice teachers used in consolidating their whiteness.

In sum, these refinements and fine-grained parsings of White teachers’ race-evasive identities updated previous research on White race-evasive identities; yet more important, this research also updated the a-critical and assimilationist ideological contexts previously described in McIntyre (1997a, 1997b), Marx (2003a), and Marx and Pennington (2003) particularly calling out humanist caring and all children standards-based discourses.
Fertile Paradoxes

Fourth, we found fertile paradoxes in recent literatures on White race-evasive teacher identities (Amos, 2011; Haviland, 2008; LaDuke, 2009; Segall & Garrett, 2013, Vaught & Castagno, 2008; Yoon, 2012). These fertile paradoxes led into the discussion on the problematics and potentials of race-visible White identities further discussed below. Fertile paradoxes articulated a complex cultural production of race-visibility inside White teachers’ personal or institutional-level race-evasion. Both Amos (2011) and LaDuke (2009) clearly articulated this paradox. Amos (2011) found that respondents recognized White privileges, yet simultaneously reincorporated understandings of White privilege back into race-evasive notions of humanist diversity. LaDuke (2009) came to similar conclusions in her research with White preservice teachers. Like Amos discussed above, LaDuke (2009) documented that many White preservice teachers showed “acceptance or at least acknowledgement of it [White privilege]” (p. 42). However, her respondents’ acceptance or acknowledgement “was not associated with a responsibility to take on antiracist identities or actions” (LaDuke, 2009, p. 42).

Similarly, Haviland (2008) and Segall and Garrett (2013) demonstrated the problematics of race-visible preservice and professional teachers’ identities that nonetheless avoided critical race discussions. Haviland reported on a graduate-level seminar for White teachers who ostensibly wanted to further develop critical teaching through race, whiteness, and White identity. In her study, Haviland found, even within a seminar of White teachers who self-selected to participate in purposeful discussions on race, that these respondents used a variety of strategies to evade serious critical content. Following the same respondents back into their classrooms, Haviland (2008, p. 40) found classroom teaching and learning ostensibly about race that tended to “‘gloss over’ issues of race, racism, and White supremacy.”

Reiterating this same paradox of race visibility inside race-evasive identities, Segall and Garrett (2013) documented that preservice teachers in the study “did not simply avoid the topic, preferring instead to invoke race” (p. 284) in discussing social inequalities. However, even as respondents recognized racialized inequalities, they subsequently diminished race “rendering it insignificant or irrelevant to events” (Segall & Garrett, 2013, p. 284). Important in Segall and Garrett (2013) was the need to follow students’ demonstrations of understanding racial inequality as they, nonetheless, reified neoliberal understandings of individualism.

Finally, Vaught and Castagno (2008) and Yoon’s (2012) research began to unravel the paradox of race-visibility inside race-evasive identities. Vaught and Castagno (2008) and Yoon (2012) provided sociological analyses that triangulated school institutions, race-conscientizing professional development on awareness of White privilege, and respondents’ race evasion. Vaught and Castagno (2008) focused on the problematic mismatch between professional development focused on individual White teachers’ awareness of White privilege that failed to embed these understandings within “the collective White structure of school districts as institutions” (p. 104). Equally important, Yoon (2012) provided a qualitative study of a school-level equity team tasked with challenging and transforming racialized inequalities. The equity team in Yoon’s (2012) study, rather than providing critical understanding of race in the school community, instead exemplified “whiteness at
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work” (p. 589). Yoon’s (2012) analysis demonstrated how an equity team charged with confronting racial inequalities actually served to reify whiteness through facile disavowals of White teachers’ complicities, understandings of diversity as “sensitivities,” and ameliorative central office politics.

We think that Vaught and Castagno (2008) and Yoon (2012) drove at and provided analyses of the complex forces that produced designated race-visibility within White teachers’ race-evasive identities (Rains, 1999). Following Lewis’s (2001) sociology of White identity and whiteness in schooling, this new research articulated the complex cultural production of both race-visibility and race-evasion in sociological contexts.

Race-Evasive Studies With New Emphases Summary

Overall, White teacher identity studies continued to advance new and important race-evasive studies to inform education research and teacher education. These race-evasive studies included new methodological–epistemological directions, increased researcher reflexivity, further conceptual refinements, and fertile paradoxes. Importantly, fertile paradoxes, which articulated race-evasion within race-visible White identities, provided an ever more complex sociology of whiteness and White identity in education. This complex sociology situated individual teachers’ White identities and often “good intentions” within the machinations of whiteness at work within larger institutional and societal structurings.

Race-Visible Studies

Definition

Though White race-evasive identities remained an important analytical theme within second-wave White teacher identity studies, our review of the White teacher identity research between 2004 and 2014 uncovered burgeoning new research lines emphasizing race-visible White teacher identities. Race-visible White teacher identities, as definition, refer to White preservice and professional teacher identities that by degrees recognized race, class, culture, language, and other differences in students and themselves and understood differences as having potentials for teaching and learning. In our review of the literatures, race-visible teacher identities (45 of 65) became the focus of the majority of White teacher identity studies’ second wave. Race-visible studies developed two subthemes: (a) White identity complexity (30 of 45) and (b) programmatic whiteness pedagogies/curriculum structures (15 of 45). We review and analyze articles representing each of these subthemes in turn, below.

Importantly, race-visible White teacher identity studies built on notions of whiteness and White privilege found in previous race-evasive studies. Nonetheless, rather than following race-evasive research lines, race-visible White teacher identity studies instead began to carefully illuminate White teachers’ understandings of race, class, culture, language, and other differences in personal and professional contexts. Moreover, these race-visible White teacher identity studies often used purposive samples of White respondents who provided degrees of racial recognition or conscientization.
White Identity Complexity

Our review of the race-visible literatures revealed that the largest group of research studies (30 of 45) that emerged over the last decade drove at race-visible White identity complexity. We use the term White identity complexity to characterize studies that described complex White identities for teaching and learning on race, class, culture, language, and other differences. Within these studies articulating new and complex race-visible White identity complexity, we found the following subthemes: inadequacy of stage models, empirical complexities, development of cultural competence, and the problem of theory-practice. Often echoing though not always directly citing conceptual critics (Appelbaum, 2003, 2005; Asher, 2007; Lensmire, 2011, 2014; Lowenstein, 2009; McCarthy, 2003), research emphasizing White identity complexity closely studied White teachers’ identities inside and outside of the classroom, providing greater understandings of context, detail, complexity, and nuance.

Inadequacy of stage models. We found three studies that directly emphasized the inadequacy of White identity development stage models (Han, West-Olatunji, & Thomas, 2011; Hill-Jackson, 2007; Horton & Scott, 2004). These three research studies, analyzing White teachers’ empirical qualitative or narrative data, struggled to locate White preservice and professional teachers on Helms’ (1990), Tatum’s (1997), or other researchers’ White identity or cross-cultural development models. Han et al. (2011), analyzing empirical narrative data, concluded that “all of them [preservice teachers] represented multiple statuses of White racial identity development outlined by Helms” (p. 7). Horton and Scott (2004), using biographical case studies, emphasized the problematics of stage models concluding that “both Helms and Tatum’s models seemed to act as descriptors of states of mind rather than [developmental] processes” (p. 16). Hill-Jackson (2007), providing a conceptual overview of various models of White and multicultural identity development, characterized 67% of her respondents as culturally “responsive” (p. 31) to understanding cultural and racialized identity differences, yet she noted that within this responsiveness White preservice teachers flip-flopped “between apathy and interest” (p. 31). Though her study maintained the use of stage models as a teaching heuristic, Hill-Jackson’s (2007) study as well as the other two studies reported on the inadequacy of stage models for representing the complex identity processes they experienced in their teaching with White preservice and professional teachers. This critique of stage models began to call into question simplistic notions of White race-evasive/ally binaries assumed or alluded to in many companion texts (Howard, 1999/2006; Landsman, 2009; Lewis & Landsman, 2011; Nieto, 1999; Tatum, 1997).

Empirical identity complexities. In addition to studies that emphasized the inadequacy of stage models, we found nine studies that emphasized empirical identity complexities of White identity (Adair, 2013, Chubbuck, 2004; Johnson Lachuck & Mosely, 2011; Jupp & Slattery, 2010a, 2010b; Laughter, 2011; Mosley & Rogers, 2011; Raible & Irizzary, 2007; Warren & Hytten, 2004). Concerned with racialized identity responsiveness, critical race conscientization, or racial literacy,
these nine race-visible studies provided detailed representations of the problematics and potentials of White preservice and professional teachers’ racialized understandings.

Within this group of nine studies, five studies employed ethnography, social biography, life history, or narrative in order to complicate understandings of White preservice and professional teachers’ identities (Johnson Lachuk & Mosley, 2011; Jupp & Slattery, 2010a; Laughter, 2011; Raible & Irizzary, 2007; Warren & Hytten, 2004). These five studies challenged static or monolithic understandings of White identity and White privilege (Jupp & Slattery, 2010a), argued for whiteness pedagogies that “listen to preservice teachers’ stories” (Johnson Lachuk & Mosley, 2011, p. 327), emphasized the recognition of White preservice and professional teachers “as diverse both within and across multiple communities” (Laughter, 2011, p. 50), detailed liminal and race-visible “Critical Democrat” (Warren & Hytten, 2004, p. 330) White identities, or argued for White identity creativity that “transforms whiteness in innovative ways with racialized others” (Raible & Irizarry, 2007, p. 195).

Of these five studies, Raible and Irizarry (2007) best articulated the emphasis on empirical complexity. Raible and Irizarry (2007) provided social biographies of two race cognizant White teachers, Ashley and Jessica, who articulated “transracialized identities” (p. 180). For Raible and Irizarry, transracialized identities emerged not as an abrupt rupture of White race-evasive consciousness but rather as a habitus negotiated through “identifications with racial others made in interracial discourses” (p. 195). Important in Raible and Irizarry’s (2007) study (which was also echoed in Jupp & Slattery, 2010a) is an understanding that conscientized race-visible identities form as part of a larger life habitus of interaction with racialized others rather than through abrupt consciousness raising events or critical consciousness conversions.

The other four studies emphasizing empirical complexity drove at White preservice and professional teachers’ identity contradictions (Adair, 2013; Chubbuck, 2004; Jupp & Slattery, 2010b, Mosley & Rogers, 2011). This second group of four studies employed life history, narrative inquiry, interview study, and ethnography as methodologies. Two of these studies drove directly at identity contradictions revealing White teachers’ critical-racial understandings and deficit thinking (Jupp & Slattery, 2010b) and demonstrating that even conscientized antiracist White teachers often “enact rather than disrupt Whiteness” (Chubbuck, 2004, p. 329). Two other studies driving at identity contradictions (Adair, 2013; Mosley & Rogers, 2011) challenged either/or dilemma thinking seemingly inherent in White teachers’ identity contradictions.

Mosley and Rogers (2011), subordinating either/or thinking in White ally/race-evasive understandings, maintained that White respondents developed racial literacy in a liminal “space of indeterminacy” (p. 321). As part of their discussion, Mosley and Rogers (2011) argued that this space of indeterminacy allowed for the shifting of hegemonic common sense understandings and critiques of “structures that are unjust” (p. 321). Following a similar direction, Adair (2013) described both early childhood teachers of color and White early childhood teachers’ ethnographic data through normative understandings of whiteness. Adair’s (2013) study demonstrated teachers of color and White teachers’ contradictory embrace
of diversity and deficit thinking in relation to racialized Latino and Asian immigrant communities. Adair (2013), in analyzing this ethnographic data, summarized “whiteness can be threatening to everyone; overcome-able by everyone and anyone” (p. 643-666). Importantly, all these nine studies emphasized empirical identity complexities not as a way of ignoring or distracting us from the urgency of responding to enduring systemic racism and White privilege but rather as a means of creating critical exchanges and understandings for social justice projects in the present moment.

Development of cultural competence. Adding to race-visible subthemes, we also found 15 new empirical studies, often framed in terms of the demographic imperative and cultural responsiveness, which qualitatively documented White preservice or professional teachers’ development of cultural competence.11 Of these 15 studies, 5 studies focused on White preservice teachers (Bueler, Ruggles Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Edwards, 2011; McDonough, 2009; Saunders, 2012; Seattlage, 2011) and 10 focused on White professional teachers (Ford, 2013; Hyland, 2005,12 2009; Jupp & Slattery, 2012; Milner, 2008, 2010; Monroe, 2009; Ullucci, 2010, 2011; Vetter, 2013). These studies extended notions of race-visible identities into respondents’ professional identities and subject area teaching in context.

Regarding the studies on preservice teachers, these five studies used narrative inquiry, case studies, and document study in emphasizing preservice teachers’ journeys toward cultural competence. These studies described White preservice teachers who did not maintain “a color blind ideology” (McDonough, 2009, p. 532), characterized respondents’ understandings as “forward movement followed by missteps and backsliding” (Bueler et al., 2009, p. 416), revealed respondents’ “willingness to learn from . . . students” (Saunders, 2012, p. 20), documented “cross cultural relationships” (Edwards, 2011), and demonstrated that preservice teachers can learn “to reflect critically upon issues of access, discrimination and privilege” (Seattlage, 2011, p. 828).

Seattlage (2011), following Lowenstein’s (2009) conceptual critique, best represented this group of studies. Seattlage (2011), in documenting preservice teachers’ learning in a qualitative mixed-methods study, argued that in order to advance teaching and learning for cultural competence in the present moment it is necessary to take up “the same pedagogy we would hold as ideals for our teachers when they work with diverse populations” (p. 829). Important in this group of studies is that they documented the problematic pathways that preservice teachers took in developing racialized understandings. Emphasizing both problematics and potentials, when taken together, these studies begin to provide an overarching narrative of preservice teachers’ racial conscientization and (always partial) classroom implementations of cultural competence in action.

Regarding the studies on professional teachers’ development of cultural competence, these 10 studies employed life history, narrative, interview study, and ethnography in articulating respondents’ understandings of cultural competence. These studies discussed problematics and potentials of professional teachers whose practice reflected the literatures “that described culturally relevant teachers” (Hyland, 2009, p. 107), provided counternarratives of teachers “who learned from students and colleagues of color” (Milner, 2010, p. 76), and illustrated how
teachers “attempted to leverage AAL [African American Language]” (Vetter, 2013, p. 200) in teaching and learning. Furthermore, these studies described teachers’ content area teaching mediated through students’ cultural identities (Jupp & Slattery, 2012), culturally responsive understandings of classroom management (Monroe, 2009), and engagement in “critical race reflection—deliberate, race-centered thinking that seeks to uncover hidden values and unconscious bias” (Ullucci, 2010, p. 146).

Milner’s (2010) research on Mr. Hall best characterized this group of studies. Milner’s (2008, 2010) broader project focuses on culturally relevant teaching and describes both Black and White teachers’ professional ethics, classroom environment, assessment strategies, work habits and dress, and commitments to students. In his work on Mr. Hall, Milner (2010) documents how this White teacher sustained “meaningful relationships with his students” (p. 76), “confronted matters of race with them” (p. 76), and “perceived teaching as a communal affair” (p. 76). Importantly, these 10 studies on White professional teachers began to describe White teachers’ (always partial) enactment of cultural competence in teaching and learning in specific classroom settings. Focusing on cultural competency in action, these studies articulated the problematics and potentials of developing White preservice and professional identities that strive at teaching through racialized identities.

The problem of theory-to-practice. Finally, we found three race-visible studies that involved White preservice and professional teachers who recognized students’ cultural identities as resources for teaching and learning, but these studies focused on the problem of theory to practice. Using qualitative interview, document study, and ethnography, studies in this group emphasized White preservice and professional teachers’ understanding of the salience of race, class, culture, and language as part of teaching and learning, but also represented respondents’ difficulties in integrating these understanding into subject area teaching (Henfield & Washington, 2012; Lander, 2011; Lee, Moss, & Coughlin, 2011). These three studies emphasized that teachers understood that cultural identities related to engaging students but found that teachers’ racial “awareness did not necessarily lead to practice” (Lee et al., 2011, p. 253), that preservice teachers needed support “into their first and subsequent years” (Lander, 2011, p. 363), and that White teachers wanted “more professional development opportunities on diversity” (Henfield & Washington, 2012, p. 158) rather than test preparation. This group of studies emphasized that on-going support is required for teachers’ professional growth in subject area teaching through race and other differences.

Identity complexity summary. Overall, the 30 studies emphasizing race-visible White identity complexity provided a burgeoning new research base in second-wave White teacher identity studies yet to be integrated into textbooks or companion texts in teacher education. These studies, seeking to inform whiteness pedagogies, racialized consciousness, and the development of cultural competence, emphasized White identity complexity in rejecting stage model understandings,
described complicated White identities and their journeys, narrated challenges and rewards of subject area teaching through students’ cultural identities, and suggested professional supports needed for moving from theory to practice.

Programmatic Pedagogy/Curriculum

In addition to White identity complexity as subtheme in second-wave White teacher identity studies, a second subtheme of race-visible research focused on documenting programmatic pedagogy/curriculum for White identity change (15 of 45). We characterize documenting programmatic pedagogy/curriculum as studies that reported on specific pedagogical or curriculum program interventions that by degrees brought about White preservice and professional teachers’ critical teaching or cultural competence. Of the 15 studies documenting programmatic pedagogy/curriculum for race-visible identities, six emphasized whiteness pedagogies and nine emphasized curriculum structures.

Studies focused on whiteness pedagogies. These six studies reported on pedagogical approaches for advancing White teachers’ racial recognitions or cultural competence. These studies used narrative, ethnography, hermeneutic analysis, critical discourse analysis, and qualitative case studies for documenting White preservice and professional teachers’ degrees of identity development and change (Adair, 2008; Davis, 2009; Gainer & Larrotta, 2010; Pennington & Brock, 2012; Rogers & Mosely, 2008; Ullucci, 2012). These studies reported on the pedagogical role of Latino students in making whiteness “noticeable, capable of having characteristics, making mistakes and being misleading” (Adair, 2008, p. 203); pedagogical uses of autoethnography for providing White preservice teachers with “an understanding of their White racial identity” (Pennington & Brock, 2012, p. 245); and book clubs in which White preservice teachers enacted “racial literacy as defined by critical race theorists” (Rogers & Mosley, 2008, p. 126). Furthermore, these studies articulated narrativized pedagogies as a critical praxis for “White students to identify their own cultural heritage” (Ullucci, 2012, p. 94); pedagogical interruptions of whiteness and deficit thinking as “powerful spaces of teaching and learning” (Gainer & Larrotta, 2010, p. 42); and transactive critical consultative model for developing White preservice teachers’ abilities to receive and reflect on “feedback from the school children” (Davis, 2009, p. 16). Overall, this group of studies focused on and articulated whiteness pedagogies for developing White preservice and professional teachers’ race visible identity recognitions or conscientization.

Ullucci’s (2012) work on narrative whiteness pedagogy best articulated the focus on whiteness pedagogy for race-visible identities. Ullucci (2012) developed narrative pedagogy as a method to operationalize her students’ “understandings of critical race reflection, critical race theory, and critical teacher reflection” (p. 92). Ullucci (2012), in analyzing more than 100 of her students’ racialized autobiographies, found that students identified whiteness and White privilege in “their own cultural heritage” (p. 94). Additionally, Ullucci found that students from local
Portuguese-speaking communities also drove at greater hybridization, including discussion of White identity integration with “Moorish, African, [and] South American influences” (p. 100). Ullucci’s (2012) study emphasized that, through narrative pedagogies, White professional teachers made significant breakthroughs, though “it would be disingenuous to suggest that these narratives have no room to grow” (p. 103). Race-visible White teacher identity studies on whiteness pedagogies began to describe, especially, narrative and autobiographical teaching and learning that documented students’ learning about race, whiteness, and White identity. Echoing Lowenstein’s (2009) conceptual critique and Lensmire et al.’s (2013) call for working differently with White preservice and professional teachers, studies focused on whiteness pedagogies began to demonstrate that nonessentializing identity understandings available in autobiographies and teacher identity narratives played an important role in the development of race-visible recognitions or conscientization.

Studies focused on curriculum structures. Nine other studies focused on curriculum structures for race-visible identity recognitions or conscientization. Studies focused on curriculum structures used interview study, ethnography, document study, and (mostly) case studies for discussing their curriculum programs and associated whiteness pedagogies (Blaisdell, 2005; Denevi & Pastan, 2006; Moule & Higgins, 2007; Reyes & Bishop, 2005; Saffold & Bales, 2011; Saffold & Longwell-Grice, 2007; Seidl & Hancock, 2011; Ukpokodu, 2004; Waddell, 2011). Race-visible studies emphasizing programmatic curriculum discussed White identities developed through professional teachers’ engagement in CRT curriculum (Blaisdell, 2005), curriculum labs that strengthened teaching through “children’s ethnicity, gender, language, and social class” (Saffold & Bales, 2011, p. 10), and the development of critical White studies support groups designed to embrace “Whites who come together to support one another in the struggle against racism” (Denevi & Pastan, 2006, p. 71).

Furthermore, studies focusing on curriculum structures emphasized preservice teachers’ course work combined with field experiences for advancing race-visible recognitions or conscientization. These studies described course work and field placements that helped preservice teachers’ understand cultural identity as a means for teaching and learning (Saffold & Longwell-Grice, 2007), raised preservice teachers’ “awareness to seriously and critically consider diversity” (Reyes & Bishop, 2005, p. 154), and provided preservice teachers with “a new understanding of self and others” (Waddell, 2011, p. 31). Moreover, these studies documented field experiences with Black mentors who developed White preservice teachers’ cultural competence in teaching and disciplining African American students (Moule & Higgins, 2007), revealed preservice teachers’ “new understanding and critical cultural knowledge” (Ukpokodu, 2004, p. 23), and theorized preservice teachers’ “development of a mature double image within multicultural, critically-oriented teacher education” (Seidl & Hancock, 2011, p. 696).

Seidl and Hancock (2011) best articulated the focus on curriculum structures. Following Trainor (2002), Lensmire (2010), and Case and Hemmings (2005),
Seidl and Hancock (2011) explained that White teachers’ race-evasive identities meant that “we have failed to find the pedagogies adequate to support White students’ transitioning out of naiveté and into productive conversations about race, racism, oppression, privilege, and Whiteness” (p. 692). Seidl and Hancock (2011), developing the notion of White double image as mature antiracist identity, discussed the field experiences of White internship teachers at Mt. Olivet, an African American community church. In this setting, White interns became aware that others viewed them as White and were unsure “if those perceptions were all positive” (p. 700). Through course work and supporting field experiences, White interns worked through White denials and understandings of Black anger toward a “mature double image [that] allows White teachers to grow into their abilities to work across raced lines” (p. 705). Seidl and Hancock (2011) lived out Case and Hemmings’ (2005) demand that instructors and programs assume responsibility for actually teaching White preservice and professional teachers’ about race, whiteness, and White identity.

Programmatic pedagogy/curriculum summary. The 15 studies focusing on programmatic pedagogy/curriculum emphasized whiteness pedagogies and curriculum structures that brought about significant degrees of race-visible recognition in White preservice and professional teachers’ identities. Programmatic pedagogy/curriculum provided particular descriptions detailing a base of pedagogical and curriculum wisdom (Eisner, 1979; Henderson & Gornik, 2007; Jupp & Slattery, 2012; Schubert et al., 2002; Shulman, 1987) for informing research that promoted White respondents’ race-visible identities. The research on programmatic pedagogy/curriculum began to answer the question: What is to be done in teacher education? Providing no guarantees to teacher educators, nonetheless these studies detailed specific pedagogical philosophies, curriculum labs, shadow studies, organizations, and field placements that significantly advanced White preservice and professional teachers’ race-visible recognition or conscientization.

Discussion

“So What?”

White teacher identity studies, emerging from African American intellectual traditions and critical White studies in education, developed and became institutionalized as a diversity component of teacher education’s accreditation processes. In both its first and second waves, it provided an area of study for scholars of color and White scholars to confront questions of racialized inequalities and injustices, as well as to produce knowledges that sought to influence teacher education and White teachers’ understandings of themselves as racialized actors in schools.

In our review of White teacher identity studies from 2004 to 2014, we focused on how this second wave of studies both explored new emphases within the central preoccupation of first-wave studies (the race-evasive identities of White preservice and professional teachers) and, more significantly, sought to document and theorize identity complexity and programmatic curriculum and pedagogy.
However, the significance of second-wave White teacher identity studies—the “so what?” of this body of work—is not, perhaps, best captured in a rehearsal of key topics and themes and new dimensions in the field. We understand the import of second-wave studies is better apprehended by noting a particular relationship between this research and the work of teacher education with White preservice and professional teachers—and especially by noting how this relationship contrasts to the relationship between first-wave studies and previous antiracist teaching and curricula.

Stated perhaps oversimply, first-wave studies produced representations of the race-evasive and privileged identities of White teachers with little attention to how these representations would then help or hinder future work with White teachers. In other words, first-wave research representations were related to whiteness pedagogies only in so much as they emerged from engagement with and research on these practices, but these first-wave representations do not, from our current vantage point, seem well-constructed to recycle back into and support future work with preservice and professional teachers. This was Lowenstein’s (2009) concern in her conceptual critique of first-wave studies, when she argued that an “often unexamined conceptualization of White teacher candidates as deficient learners about issues of diversity” might “lead to pedagogies that deaden their engagement in teacher education classrooms” (p. 163). Similarly, Jupp and Slattery (2010a) worried that first-wave studies too often insisted that “Whites de facto represent a static, monolithic, and ontological White supremacist homeland;” they thought it a tragic error to “emphasize essentializing stasis, if that is what, in fact, we seek to change” (p. 471).

A crucial contribution of second-wave studies, then, is that its representations of White teacher identity have been fashioned in a way that already anticipate their consequences for future work with White preservice and professional teachers. These representations are already built to recycle back into practice. New emphases in relation to race-evasive identities, careful attention to the nuances and complexities of White race-visible identities, detailed accounts of the actual pedagogies and curricula that form the complex contexts of White teachers’ identities—these are pursued in the second wave of White teacher identity studies exactly because they are necessary for understanding and intervening more powerfully in the education of White teachers.

For researchers, our review of empirical qualitative and narrative literatures emphasizes that the study of White preservice and professional teacher identities has moved beyond assuming static binaries of race-evasive/White ally identities and has instead explored continued race-evasion, nonessentializing identities, relationality, whiteness pedagogies, and problematic yet critical alliances between White people and people of color. Rather than diminishing the radical ontological and epistemological foundations of African American intellectual traditions and critical White studies, second-wave work embodied more analytic flexibility and suggested a field that has kept its eye on systemic racialized inequalities, but that has also begun to describe the complexity of racial identities, historical and social forces, and White respondents’ relationalities within hegemonic contexts.

We think continued research in White teacher identity studies must move forward in multidimensional ways that include recognitions of new research lines.
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This research would continue both race-evasive and race-visible research directions as a means of outlining complex-relational identity fields within racialized structuring complexes of power in schools and society. Here, Haviland (2008), Segall and Garrett, (2013), Vaught and Castagno (2008), and Yoon (2012)—whose studies drove at the fertile paradoxes of race-visibility inside White race-evasive identities—offered up exemplars for the field with their complex understandings of politics, history, and institutions, and in their fruitful extensions of Rains’s (1999) concept of “designated visibility” (p. 156), which Rains had used to describe how the racial identities of women faculty of color in universities involved both visibility and invisibility.

For teacher educators, we think that the field of second-wave White teacher identity studies provides important conceptual, pedagogical, and curricular representations for continued teaching and learning on race, whiteness, and White identity in teacher education. We advocate for second-wave White teacher identity studies not as a means of eclipsing previous first-wave studies that emphasized White teachers’ race-evasive identities, for race-evasion remains a critical concern to which teacher educators must attend. Nonetheless, we argue that the time has come to recognize the field’s second-wave studies that have provided greater complexity of representations for pedagogical deployment in racially conscientizing teacher education.

That is, we believe that recognition of second-wave race-visible studies offers a key opportunity for teacher educators to develop and revise multidimensional curriculum and pedagogy that presume complex understandings of race-evasive and race-visible White identities, that recognize the problematics and potentials of race-visible representations, and that anticipate the intricate missteps and advancements that accompany teaching and learning about race, whiteness, and White identity. Here, we point again to Seidl and Hancock (2011) as a second-wave study that offers much to imagining and living out an antiracist teacher education, especially for how responsive it is to Cross’s (2005) potent argument that mainstream teacher education reforms—reforms that, for example, champion extensive clinical experience and undermine educational foundations—result not in transformative teaching and learning, but the “‘same ole’ oppression” (p. 267).

Conclusion

Inherent in our discussion of White teacher identity studies is a progress narrative, in which a second wave of studies builds on and improves on an earlier one. And indeed, we are asserting this kind of progress in the field—akin, for example, to how feminist-poststructuralist (e.g., Ellsworth, 1989; Lather, 1991) and indigenous (e.g., Grande, 2004) scholars criticized and reconstructed early renderings of critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1970; Giroux & McLaren, 1986), or akin to how whiteness studies in sociology has moved from viewing White racial identity as monolithic and privileged to conceptualizing it as complex and situated (Lewis, 2004; McDermott & Samson, 2005; Perry & Shotwell, 2009; Winans, 2005).

However, we offer two caveats to a narrative of progress in the field of White teacher identity studies. First—and we hope that this has already been suggested by our attention to the field’s foundations in African American intellectual
traditions and critical White studies—we believe that sometimes we have to go backward in order to go forward. We encourage researchers and teacher educators to return to earlier foundational writings on race, not only, or even primarily, in order to understand their contributions to a developing field, but for how they continue to help us understand and theorize our current situation. For example, Lensmire (2014) found novelist and essayist Ralph Ellison’s (1953/1995) explorations of how White American identity is grounded in scapegoating rituals to be incredibly fruitful for interpreting his interviews with White men. Another example is provided by Berry and Stovall (2013), who created a forceful lesson about Black education for teachers, education policymakers, and teacher educators by performing a powerful reading and counterstory of the tragedy of Trayvon Martin’s death. They created this lesson by returning, directly, to Derrick Bell’s writing and CRT, as well as by articulating a critical race feminism (Berry, 2010, 2012, 2014) with significant links to Bell.

Our second caveat is foreshadowed by our references, above, to scapegoating rituals and the murder of Trayvon Martin. Our claim of progress in the field of White teacher identity studies is not to be confused with any claim of progress, in our society, with mobilizing White people for antiracist action. In the larger context of the brutal and ongoing violence being waged against people of color in the United States, our attention to nuance and complexity in the racial identities of White preservice and professional teachers might seem soft on racism, a distraction from unequivocal denunciations of and action against White supremacy.

We denounce White supremacy, yet we recommend second-wave White teacher identity studies as one aspect of a broader alliance-oriented effort to defend and advance critical knowledge in education research and teacher education that might inform and enhance social justice projects in the present moment.

Notes

1 The NCES (2009, 2011) studies reference “students of color” including students in the following groups: Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Hispanic. In the next paragraph, the NCES (2008) study referenced “teachers of color” using similar group compositions. We understand these categories as historically constructed, changing, and contested (Omi & Winant, 1986/1994). Nonetheless, we deploy these categories in the present moment in a critical politics focused on documenting and denouncing continued racial inequalities in schools. We use these same categories in variously referring to “students of color,” “teachers of color,” or “respondents of color” throughout the article though we understand that such group categorizations are problematic.

2 Tendencies toward resegregation are clearly demonstrated in recent statistical research measuring the concentration of minority groups in schools (NCES, 2009). The fact that many public schools are quickly becoming majority “minority” schools is reflected in recent data that indicate increased concentrations of minority students attending schools with an enrollment of over 75% and 50% minority group populations. In the case of the most sizeable minorities in the United States, 57% of Hispanic students attend schools with an enrollment of over 75% minority populations, and 77% of Hispanics attend schools with 50% or more minority group populations (NCES, 2009). Similarly, 52% of Black students attend schools with an enrollment of over 75% minority populations, and 73% of Black students attend schools with 50% or more minority group populations (NCES,
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2009). Clearly demonstrating the tendencies toward resegregation in schools, only 3% of White students enrolled in public schools attend schools with enrollment of over 75% minority populations, and only 12% of White students attend schools with 50% or more minority group population (NCES, 2009). Increasingly, students historically categorized as minorities represent majorities in elementary and secondary school settings (NCES, 2009). Paradoxically—much but not at all, the resegregation of public schools has provided an historical example of the resurgence of White privilege, and beyond notions of privilege, the active reconstitution of Whiteness (Leonardo, 2002) in “local” policies’ return to seemingly benign and color-blind “neighborhood” schools.

3Careful reader, the consolidation of White teacher identity studies as a field is discussed in the first subsection in the “Method” section and fully developed in the section “An Historical Review of White Teacher Identity Studies.”

4Further justifying the need for this study, in our research we confirmed what Cochran-Smith et al. (2004) correctly noted over 10 years ago. White teacher identity studies has received little, if any, institutional or longitudinal support nor does any systematic review of the literatures over the last decade exist. As a result of this lack of institutional or longitudinal support, White teacher identity studies has been particularly susceptible to academic siloing. Though proliferating apace with individual studies, nonetheless the area of White teacher identity studies typically proceeds in “one-off” fashion as committed individual education researchers and teacher educators conduct research into their own settings and practices. As a consequence of siloing and one-off studies, education researchers and teacher educators tend to conveniently cite and work with a few studies related only to their narrow research questions without engaging either the historic field nor recent thematic convergences within the field that, if understood, could further advance White teacher identity studies beyond its current limits and truncations.

5We understand that critical literatures on whiteness and White identity traffic under various labels such as critical whiteness studies, antiracist scholarship, and critical White studies. We follow Delgado and Stefancic’s (1997) term critical White studies.

6Though this section provides only an account of the emergence of White teacher identity studies as a field, Jupp and several colleagues are currently conducting research that systematically reviews literatures before and after 2004. The development of a systematic review of the entirety of these literatures represents a worthy yet expansive multiple-article project that well exceeds the scope of this literature review. As mentioned in the introduction, referred to in the section “Method,” and further explained here, the systematic literature review focuses on the years between 2004 and 2014 only. We also understand that a number of traditions, perspectives, or intersectional approaches might be newly trafficked in informing White teacher identity studies. Jupp (2013), in chapter 4 of his book, drives at this new direction in studying White male teachers’ masculinities, and we understand that more research needs to be done here, especially in relation to White female teachers and gender. Nonetheless, our genealogy follows and reflects the literatures that informed White teacher identity studies’ present development as a field. Because we follow and reflect these literatures, we emphasize the two main traditions that have historically emphasized theories of White identity writ large: African American intellectual traditions and critical White studies. We understand that more intersectional work is in the offing and should be pursued.

7The recent fatal shootings of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, 12-year-old Tamir Rice in Cleveland, Ohio, and Tony Robinson in Madison, Wisconsin, as well as the strangulation of Eric Garner added to the list of events in the ongoing racialized tragedy in U.S. social history. We mention this in the Notes so as to sombrely recognize the ongoing violent tragedy without using these events as “stand ins” for the larger violence carried out through racialized structurings and segregation. Certainly, the historic sweep of racial representation in the United States (Omi & Winant, 1986/1994) demonstrates that discursively
structured racialized violence is a constant feature of our society, and recent deaths are but a few more examples of direct violence against people of color.

Though we argue that critical White studies merely informed and codeveloped with White teacher identity studies in a general sense, considerable cross-referencing between critical White studies and White teacher identities was present in the literatures in the 1990s, especially since curriculum scholars were involved in editing critical White studies volumes (e.g., Fine et al., 1997; Kincheloe et al., 1998). Regarding the particular citation genealogies required by one reviewer, we argue that a literal review of citing practices strengthens our statements that critical White studies informed and codeveloped with White teacher identity studies. Early peer-reviewed journal articles and chapters by Sleeter (1992, 1993) cited scholarly contributions from the emerging field of critical White studies by West and Dyer. Henze et al. (1998) cited McIntosh along with multicultural resources. Berlak (1999) began to demonstrate the consolidation of White teacher identity studies by citing contributions by McIntosh and Morrison and by mentioning previous studies in the field by Sleeter and McIntyre. Kalin (1999) further demonstrated the consolidation of the field in citing Hall, Frankenberg, and Roediger along with Sleeter’s foundational work, and Kalin (1999), while not anchoring her use of the term by citing McIntosh (1988), made continual reference to the concept of White privilege. Regarding the development of peer-reviewed journal articles a few years later, Glazier (2003), Lewis (2001), and McIntyre (2002), who all further demonstrated the consolidation of White teacher identity, evinced a greater convergence of citing practices. Glazier (2003) cited contributions by Frankenberg, hooks, McIntosh, Morrison, and Scheurich along with McIntyre’s (1997b) book. Lewis (2001) cited Fine, Weis, Powel, and Mun Wong’s (1997) edited volume along with contributions by Frankenberg, Hall, and Sleeter. McIntyre (2002) cited contributions by Frankenberg, Harris, hooks, Ignatiev, McIntosh, Morrison, Roediger, Scheurich, and Sleeter. Similar citing practices are present in Hytten and Warren (2003) and Marx and Pennington (2003) which make further listings redundant. Moreover, and perhaps more significant, the field’s defining statements (Marx, 2003a; McIntyre, 1997b) that we emphasized in “the emergence of a field” further substantiate our argument that critical White studies informed and codeveloped the field. McIntyre’s book (1997b) cited contributions from Frankenberg, Harris, hooks, Ignatiev, McIntosh, McIntyre (herself), and Sleeter (multiple citations). Marx’s (2003a) introduction to the Qualitative Studies in Education special issue cited contributions by Bell, Frankenberg, hooks, McIntosh, McIntyre, Scheurich, and Young. Marx’s (2003a) omission of historical resources in her statement (e.g., Ignatiev, 1995; Roediger, 1994) became the substance of McCarthy’s (2003) critique of the special issue, which demonstrated that research in the field had become self-correcting of omissions.

We recognize the limitations of the terms first-wave and second-wave as suggesting oppositions, binaries, or reductions, but we insist throughout the essay on using this language to express complex shifting ideas and emphases within a developing yet marginalized research field. We also recognize that “second-wave” research has its discursive “seeds” in “first-wave” research, as it did, for example, in first- and second-wave feminist research of the 1970s and 1980s, respectively. Nonetheless, working within descriptive language confines, we settled on the term wave not to emphasize oppositions, binaries, or reductions but rather as an attempt to explain complex representational emphases and shifts in a developing field that has potential for continued work and critical influence in education research and teacher education. As this study emphasizes, our purpose here is to define, outline, and advance the field of White teacher identity studies not to make dismissive arguments based on simplistic oppositions, binaries, or reductions.

We recognize that literatures around 2002 through 2005 are not strictly separated in patterns and concerns, but Marx’s (2003b) special issue, as discussed, provided a definite
signpost that a field of White teacher identity studies existed and was expanding beyond its first iterations.

Following Lowenstein (2009), we understand these studies to be predominantly (though not exclusively) concerned with White preservice and professional teachers’ identity development. We also understand that new studies have emerged that qualitatively describe, narrate, or measure different identity groups’ journeys to critical teaching or cultural competence. Importantly, Morales (2011) began to document Latina teachers’ burdens and gifts in developing cultural competency and critical teaching identities. This is an important new research area, though it is not the focus of our literature review.

One reviewer suggested that we remove this study because it provided representations of a Latina teacher that exemplified, paradoxically, White race-evasion and another White teacher who, in expressing her understandings of the race and culture in teaching and learning, offered stereotypes of African American language. Only the third teacher portrayed in this study, who was White, approximated cultural competence as described, for example, in Ladson Billings (1994/2009). Despite all three teachers’ problematic identities, we think that this study belongs in race-visible White teacher identity studies because race-visible studies do not drive at neat “identity solutions” for teachers’ identity consumption; rather, race-visible White teacher identity studies provide new and provoking resources for education research and teacher education. Race-visible White teacher identity studies are not finished demonstration “products” nor do they represent simplistic “dispositions” for preservice and professional teachers to “get in their heads”; rather by definition, race-visible White teacher identity studies purposively examine the problematics and potentials of race-visible identities focusing on an ethics of vigilance (Appelbaum, 2003, 2005, 2013) rather the consumption of idealized “identity solutions.”
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