How the Bridges Are Falling Down:
A New Literacies Teacher Negotiating "New" Pedagogies in "Old" Spaces

Jeanine M. Staples
Pennsylvania State University

Introduction

DiAngelo (2006) noted that the most recent data on U.S. educators show the majority of elementary and secondary school teachers are White women. A decade ago, the teacher population was 87% White (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1999) and 74% women (Snyder, 1999). Recent research indicates that the percentage of White women teachers in public schools is increasing while pre- and in-service placements within heterogeneous classrooms among this group is on the decline, and diversity among students is increasing (Gay, 2003; King, 1991; Snyder; Su, 1996, 1997). It may be hypothesized from these statistics that many novice White educators do not interact with diverse students in any direct or sustained ways. For the purpose of this discussion, the term *diverse* refers to students whose race, culture, cognitive, social, and class affiliations are different from White, middle or upper class, and cognitively and socially normalized people. Sleeter (2001) conducted an extensive review of the literature on how universities prepare majority teachers to engage, understand, and respect the lived experiences of diverse students who are notably underserved. Sleeter reported that:

Jeanine M. Staples is an assistant professor in the College of Education at Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania. Her e-mail address is jms1098@psu.edu

> Most White [teacher candidates in predominantly White institutions] are fairly naïve and have stereotypic beliefs about urban[1] children, such as believing that urban children bring attitudes that interfere with education . . . Most White [teacher candidates] bring little awareness or understanding of discrimination and its effects. (p. 95)

It is therefore critical that, when White women teacher candidates, along with all pre- and in-service educators, do interact with diverse students, they are able to recognize the ways in which racism reproduces itself. This reproduction is often conveyed through teachers' pedagogical frameworks for teaching and learning. In effect, racism, along with other social constructs, can be embodied by and transferred within philosophical ideologies, instructional practices, and formative assessments of aptitude and awareness. A "new" pedagogical framework, one that includes deep consideration of social constructs via their intersections with "new" literacies, may act as a localized precedent to a complex understanding of the ways that globalized consciousness in teaching happens. Such a development is important because it recognizes, first, the evolutionary nature of knowledge about teaching abstract concepts that influence human perceptions through literacy education and, second, the persistent nature of our "flattening" world as a global space in which racism is performed in new iterations and with new consequences for global citizens.

Teaching Teacher Candidates about "New" Pedagogies and "New" Literacies

I recently researched and designed a course titled *Seminar on Diversity and Disability* to understand better the ways that "new" pedagogies are received by a group of mostly White special education teacher candidates being prepared to teach reading and prosocial behavioral skills to diverse students with high incidence disabilities. Such disabilities (e.g., mild attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, learning differences, moderate behavior problems) are common in many classrooms across the country. The difference between the diverse youth that my special education teacher candidates would engage and their general education peers was a matter of diagnosis, use of special services, and the students' local and international backgrounds.

Seminar on Diversity and Disability was meant to gauge teacher candidates' understanding and acceptance of key pedagogical concepts and practices, new literacies, and texts useful in meaningful engagements with these youth. It was also intended to provide a real-world understanding of the proverbial "bridges" that New Literacies theorists attempt to build to link literacy teaching and learning among diverse

youth and their teachers in multiple contexts. These bridges specifically attend to the various ways that youths read, write, speak, and listen in relationship to media, popular culture, and technologies (Staples, 2005; Staples, 2008b). I directed the analysis and interpretation of the data yielded by the course.

Seminar on Diversity and Disability centered on race and literacies because, as an African American female teacher educator and New Literacies theorist, I was uncertain that novice teachers had the research pedagogy (Vasudevan, 2008) necessary to invoke simple methods to identify, analyze, interpret, and describe controversial or uncomfortable phenomena (e.g., race and racism and their effects) as they are performed and affect knowledge among said youth and within their own pedagogical practices. I was even less certain that these new teachers were equipped to (co)construct and facilitate spaces that might successfully couch such learning and support its growth into new academic, social, and cultural knowing. These uncertainties forged a desire to explore artifacts from this course and to begin to form a conversant understanding of the ways that White special education teacher candidates understood the intersections of race, literacies, pedagogy, and local/global social justice.

In this article, I highlight the parameters and tenets of *Seminar on Diversity and Disability*. I also consider the types of institutional supports that one needs to teach concepts that are unpopular, misunderstood, or ignored. Additionally, I review the ways that I redirected attention from learning about new literacies (e.g., emailing, social networking, collaboration, responsive community discourse practices, blogging, texting, gaming), and thoughts about pedagogical frameworks that might couch them and our understanding of racism, to consideration of research into teacher preparation, institutionally sanctioned and "othered" pedagogies. Finally, I give thought to what it means to develop a pedagogical framework of counter-hegemonic resistance to meet, assuage, and reposit teacher candidate resistances in my course as well as better prepare them for teaching and learning with diverse students and globalized classrooms.

Course Context, Research Question, and Pedagogical Concepts

This course was taught in a Department of Special Education at a comprehensive, research university in the northeast. It was the first of its kind in this department in nearly a decade. Prior to its implementation, teacher candidates were not required to take a course in diversity and disability, or diversity and literacy education. As of 2007, the teacher candidates who graduated from this department were consistently and overwhelmingly White and abled (Table 1).

Table 1
Demographics of Teacher Candidates

Graduation Year	Graduates (n)	Minority2 (%)	Disability (Self-identified) (%)
2007	20	20	10
2006	25	8	12
2005	24	13	17
2004	21	14	9
2003	24	17	0
2002	28	29	4

Note. Data from the Department of Special Education's Teacher Education Records, 2007.

A total of 17 teacher candidates (2 males and 15 females) were enrolled in *Seminar in Diversity and Disability*. Each candidate was engaged in practicum placements that included diverse populations. Two of the women were African American, and 13 were White. Per a demographic survey, all 17 teacher candidates considered themselves middle class to upper middle class. All were socially and cognitively normalized, while their students included marginalized ethnic minorities (including youth from different countries) of middle to lower class (economic status). Some of these youth were diagnosed with certain high-incidence disabilities and others with various language and literacy abilities valued in their home countries but not in the U.S. Some of these abilities included complex foreign linguistic skills and culturally-specific multimodal performances. The 3-hour class met once a week for 15 consecutive weeks during the fall 2007 semester. To interrogate the course's teacher candidate-centered artifacts, I asked:

> *What happens when special education teacher candidates transact with frameworks and practices that encourage new knowledge of issues of diversity and literacies in a graduate course?*

As a primary text, I selected the popular book, *Courageous Conversations about Race: A Field Guide for Achieving Equity in Schools* (Singleton & Clinton, 2006). I chose this book to present teacher candidates with a framework for thinking about and discussing race and racism, particularly as these phenomena relate to urban schools, global consciousness, literacy teaching, and literacy learning. I also chose supplementary readings from Glynda Hull and Katherine Schultz, James Paul Gee, Colin Lankshear and Michelle Knobel, Jabari Mahiri, and Brian Street to present my students with new ideas about literacies, multimodalities, and social contexts. The course was designed to promote four outcomes. Teacher candidates were to:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of key concepts and the ways that these concepts affect teaching and learning.

2. Reflect on the differences between tolerance and respect in relationship to diversity and expectations for social and academic success in literacy education among diverse students.

3. Demonstrate a local and global understanding of diversity and incorporate their ideas into conversations about pedagogy.

4. Investigate frameworks for thinking about race and culture in relationship to literacy and learning with and among diverse youth.

I quickly realized that I needed to introduce students to several key concepts that could represent several "important ideas" in education, particularly as they pertain to literacy work (Knobel, 2006; Street, 1995) and diverse populations. My hope was that these terms would spark a discussion of inclusion and social criticism. The key concepts presented were:

• Race—a group of people related by a common ancestry or a social construct used to identify and categorize groups of human beings.

• Culture—the practices and beliefs characteristic of a particular social, ethnic, or age group.

• Class—a social stratum sharing basic economic or political characteristics, and having the same respective positionality in society.

• Disability—a social construct of personhood that defines or categorizes physical, mental, or social aptitude in addition to prescribing certain accommodations and interventions for support.

• Self-reflexivity—the act of reflective inward thinking with the intent of personal analysis and discovery in the assistance of global social justice and action.

• Critical consciousness—the process of *questioning* the social, political, and cultural implications of a constructed concept, stance, action, strategy, and/or policy as they relate to lived experiences, opportunities, and access.

• Social/global justice—an actively pursued state of theoretical and practical equality in which the social/global and political

rights, responsibilities, and unique contributions of all people are truthfully and consistently explored, secured, encouraged, and valued equally.

• Teacher leader—a self-reflective educator who maintains a critical consciousness, embraces social/global justice, and participates in conceptualizing and organizing initiatives that support progressive classroom teaching and research for the benefit of colleagues and all students.

• New Literac(ies)—the socially situated, culturally informed, politically laden ways that individuals and groups communicate ideas, share knowledge, cultivate questions and responses, generate new texts, facilitate resistance or oppression, and interpret signs and signifiers for particular purposes.

To better infuse these key concepts into our space, the course was organized into four progressive phases. Each phase included approximately 4 weeks of the semester:

1. Understanding key concepts and teaching/learning. During this phase teacher candidates and I explored and questioned the ways that key concepts were used in the literature and actualized in their diverse classrooms.

2. Negotiation tolerance and respect. Teacher candidates and I pondered the differences between a teacher's tolerance of student race, culture, nationality, and new literacies as well as their respect of these constructs and practices.

3. Diversity and literacy pedagogy. I thought seriously about what the term *diversity* means and how one might go about developing a pedagogical framework for literacy education among diverse student groups.

4. Frameworks for thinking about race, racism, and literac(ies). I attempted to develop frameworks for thinking about how these phenomena worked together and supported "good" (or inclusive, democratic, critical, purposeful) teaching and learning among diverse students.

Datasets and Interpretive Framework

Datasets for this project included:

• Departmental documents (i.e., program guides, program website, course syllabi).

- A preliminary demographic survey.
- Teacher candidates' written work (i.e., class notes, journals, and portfolios of four lesson plans).
- Teacher candidates' discussions of readings and popular culture narratives (Staples, 2008c).
- Instructor's participant-observation journal notes.
- Teacher candidates' course evaluations.
- Course content (i.e., *Courageous Conversations about Race* and other readings on new literacies, race, and culture, in addition to digital Web content that included blogs, YouTube® videos, and Internet websites).

Popular culture narratives (PCNs) were used in the course due to their prevalence and social weight. PCNs are media texts such as films, videos, television programs, Internet Web sites and blogs, urban or street fiction, and popular periodicals. These narratives are artistic tools of public discourse that perform creatively and purposefully the languages, signs, social situations, political dilemmas, and cultural contradictions particular to human beings and our lived experiences. They reflect and affect our sensibilities, meaning-making, and determinations. Elsewhere, based on data-driven research of African American urban adolescents' critical literacy practices in relationship to various media texts engaged after school, I further describe these narratives, and a student/teacher (co)constructed framework that can be used to produce and facilitate transactions with such narratives (Staples, 2008b). These narratives have five primary descriptors.

First, PCNs portray nuances of social constructs. Race, class, gender, and sexuality are often at issue in them. Second, they depict archetypes, representative human paradigms that embody "types" of identity. Third, these narratives often mingle standardized English and variations of English. This mingling provides characters, authors, or narrators with the ability to texturize social situations and individuals in specific ways. Fourth, they produce or describe visual representations that signify and complicate language. That is, compositions of rich, moving, and still images are depicted and invoked to pictorially translate what is expressed. Lastly, PCNs provoke readers to deeper revelations of the predicaments of the human condition and the complexities of personhood, place, word, and image. This provocation can be (and often is) initiated by both print and visual popular culture narratives (Staples, 2008b).

To gain insight into the intersections of these data, I employed an

interpretive framework that included Critical Race Theory (CRT), Adolescent Literacy Theories (ALT), Critical Black Feminist Epistemologies (CBFE), and Social Semiotics (SS). I relied on the lenses of CRT and ALT to interpret data in which teacher candidates generated inductive talk, such as class conversations. CRT provides ways to conceptualize and validate lived experiences and subjectivities in the context of storytelling (Crenshaw, 1995; Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Gates, 1997a, 1997b). Theories about adolescent literacies point to the developmental ways that teenagers use media and technology to perform and shape new literacies (Brandt & Clinton, 2002; Gee, 2000; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Hull & Schultz, 2001).

Because this work with teacher candidates relied on the ways that individuals tell racialized, gendered, and class-referenced stories in response to media, these lenses helped me to understand better the ways that teacher candidates talked about their identities, perspectives, and experiences when engaged in conversations about race, new literacies, and diverse youths' uses of media and technology.

CBFE helped me to tease out the ideas that students had about race and gender. When confronted with archetypes and language choices that frame notions of femininity, masculinity, race, and power, CBFE provided ways for me to question and assist teacher candidates' assertions and conclusions (Collins, 2000; Fine & Mcpherson, 1992; Haggis, 1990; Harding, 1987; Hawkesworth, 1989). This was particularly important because I was the first and only female African American professor whom my teacher candidates encountered in graduate school. Because these assertions and conclusions were often private, I used this interpretive lens to investigate journal entries that were not shared with the group. To gauge the ways that teacher candidates recognized signs and signifiers—words and images that construct representations visually and give them meaning—I used SS. When teacher candidates engaged popular culture narratives by juxtaposing words and images from Web sites, films, and television, I used theories about social semiotics to interpret their vantage points and understandings of these phenomena and their implications for pedagogical development (Buckingham, 1996; Hobbs, 2001; Lemke, 1988, 1989; Piette & Giroux, 1997).

This framework allowed me to question data in ways that can inform teacher education and literacy education. It also helped me to configure ways to include teacher candidates and encourage their participation through means that inspire them: conversation and storytelling (CRT), use and critique of technology (ALT), journaling and note taking (CBFE), and interpretation of still and moving images (SS). As a result of this framework, all teacher candidates, regardless of their abilities

and inclinations, had multiple opportunities to participate fully in the course. For instance, students who had trouble digesting readings that discussed key concepts were able to call upon their abilities to talk, write, or deconstruct images while they gained practice interrogating new ideas. Similarly, teacher candidates who were strong writers, but felt uncomfortable speaking publicly or exploring images critically, were given opportunities to draft journal entries and lesson plans in addition to participating in generative discussions.

In any case, teacher candidates had continual practice in reading, writing, speaking, and listening, which provided continuous opportunities to engage with and develop a new pedagogy that included the literate lives of their diverse students. These methods were employed based on research on adolescents (Staples, 2008a, 2008b, 2008d) that demonstrated how such methods and frameworks for understanding literate experiences and abilities elucidated patterns that were useful for pedagogical and interpretive knowledge.

About the "Old" Space:
Problems of Viewpoints, Ambiguity, and Accountability

There were several points of pedagogical disconnection within the meta-context of the course. First, instructors within the department held a very strong belief in "reading" education and its distinction from "literacy" education, which, in the minds of many, has to do with readers' relationships to print. For the majority of faculty members, decoding print, memorizing vocabulary lists, learning sight words, and developing ways to subjectively assess children's and youths' comprehension of information from traditional documents were prime goals of teacher preparation. The rigidity of these goals was likely a result of the fact that instructors had little experience teaching or researching new literacies or grappling with the expansive nature of the term "literacy/ies" (Staples, 2008a, 2008d) in relationship to diverse students.

Their inflexibility may also have been due to a belief that consideration of new literacies as a different way to understand and appreciate diverse students' cognitive abilities, cultural norms, social aptitude, and political awareness is a passing fad in the field. Without more expansive and inclusive viewpoints, instructors in the department relied primarily on antiquated notions of what it means to read and write among diverse youth in the 21st century. Such notions nearly eliminated from the minds of teacher candidates ways of conceptualizing diverse students' abilities in constructive or affirmative ways.

A second characteristic was the department's narrow understanding of what *diversity* means. Based on an extensive review of course syllabi

and the departmental program guides, I found that *diversity* included issues of disability and over-representation among African American boys in special education. However, there was no explicit talk of race, color, culture, nationality, language, sexuality, religion, *and* disability in the courses offered. Third, the department held no 21st century statement of intention and objectives that might guide teacher education in relationship to a broad sense of diversity and/or advanced notions of literacy education.

As of 2007, there was no document of record to which instructors of pre-service teachers might refer questions such as: How can we make the concept of *diversity* more encompassing and reflective of the global nature of our contemporary society? Why should we do this? What should teacher candidates know and be able to do in relationship to issues of this type of diversity and (new) literacy education? What is our stance on the literacies of diverse youth, particularly those in urban areas and those in urban areas who were born in different countries? What does it mean that the vast majority of our teacher candidates embody a different race, socioeconomic class, physical disposition, mental aptitude, emotional inclination, and cultural background than the students they will serve? (Staples, 2008a; in press).

By searching Web sites for posted policies, *diversity* course syllabi, demographic reports, and course reviews, I was able to gather institutional documents. I also asked colleagues to provide me with reflective notes regarding their teaching experiences in *diversity* courses. I triangulated these data by asking the questions above of all sources, juxtaposing contextual findings within one set of documents with those of others as well as isolating trends in concepts and voids. I then listed these trends and kept records of them.

Then, when findings about students' resistances became clearer as a result of the analytic process, I juxtaposed these with institutional findings and began to firm up conclusions about the ways that student teachers' resistances were, or were not, reinforced, questioned, and/or disassembled. I found it interesting that, while instructors promised to focus attention on diversity and literacy throughout courses offered by the department, there was no actual way to gauge the consistencies or effects of such a focus in teacher preparation because there were no official records of this and no accountability measures established. The absence of such guidelines and responsibility measures enacted an unspoken pedagogy indicative of insensitivities and gaping junctures in teacher preparation.

A Pedagogical Counter-yell

Without departmental solidarity in ideology, language, and accountability, I was left to my own teaching, learning, and research devices. Soon, my literacy teaching/learning pedagogy produced a counter-yell. It voiced loudly the amalgamation of my commitments to the ways that teacher candidates conceptualize and respect new literacies, diverse youth, teaching/learning spaces, constructs of identities, and knowledge building/sharing across time and space. Through the design and delivery of the course, my pedagogy also spoke passionately about the ways that these things could transgress oppression and subjection to injustice (Staples, 2008c).

As my counter-yell grew louder, I also learned quickly that I needed to redirect my attention from facilitating learning about new literacies and issues of diversity to issues of research into teacher preparation and the context of institutionally sanctioned pedagogies. Such a turn can be understood as the impetus for a research pedagogy (Vasudevan, 2008). Through it, I was able to begin to mine teacher candidates' responses to readings, assignments, class discussions, and course reviews to better understand my instructional practices and sharpen a materializing inquiring stance on practice. This helped me to deeply consider the ways that I needed to develop networks of counter-resistance to meet, assuage, and reposit teacher candidates' resistance to the course and to me as an African American woman.

Findings: A Typology of Resistance[3]

Analyses of the data reveal that all White teacher candidates conveyed certain resistances to the content of the course. In many instances, their methods of resistance were also conflated with their resistance to me as a person who embodied at least one point of *diversity* in their eyes (i.e., race). Although I view resistance as a useful teaching/learning tool to counter meta-narratives of oppression, marginalization, and ignorance, I do not find it helpful when imposed in antagonistic and contrary ways, particularly to the point of negating the construction of intellectual work.[4] Teacher candidates resisted transactions with frameworks and practices that encouraged new knowledge about issues of diversity and literacies in several ways. Four categories of resistance were identified: passive, aggressive, passive-aggressive, and institutional.

Passive Resistance

Instances of "passive resistance" included teacher candidates' blatant inattention in class, consistently late or incomplete assignments,

excessive absences, and ignorance of class material when called upon. These instances were noted after extenuating circumstances (i.e., verifiable illness, a friend or relative's death, or travel to practicum sites) were ruled out. These instances produced a *dismembered* effect in which teacher candidates could "check out" of intense or uncomfortable discussions about students' race, culture, nationality, and new literacies. Teacher candidates might check out mentally, emotionally, or physically but still not be seen as ostensibly disrespectful in the eyes of a visitor. These resistances were documented through my participant-observer journal notes and students' late or non-existent documents (i.e., journals or lesson plans).

Aggressive Resistance

Instances of "aggressive resistance" were more apparent. They included teacher candidates' hypercritical attention to my or peers' discussions of salient issues or ideas relative to the key concepts. They also included extraneous assignments. Such assignments were either not mandated or they were the result of a teacher candidates' alteration of a given assignment to accommodate a particular expression of dissatisfaction or hostility. Aggressive resistances also included talking out of turn, interruptions, and antagonistic posturing. These instances produced a *malignant mass* effect to the extent that these teacher candidates' presence, comments, and writings performed in contrary, rarely productive ways. These resisters often stood on the outside of class discussions and endeavors and caused many activities to feel fractured, with attention split between a few teacher candidates' personal issues and the issues at hand, e.g., in response to a prompt articulated in a class near the end of the term. The prompt, "How might racism and new literacies intersect in your future classroom of diverse students?" elicited from a White man the following:

> This is ridiculous. When are we gonna talk about regular special ed. stuff? The Black, Hispanic, Nigerian, and Chinese kids I'm gonna teach can't read. They can't write. They can't do anything. That's what race has to do with literacy. They need special services and that's what we should be talking about.

Such outbursts were fairly regular for this and a few other White students and were laden with multiple layers of unknowing. This unknowing included a lack of attention to the ways that diverse youth with high incidence disabilities *do* read and write in multiple contexts and limited, presumptuous notions about diverse students' communicative abilities, their range and variation of literacies, and teaching/learning needs.

These resistances were found at the cross-sections of teacher candidates' journals, written notes, class discussions, and course evaluations.

Passive-Aggressive Resistance

Passive-aggressive resisters were often randomly passive or aggressive in particular ways. For instance, one White female teacher candidate who was usually very quiet in class, and often professed to be unfamiliar with readings when called upon, wrote ardently about her dissatisfaction with course content and my "pushy" approach that "asked students to do things they weren't used to doing" (Teacher Candidate Journal Entry, October 22, 2007). For instance, in response to a journal prompt, "What is racism and anti-racism? Why should you examine them closely in your teaching with diverse students?" the White teacher candidate wrote:

> Singleton and Linton say that White educators should examine rac[ism] and anti-racism. As I read this I wondered why this should only be done by White educators. I do not feel that I as a White person should need to do this more so than the colored educator next to me. Or that a colored person should not have to do this themselves. After all, racism is their problem too, not just ours.

These resisters were so inconsistent in controlling and monitoring their responses and interactions that many teacher candidates could not reach a satisfactory level of engagement with class discussions or partnership in small, in-class, group work. Because of this inconsistency, correcting students' erroneous use of terms and language was also difficult (e.g., references to African Americans as "colored" people). Iterations of this resistance were found in 6 out of 17 teacher candidate datasets and in my journal notes.

Institutional Resistance

Finally, the department's avoidance of the gravity of new literacy and diversity education among special education teacher candidates communicated a sense of justification about counter-productive resistances among students. Because I had little means of garnering support for my "new" pedagogical work inside this "old" space, there were few relevant consequences for teacher candidates' resistance. Additionally, because there was no sense of departmental solidarity or uniformity on these important topics, students did not have consistent opportunities to think critically about literacy practices, multimodalities, popular culture, technology, or issues of diversity in other departmental teacher preparation courses. Thus, there were no complements to my course.

The dearth of intersecting spaces to converse, ponder, question, and

model actions that foster confident, inclusive teaching within diverse classrooms whereby various types of literacies work occur left my teacher candidates severely ill-equipped for new literacies teaching among students who are different from them. They were also ill-equipped to be sensitive to social/global justice issues that their future students would face as a result of their linguistic abilities, social situation, and cultural norms. Conversely, as their instructor, I was also left dissatisfied. I felt that I was left alone to examine the gap left by the loss of the connection between "new" and "old" pedagogies and, ultimately, "new" and "old" spaces for new literacy education.

Discussion: The Gap between "New" and "Old" Pedagogies

The gap that exists between "new" pedagogical frameworks for urban literacy learning, teaching, and research and the "old" spaces in which those pedagogies can be shared and developed is growing. This gap contains:

- The uncertainties of Reading/English/Language/Arts teacher candidates who attempt to make sense of the ways that new literacies bear meaning and are enacted among diverse student groups.
- Lack of support for the development of new teaching and research pedagogies that complement the new literacies generated among teachers and teacher candidates.
- An underdeveloped sense of the possibilities of transgressing spaces where literacies happen and grow in ways that unify seemingly disparate teaching/learning contexts for the benefit of teachers, students, administrators, and community members.
- A dearth of teaching and research that extends itself to pedagogical frameworks for strategic teaching, deep learning, and richly contemplative research in light of our increasingly global education system.

If we allow the gap to remain, teacher candidates will be left to wonder how they can link new literacies teaching and research to the encroaching standards and high-stakes tests that have become integral to diverse students' literate lives. Novice teachers will examine the gap and will wonder how it is possible to build bridges between in- and out-of-school literacies among individual students and diverse students. They may walk away from the gap discouraged, without attempts to bridge it. If they do walk away, it will be to the detriment of the diverse students whom they teach.

Bridging the Gap

I offer several strategies to bridge the gap that exists between "new" and "old" spaces and "new" and "old" pedagogies for a dynamic literacy education:

- Require that institutions make formal statements conceptualizing new literacies teaching and research and issues of diversity for the 21st century.
- Provide practical measures or criteria whereby each of these statements can be realized in course- and practicum-work.
- Require compatible measures of accountability within and across departments at the school and university levels.
- Facilitate meaningful, reflective "what works/what needs work" conferences for constituents of all vested, diverse, literacy teaching/learning spaces.
- Allow teacher candidates multiple opportunities to actualize new literacies and to demonstrate them within their peer groups and within their university preparation courses.
- Encourage diverse youth with various learning abilities and new literacy interests to actualize and demonstrate their work with teacher candidates, in-service educators, school administrators, and university personnel over time.
- Make these processes interdisciplinary, reflective, and continual.

Conclusion: Implications and Developing a New Pedagogical Framework of Resistance

The implications for teaching include a potential crisis at the juncture between the ways that teachers are trained to respect and support students who are different from them, professional development, and practical literacy instruction. This juncture may also negatively affect the ways that novice teachers construct their pedagogy and even their praxis as they evolve as professionals. A "new" pedagogical framework for counter-hegemonic resistance that competes with the levels of counter-productive resistances instantiated by White special education teacher candidates includes:

- Attention to the ways that social constructs such as race and racism are used within popular culture narratives that subjugate "diverse" youth or ones that they engage and/or generate.

- Attention to the ways that words, images, ideas, and technology intersect each other and influence confluences of communication and cultural assumptions as well as affect social meaning-making, global consciousness, and personal perceptions as determined by "normalized" individuals and groups and for particular purposes.

- Attention to the ways that teacher candidates can assume a stance that productively and inclusively affects social/global justice work and curricular counter-action.

The amalgamation of these "ways" culminates as a pedagogical framework for counter- hegemonic resistance. It is one that identifies, interrogates, and intercepts information in various texts that intersect the literate lives of diverse youth with various abilities and takes account of individuals' and groups' identities and trajectories as a means of empowerment. I position this framework in relationship to literacy work that includes media, social justice, and global consciousness for teacher education. If "new" pedagogies such as this one are able to thrive inside of "old" spaces and speak to their resistant members, the connected may be rebuilt to serve more effectively and respectfully future diverse student groups and their families.

Notes

[1] Although it is not explicated in Sleeter's (2001) article, it is implied that use of the term "urban children" refers to those from cultural, economic, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds that are different from White, middle-class, standard-English language users.

[2] The "minority" designation refers to non-"White" race (including African American, Asian, Hispanic), as reported by students. The "disability" category is defined as students with documented disabilities (primarily LD) who are registered with Disability Support Service on campus.

[3] For the purposes of this article, I have only included findings that speak to the ways that White female teacher candidates transact with frameworks and practices that encourage new knowledge about issues of diversity and literacies in a graduate course.

[4] Intellectual work is the synergy of socially situated literacy practices and culturally situated knowledge produced at the intersection of adolescent literacies and popular culture narratives. This phenomenon is "intellectual" because it is inspired by the complexities of local knowledge. It is "work" because it is

exerted through tensions within and among activities that happen in relationship to meanings and messages of various types of texts. Then, intellectual work is manifested when people are motivated to engage with texts and nurture a positive self-efficacy in relationship to activities that are meaningful to them. The results of sustained intellectual work are often evidenced by production of layered understandings and critical consciousness among individuals and/or groups.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1999). *Teacher education pipeline: Schools, colleges, and departments of education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Brandt, D., & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*(3), 337-356.

Buckingham, D. (1996). *Moving images: Understanding children's emotional responses to television*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Crenshaw, K. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Fine, M., & McPherson, P. (1992). Over dinner: Feminism and adolescent female bodies. In M. Fine (Ed.), *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research* (pp. 175-203). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Gates, N. E. (1997a). *The concept of "race" in natural and social science*. New York: Garland.

Gates, N. E. (1997b). *Cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of "race."* New York: Garland.

Gay, G. (2003). *Becoming multicultural educators: A personal journey toward professional agency.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Teenagers in new times: A new literacy studies perspective. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*(5), 412-420.

Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(1), 79-129.

Haggis, J. (1990). The feminist research process. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist praxis: Research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology* (pp. 67-79). London, UK: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1987). Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 1-14). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hawkesworth, M. (1989). Knowers, knowing, known: Feminist theory and claims of truth. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *14*(3), 533-557.

Hobbs, R. (2001). Improving reading comprehension by using media literacy activities. *Voices from the Middle 8*(4), 44-50.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2001). *School's out: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146.

Knobel, M. (2006). *Everyday literacies: Students, discourse, and social practice*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lemke, J. L. (1988). Towards a social semiotics of the material subject. *Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture Working Papers, 2*(1), 1-17.

Lemke, J. L. (1989). Social semiotics: A new model for literacy education. In D. Bloom, (Ed.), *Classrooms and literacy* (pp. 289-309). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Piette, J., & Giroux, L. (1997). The theoretical foundations of media education programs. In R. Kubey (Ed.), *Media literacy in the information age.* New York: Transaction Press.

Singleton, G., & Clinton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-116.

Snyder, T. (1999). *Digest of education statistics.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Education.

Staples, J. M. (2005). What's love got to do with it? Reading "Black femininity" in a media text. *Perspectives on Urban Education, 3*(2) [Electronic version]. Available at http://www.urbanedjournal.org/archive/vol3issue2/commentaries/comment0012.pdf

Staples, J. M. (2008a). "Do you remember?" Confronting post-9/11 censorship through critical questioning and poetic devices. *English Journal*, *97*(5), 81-87.

Staples, J. M. (2008b). "Hustle and flow": A critical student and teacher-generated framework for re-authoring a representation of Black masculinity. *Educational Action Research, 16*(3), 377-390.

Staples, J. M. (2008c). "How does that hurt?" Encouraging teacher leadership that confronts linguistic violence in popular culture media. *English Leadership Quarterly, 31*(2), 3-6.

Staples, J. M. (2008d). "How do I know what I think 'til I hear what I say?" The role of collaborative discourse in critical media literacy development. *The International Journal of Learning*, *15*(7), 107-118.

Staples, J. M. (in press). Encouraging agitation: Teaching teacher candidates to confront words that wound. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy development, ethnography, and education*. New York: Longman Group Limited.

Su, Z. (1996). Why teach: Profiles and entry perspectives of minority students as becoming teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29*(3), 25-27.

Su, Z. (1997). Teaching as a profession and as a career: Minority candidates' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*, 325-340.

Vasudevan, L. (2008). Negotiating new literacies in "old" spaces: Toward a new literacies research pedagogy. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York.